## 1 High feasibility of salivary therapeutic drug monitoring in linezolid, but less in

## 2 tedizolid: A single-dose study in healthy subjects

- 3
- 4 Hitoshi Kawasuji,<sup>a</sup> Yasuhiro Tsuji,<sup>b</sup> Keiko Miyaki,<sup>b</sup> Takahiko Aoyama,<sup>b</sup> Fumihiro Kurosaki,<sup>b</sup>
- 5 Masayoshi Ezaki,<sup>a</sup> Yuki Koshiyama,<sup>a</sup> Yusuke Takegoshi,<sup>a</sup> Makito Kaneda,<sup>a</sup> Yushi Murai,<sup>a</sup>
- 6 Kou Kimoto,<sup>a</sup> Kentaro Nagaoka,<sup>a</sup> and Yoshihiro Yamamoto<sup>a</sup>\*
- 7
- <sup>a</sup> Department of Clinical Infectious Diseases, Toyama University Graduate School of
- 9 Medicine and Pharmaceutical Sciences, Toyama, Japan
- <sup>10</sup> <sup>b</sup> Laboratory of Clinical Pharmacometrics, School of Pharmacy, Nihon University, Funabashi,
- 11 Chiba, Japan
- 12

## 13 **\*Corresponding author**

- 14 Yoshihiro Yamamoto, MD, PhD
- 15 Department of Clinical Infectious Diseases
- 16 Graduate School of Medicine and Pharmaceutical Sciences
- 17 University of Toyama
- 18 2630 Sugitani, Toyama 930-0194 Japan
- 19 Phone: +81-76-434-7245
- 20 Fax: +81-76-434-5018
- 21 E-mail: <u>yamamoto@med.u-toyama.ac.jp</u>
- 22
- 23 **Running title:** Salivary therapeutic drug monitoring in linezolid and tedizolid

## 25 ABSTRACT

### 26 Background

27 Salivary therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) offers the potential to reduce the risks, burden, 28 time, and costs of blood-based TDM, but its feasibility in oxazolidinone antibiotics and the 29 influence of food intake remain unknown.

## 30 Methods

A total of 12 healthy volunteers participated in this study. Linezolid and tedizolid were intravenously administered to 6 participants each. Saliva samples were taken at 15 time points and peripheral venous blood samples were also taken at 12 time points simultaneously with saliva. Total and unbound serum and saliva concentrations of linezolid and tedizolid were measured using high-performance liquid chromatography.

### 36 **Results**

37 Individual concentration-time curves in saliva versus serum (total and unbound) were similar 38 in linezolid, but different in tedizolid. Saliva concentrations were significantly correlated with 39 total and unbound serum concentrations in both agents. However, concentrations in each 40 case and area under the concentration-time curve from 0 to 10 h (AUC<sub>0-10</sub>) in saliva were correlated with those in total or unbound serum for linezolid, but not for tedizolid. The mean 41 42 saliva-to-serum (total and unbound) concentration and  $AUC_{0-10}$  ratios were 0.90 and 0.90 in total and 1.09 and 0.99 in unbound. Food intake did not influence these correlations in 43 linezolid. 44

## 45 **Conclusions**

The analysis of linezolid in saliva is applicable for TDM as a promising alternative to conventional serum sampling without correlation factors, but application of tedizolid is less feasible. Easy sampling using a noninvasive technique may facilitate TDM even in underdeveloped countries with limited resources and specific patient categories.

51 Key words: linezolid; tedizolid; serum; saliva; therapeutic drug monitoring

## 53 **INTRODUCTION**

54 Linezolid has been widely used in methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) 55 (1, 2) and vancomycin-resistant *Enterococcus faecium* (VRE) infections (3), and has recently gained a greater role in treatment regimens for multidrug-resistant or extensively 56 drug-resistant Mycobacterium tuberculosis, or Mycobacterium abscessus (4-6). Patients 57should be closey monitored due to time- and concentration-dependent serious adverse 58effects of linezolid, including myelosuppression and neuropathy (7). In spite of linezolid 5960 being a drug with a very narrow therapeutic window (8), linezolid shows large 61 pharmacokinetic variability, and drug-drug interactions also contribute to the high inter-individual variability in linezolid pharmacokinetics (9). 62

Therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) serves as an efficient patient management tool by contributing to assessment of treatment response, helping to reduce toxicity and minimizing antibiotic resistance while ensuring adequate drug exposure (10). Several findings have provided evidence for the proper application of TDM for linezolid as an effective tool to predict serious adverse events and prevent discontinuation in advance (11-14).

Conventional venipuncture, the sampling currently used in clinical practice for TDM, is an invasive procedure with several logistical restrictions, such as the requirement of trained phlebotomists and appropriate materials, immediate storage in a refrigerator or freezer after collection, and cold chain transport to maintain the biospecimen integrity (15). Blood sampling is undesirable for some patient groups because of limited blood supply (e.g., neonates), less accessible veins (e.g., elderly), or religious objections (15). Alternatives to regular blood sampling (e.g., saliva) are therefore being studied.

Saliva sampling could reduce the risks, burden, time, and costs of blood sampling (16).
Self-sampling at home would be advantageous, especially in TB-endemic countries, and
would enable multiple sample collection (17). Dried blood spot (DBS) sampling is another
less invasive method (18). However, DBS sampling can be painful, is more complicated, and

has higher failure rates than saliva sampling (15). The drug concentrations in DBS are
influenced by the hematocrit value, blood volume, sampling paper, and chromatographic
effects (15, 18). In addition, unbound drug concentrations are not determinable in DBS;
salivary concentrations are generally used to represent the unbound drug concentrations
(15).

Serum contains unbound and bound drugs, whereas saliva generally contains only unbound drugs. Measuring the concentrations of unbound drugs may be important in pharmacokinetic studies, because only unbound drugs are pharmacologically active (19). This means that salivary concentrations of drugs may be more strongly associated with therapeutically active drug concentrations than total serum/plasma concentrations (19).

Previously, a few studies described linezolid concentrations in saliva and found that 89 saliva is a suitable matrix for TDM in healthy individuals or MDR-TB patients (15, 17, 20-22). 90 91 Salivary concentrations can be translated to plasma or serum concentrations with a 92 correction factor of 1.0–1.2 (15, 20, 22). However, there has been no human study measuring unbound concentrations of linezolid and assessing the correlation between saliva 93 94 and unbound serum/plasma concentrations. Only about 3-7 time points are generally used 95 for linezolid measurement (15, 20, 21), and thus the data for linezolid pharmacokinetics in 96 saliva and serum remain scarce.

97 Tedizolid is a second-generation oxazolidinone which has shown similar efficacy to linezolid in acute bacterial skin and soft tissue infections, with reduced adverse side effects 98 99 (23, 24). Tedizolid has also shown high activity against *M. tuberculosis* including MDR 100 strains (25) and species of nontuberculous mycobacteria (NTM) (26); thus, tedizolid is gaining recognition as an attractive alternative to linezolid for MDR-TB and NTM (27-29). 101 102 Plasma protein binding differs between tedizolid and linezolid and is reported as 70-90% 103 (29) and 18% (30) in humans; therefore the pharmacokinetics of these two drugs is 104 considered to be different. However, there is scarce information regarding the

pharmacokinetics in clinical practice. Furthermore, while there has been one study
 measuring salivary concentrations of tedizolid in rats (31), there has been no such study in
 humans.

In addition, salivary properties are known to influenced by food intake (16), but it is
unclear whether diet may also affect salivary drug concentrations in linezolid or tedizolid.
The aim of this study was to explore the feasibility of saliva-based TDM of linezolid and
tedizolid in clinical settings, including the requirement for dietary control for saliva collection.
To this end, we investigated the correlations of saliva and total and unbound serum
concentrations in healthy volunteers, and assessed these correlations before and just after
food intake.

## 116 **Participants and Methods**

This study was registered at UMIN (UMIN000046556) and approved by the ethical review board of the University of Toyama (approval nos. R2012133 and R2020147) and the Nihon University (approval nos. 20-005 and 23A-005). Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

A total of 12 healthy volunteers participated in this study. Linezolid was administered to 6 participants and tedizolid to 6 participants. Linezolid ( $Zyvox^{@_{-}}$  IV bag 600 mg / 300 mL) and tedizolid phosphate (Sivectro<sup>@\_</sup> 200mg vial) for infusion were purchased from Pfizer (Tokyo) and MSD (Tokyo), respectively. Linezolid 600 mg/300 mL bag and tedizolid phosphate reconstituted with 4 mL of sterile water and further dissolved with 250 mL of 0.9% sterile saline were infused intravenously for 1 h.

Saliva samples were taken at 15 time points according to a preset schedule (Table S1) 127128 consisting of a sample before and at 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1, 1.25, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 10 129 h after the start of the infusion. To collect saliva samples, participants were asked to drink 50 130 mL of distilled water to promote saliva secretion before saliva collection. Subsequently, the saliva samples were collected by chewing on a cotton roll and processed using Salivette 131 132(Sarstedt, Nu mbrecht, Germany) in combination with centrifugation ( $3000 \times g$  for 2 min) 133 according to the manufacturer's instructions. Peripheral venous blood samples were also 134 taken simultaneously with saliva, before and at 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 10 h after 135the start of the infusion, through a short venous catheter inserted in the forearm opposite the 136 infusion site. The serum samples were centrifuged at 3000×g for 10 min. All samples were 137 stored at -80°C until analysis. During the study, participants ate the same food at the specified times (linezolid, food consumption between 4 and 5 h (4–5 h) after the start of the 138 infusion; tedizolid, at 3–4, 6–8, and 8–10 h after the start of the infusion) and drank only 139 water, which was unrestricted, from the start to the end of sampling. 140

141 Total and unbound serum concentrations of linezolid and tedizolid were measured

using the improved methodology based on our previously published high-performance liquid
 chromatography (HPLC) methods (30, 32). Saliva samples were applied in the same
 manner as serum to measure saliva concentration.

Linezolid bulk powder (CAS No. 165800033) was purchased from Toronto Research 145Chemicals (North York, Canada), and tedizolid bulk powder (CAS No. 856867-55-5) was 146 147 purchased from LKT Laboratories (Saint Paul, MN). Tedizolid was used as an internal standard (IS) for linezolid. L-tryptophan methyl ester hydrochloride was purchased from 148 149 Tokyo Chemical Industry Co. (Tokyo) and used as an IS for tedizolid. All other reagents were 150of analytical grade and were commercially available. Linezolid and tedizolid concentrations were determined using an HPLC system (Shimadzu Corporation, Kyoto, Japan). High 151 linearity was exhibited over a concentration range for linezolid and tedizolid (R<sup>2</sup>>0.999). The 152lower limit of quantifications (LLOQ) of linezolid and tedizolid were 0.1 and 0.001 mg/L, 153154 respectively. All concentration levels met the pre-set criteria for accuracy and precision (bias and coefficient of variation [CV] <15%; at LLOQ both <20%). 155

Area under the concentration-time curve from 0 to 10 h (AUC<sub>0-10</sub>) in serum and saliva was calculated using the trapezoidal rule. AUC<sub>10- $\infty$ </sub> was determined using the equation C<sub>10</sub>/elimination rate constant (ke). ke was determined by using log-linear regression of the concentrations in the terminal period. AUC<sub>0- $\infty$ </sub> was calculated by adding AUC<sub>0-10</sub> and AUC<sub>10-</sub>  $\infty$ . Half-life (t<sub>1/2</sub>) was calculated using the equation 0.693/ke. C<sub>max</sub> was defined as the highest observed concentration and T<sub>max</sub> as the corresponding time of C<sub>max</sub>.

PK analyses, including determination of the  $C_{max}$ ,  $T_{max}$ ,  $AUC_{0-10}$ ,  $AUC_{0-\infty}$ , and  $t_{1/2}$  of linezolid and tedizolid, were performed in R (v4.3.3) applying the ggplot2 package (v3.5.0) (22) in a tidyverse framework (v2.0.0).

Passing–Bablok regression and Bland–Altman plots were used to analyse results. Pearson's correlation and the Wilcoxon signed-rank test were applied to other comparisons. Statistical significance between different groups was defined as P < 0.05. Statistical analysis

- and figure construction were performed using JMP Pro version 17.0.0 software (SAS
  Institute, Cary, NC) and GraphPad Prism version 9.5.1 (GraphPad Software, San Diego,
  CA). Data are expressed as mean with standard deviation (SD) or median with interquartile
  range (IQR).
- 172

## 174 **RESULTS**

Participant demographics and the pharmacokinetic parameters (AUC<sub>0-10</sub>, AUC<sub>0-∞</sub>, C<sub>max</sub>, T<sub>max</sub>,  $t_{1/2}$ , protein binding rate) of linezolid are shown in **Table 1**. Individual linezolid concentration–time curves in saliva versus serum (total and unbound) were similarly shaped (**Fig. 1A**) and T<sub>max</sub> in saliva was not delayed (**Table 1**), which suggested that penetration of linezolid into saliva is fast. The linezolid AUC<sub>0-10</sub>, AUC<sub>0-∞</sub>, and  $t_{1/2}$  in saliva were similar to those in unbound serum, but C<sub>max</sub> in saliva was similar to that in total serum rather than that in unbound serum.

182Pearson's test revealed that the total and unbound serum concentrations were significantly correlated with saliva concentration in total (Fig. 2A and 2B) and in each 183 individual (Fig. S1) for linezolid. Passing-Bablok analysis also showed that the linear 184 regression line of linezolid saliva concentration = -0.38 + 0.95 x total serum concentration 185 186 with 95%Cl of intercept -0.99–0.11; 95%Cl of slope 0.88–1.02; R = 0.75, and P < 0.001. A 187 linear relationship between unbound serum and saliva concentrations of linezolid was also 188 observed: saliva concentration =  $-0.55 + 1.15 \times$  unbound serum concentration with 95%CI of 189 intercept -1.34–0.10; 95%CI of slope 1.04–1.25; R = 0.66, and P < 0.001, respectively.

For AUCs, Pearson's test also revealed that the total and unbound serum AUC<sub>0-10</sub> and AUC<sub>0- $\infty$ </sub> were correlated with saliva AUC<sub>0-10</sub> and AUC<sub>0- $\infty$ </sub>, except for unbound serum AUC<sub>0- $\infty$ </sub> (**Fig. 3A**). Passing–Bablok regression also showed a good relationship between the saliva AUC<sub>0-10</sub> and total serum AUC<sub>0-10</sub> with a slope estimate of 0.86 (95%Cl, -0.33–2.86) and an intercept estimate of 5.44 (95%Cl, -154.0–98.5), and unbound serum AUC<sub>0-10</sub> with a slope estimate of 1.48 (95%Cl, 0.14–2.52) and an intercept estimate of -26.6 (95%Cl, -109.4–75.3), respectively.

Bland–Altman assessment demonstrated good agreement between analyses of linezolid concentrations in saliva and serum (total and unbound). The mean saliva to total serum concentration,  $AUC_{0-10}$ , and  $AUC_{0-\infty}$  ratios were 0.90 (95%CI 0.67–1.13), 0.90

200 (95%CI 0.80-1.00), and 0.76 (95%CI 0.60-0.93), respectively (Fig. 4A-C), and the mean 201 saliva to unbound serum concentration, AUC<sub>0-10</sub>, and AUC<sub>0- $\infty$ </sub> ratios were 1.07 (95%CI 202 0.74–1.40), 1.09 (95%CI 0.94–1.23), and 0.99 (95%CI 0.63–1.35), respectively (Fig. 4D–F). 203 Regarding the influence of diet, at 5 h after administration after food intake, the total and 204 unbound serum concentrations were significantly correlated with saliva concentration (Fig. 205 S2) and the biases (ranges) of saliva to total and unbound serum concentration ratios were 0.86 (95%CI 0.64–1.10) and 1.05 (95%CI 0.75–1.35), respectively. These results suggested 206 207 that the correlation between serum and saliva may not be affected by food intake.

208 Participant demographic and pharmacokinetic parameters of tedizolid are also shown 209 in **Table 1**. Although the tedizolid AUC<sub>0-10</sub>, AUC<sub>0- $\infty$ </sub>, C<sub>max</sub>, and t<sub>1/2</sub> in saliva were more similar to those in unbound serum than in total serum, individual tedizolid concentration-time 210 curves in saliva versus serum (total and unbound) were differently shaped (Fig. 1B). 211 212 Pearson's test revealed that the total and unbound serum concentrations of tedizolid were 213 significantly correlated with total saliva concentration (Fig. 2C and 2D). However, in the 214 individual evaluations, 3 out of 6 participants showed no correlation between saliva and total 215 or unbound tedizolid concentration (Fig. S3 and S4), which was due to the inconsistent 216results for  $T_{max}$  in saliva and serum; in 5 out of 6 participants (all but participant 2), peaks of 217 saliva concentration were not observed and  $T_{max}$  in saliva was different from  $T_{max}$  in serum (Fig. S3 and S4). These difference seemed not to be due to the diet because T<sub>max</sub> values in 218 219 serum or saliva were measured before food intake (at 3–4, 6–8, and 8–10 h after the start of 220 the infusion).

Passing–Bablok analysis showed that the linear regression line of tedizolid saliva concentration =  $0.0055 + 0.053 \times \text{total}$  serum concentration with 95%Cl of intercept -0.0047-0.03208; 95%Cl of slope 0.040-0.064; R = 0.54, and P < 0.001. The unbound serum concentrations of tedizolid were also linearly correlated with saliva concentrations with equation saliva concentration =  $0.0067 + 0.36 \times \text{unbound}$  serum concentration with

95%CI of intercept -0.005–0.021; 95%CI of slope 0.29–0.43; R = 0.50, and P < 0.001, respectively. However, for AUCs, Pearson's test revealed that the total and unbound serum AUCs (AUC<sub>0–10</sub> and AUC<sub>0-∞</sub>) were all uncorrelated with saliva AUCs (**Fig. S5**), which does not favour saliva as a sampling matrix for TDM. The mean (range) saliva to total and unbound serum tedizolid concentration rates were 0.060 (0.012–0.108) and 0.39 (0.07–0.74), respectively.

232

### 234 **DISCUSSION**

This study is the first to investigate the relationship between saliva and unbound serum concentration with multiple time points and to measure saliva tedizolid concentrations in humans. We also investigated the influence of diet on the correlation between saliva and total or unbound serum concentrations, because while salivary properties are known to change according to food intake (16), the effect of diet on salivary drug concentrations has not been unclarified.

241 Saliva contains only the unbound fraction of drugs, since only the unbound fraction is 242 able to infiltrate through the salivary tissues, including the capillary wall, the basement 243 membrane, and the membrane of the salivary gland epithelial cells (33). Thus, salivary 244 concentrations generally represent the unbound drug concentrations (15). Regarding 245 linezolid, as we expected, the time-courses of linezolid saliva concentrations were similarly 246 shaped with unbound concentrations in serum, and the mean saliva-to-serum concentration, 247  $AUC_{0-10}$ , and  $AUC_{0-\infty}$  ratios were closer to 1 for those to unbound serum compared to those 248 to total serum. The mean saliva to unbound serum concentration, AUC<sub>0-10</sub>, and AUC<sub>0- $\infty$ </sub>

ratios were 1.07, 1.09, and 0.99, respectively (**Fig. 4D–F**).

250 To date, no human study has compared linezolid saliva and unbound concentrations in 251serum or plasma. Based on the previous studies conducted in TB patients, Bolhuis et al. 252 reported the mean oral fluid/total serum concentration or AUC from 0 to 12 h (AUC<sub>0-12</sub>) ratios 253were 1.03 and 0.97, respectively (20). Van den Elsen et al. also showed that the median 254saliva/total serum concentration and AUC<sub>0-24</sub> ratios were 0.76 and 0.81, respectively (17). 255They also suggested a correlation factor of 1.2 when translated to serum  $AUC_{0.24}$  using 256 saliva  $AUC_{0-24}$ , which may be due to the difference between the total and saliva 257 concentrations, the latter of which represent the unbound concentrations, and it seemed that 258the values of saliva AUC<sub>0-24</sub> and unbound serum AUC<sub>0-24</sub> would be approximately the same. 259 In the present study, the mean saliva-to-total serum concentration,  $AUC_{0-10}$ , and  $AUC_{0-\infty}$ 

ratios were 0.90, 0.90, and 0.76, respectively (**Fig. 4A–C**), and the mean saliva-to-serum concentration,  $AUC_{0-10}$ , and  $AUC_{0-\infty}$  ratios were closer to 1 for unbound serum concentrations than for the total serum concentrations. Although there were slight differences in saliva-to-total serum concentrations or AUC ratios in these studies, which might be attributable to differences in sampling methods, processing or storage, salivary TDM of linezolid indeed might indeed be feasible with good reproducibility and is ready for validation in a clinical setting.

267 Salivary properties are known to change according to food intake (16). To improve the 268 feasibility of salivary linezolid TDM, we investigated the effects of food intake on salivary 269 linezolid concentrations and the correlation with total and unbound serum concentrations. In 270 the present study, even after food intake, total and unbound serum concentrations were 271 significantly correlated with saliva concentration (Fig. S2) and the biases (ranges) of saliva 272 to total and unbound serum concentration ratios were 0.86 (0.64–1.10) and 1.05 (0.75–1.35). 273 respectively. These results suggested that the correlation between serum and saliva 274 linezolid concentrations may not be affected by diet, and dietary control may not be 275 necessary when collecting saliva.

276 For tedizolid, the mean (range) tedizolid saliva-to-unbound serum concentration ratio 277 was 0.39 (0.07–0.74), suggesting lower passage into the saliva than linezolid. As in previous 278 studies (29, 32), the serum protein-binding rates were different between linezolid and 279 tedizolid in the present study. The median (IQR) serum protein-binding rates are 18.2 280 (15.8–19.8) in linezolid and 60.3 (48.0–71.1) in tedizolid, respectively (**Table 1**). It is thought 281 that the significant difference in serum-protein binding between linezolid and tedizolid affects 282 drug passage into the saliva. In addition to serum-protein binding, pH and pKa, lipid solubility, 283 charge, molecular weight and spatial configuration, dose and clearance of the drug, salivary 284 flow rate and pH, and salivary-binding proteins and salivary enzymes capable of 285 metabolizing the drug would also affect the results (16, 34). Based on these many variables,

286 the analysis of oxazolidinone concentrations in saliva and serum must be validated in 287 humans, not animals. In fact, however, there has been only one study measuring salivary 288 concentrations of tedizolid, and that study used a rat model; the results showed that the serum-protein binding and salivary pH values were different from those of humans (31). The 289 290 study also demonstrated a strong correlation between saliva and plasma concentrations of 291 tedizolid and suggested that saliva is a useful matrix for TDM of not only linezolid but also 292 tedizolid (31). However, in the present study in humans, although correlations between 293 saliva and total and unbound serum tedizolid concentrations were observed in participants 294overall, these correlations were not observed in 3 of the 6 participants (Fig. S3). A possible 295 explanation for the observed nonlinear relationship might be the low tedizolid concentrations, higher interindividual variability, and the absence or delayed saliva concentration peak after 296 297 infusion (**Fig. S3 and S4**). In addition, the total and unbound serum AUCs (AUC<sub>0-10</sub> and 298  $AUC_{0-\infty}$ ) were all uncorrelated with saliva AUCs in tedizolid (**Fig. S5**). Based on these results, 299 saliva seems not to be useful in TDM for tedizolid.

Salivary TDM could be an attractive alternative method for traditional linezolid TDM using plasma or serum, and feasibility improvements will likely be a focus of future studies, including stability studies for transport at room temperature and cross-validation of existing analytical methods in saliva (17). However, with respect to tedizolid our data do not support saliva as a suitable matrix for TDM using the described method. As shown in a previous systematic review (15), saliva will likely not be a universal but only a selective matrix for TDM.

Saliva sampling is easy and noninvasive, and requires only a small sample volume
(100 µL) for measurement, thus allows for the collection of multiple samples, while avoiding
the risks associated with blood drawing. As with other drugs reported in previous studies (15,
35), the linezolid concentrations in saliva represent the unbound concentrations in the serum,
and therefore salivary concentrations may be considered more closely related to

312 therapeutically active unbound concentrations at the site of action than total serum 313 concentrations. Saliva sampling might even reduce costs due to the higher level of training 314 of personnel needed for blood sampling and because less time is needed. Moreover, saliva 315 sampling might even take place at home. If collected saliva is stable for a certain period (e.g., 316 a few weeks) even under low or high temperature, salivary TDM would allow children, elderly, 317 and people with disabilities the option to sample themselves at any location and afterward bring their saliva samples to a local health post (15). To further improve feasibility of salivary 318 319 TDM in clinical settings, the applicability of saliva and/or collection devices other than the 320 Salivette (Sarstedt, Leicester, United Kingdom) for pharmacokinetic analysis and therapeutic 321 drug monitoring in patients should be clinically validated (20). 322 There were several limitations in the present study. First, salivary pH values which 323 could influence drug penetration into saliva were not measured. Second, we included only 324 healthy volunteers in the present study and did not investigate children or patients. 325 especially those with disease affecting the saliva composition. Third, we did not evaluate the 326 time-stability of saliva samples under room temperature conditions. 327 In conclusion, the analysis of linezolid (with no correction factor) in saliva is applicable 328 for TDM as a promising alternative to conventional serum sampling. Easy sampling using a 329 noninvasive technique may facilitate therapeutic drug monitoring for specific patient 330 categories.

## 332 **Transparency declaration**

## **Data availability**

- <sup>334</sup> The data presented in this study are available upon request from the corresponding author.
- 335 **Conflicts of interest**
- 336 We have no conflicts of interest to declare.
- 337 Funding
- 338 This study was supported by research grants from the Japanese Society of Chemotherapy

<sup>339</sup> Foundation (the 8th Uehara Infectious Disease and Chemotherapy Research Award to H.K.)

- and the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science KAKENHI program (grant number
- JP22K08597 to Y.Y.). The funding bodies played no role in the study design, collection,
- analysis, or interpretation of data, and no role in writing the manuscript.

## 343 Acknowledgments

- We thank Kai Kurihara, Risa Sakurai, and Rei Yasukochi for their assistance with the sample
- 345 collections.
- Author contributions: Conceptualization: H.K., Y. Tsuji, and Y.Y.; Methodology: H.K. and Y.
- <sup>347</sup> Tsuji; Validation: H.K. and Y. Tsuji; Formal Analysis: H.K. and Y. Tsuji; Investigation: H.K., Y.
- 348 Tsuji, K.M., T.A., F.K., M.E., Y.K., Y. Takegoshi, M.K., Y.M., K.K., and K.N.; Data Curation:
- H.K. and Y. Tsuji; Writing–Original Draft Preparation: H.K. and Y. Tsuji; Writing–Review and
- Editing: H.K. and Y. Tsuji; Visualization: H.K. and Y. Tsuji; Supervision: Y. Tsuji and Y.Y.;
- <sup>351</sup> Project Administration: Y. Tsuji and Y.Y.; Funding acquisition: H.K. and Y.Y.

353 Figure legends:

#### Figure 1. Concentration-time curves for linezolid and tedizolid in total and unbound 354

#### serum and saliva 355

(A) Concentration-time curves in total (red) and unbound serum (orange) and saliva (blue) 356 for linezolid (n = 6). (B) Concentration-time curves in total (red) and unbound serum 357 (orange) and saliva (blue) for tedizolid (n = 6). Data are presented as means and standard 358 deviations. 359

360

#### 361 Figure 2. Correlation between total or unbound serum and saliva concentrations of linezolid and tedizolid 362

The relationship between saliva concentrations and (A) total or (B) unbound serum 363 concentrations of linezolid (n = 6). The relationship between saliva concentrations and (C) 364 365 total or (D) unbound serum concentrations of tedizolid (n = 6). Each dot represents the 366 concentration measured at one time point for one individual. The Pearson correlation was 367 calculated, and the *P* value and r value and general linear regression lines are shown.

368

#### 369 Figure 3. Correlation between saliva and total or unbound serum AUCs of linezolid

370 The relationship of area under the concentration-time curve from 0 to 10 h (AUC<sub>0-10</sub>)

between in saliva and in (A) total or (C) unbound serum for linezolid (n = 6). The relationship 371

of AUC extrapolated to infinity (AUC<sub>0-∞</sub>) between in saliva and in (B) total or (D) unbound 372 373 serum for linezolid (n = 6). Each dot represents an individual value. The Pearson correlation

was calculated, and the *P* value and r value and general linear regression lines are shown.

375

374

Figure 4. Bland-Altman plot of linezolid concentration, AUC<sub>0-10</sub>, and AUC<sub>0-∞</sub> ratios in 376 saliva versus total or unbound serum 377

378 Bland-Altman plot of ratios of (A) concentrations, (B) AUC<sub>0-10</sub>, and (C) AUC<sub>0- $\infty$ </sub> between

saliva and total serum compared to the average of those in saliva and total serum. Bland-Altman plot of ratios of **(D)** concentrations, **(E)**  $AUC_{0-10}$ , and **(F)**  $AUC_{0-\infty}$  between in saliva and unbound serum compared to the average of those in saliva and unbound serum. Solid line: the bias. Dashed lines: the 95% limits of agreement.

383

## Figure S1. Correlation between total or unbound serum and saliva concentrations of

## 385 **linezolid in each individual**

The relationship between saliva concentrations and total (red) or unbound serum concentrations (orange) of linezolid in participant 1 to 6. Each dot represents the concentration measured at each time point for each individual. The Pearson correlation was calculated, and the *P* value and r value and general linear regression lines are shown.

390

# Figure S2. Correlation between total or unbound serum and saliva concentrations of linezolid before and after food intake

(A) The relationship between saliva concentrations and total (red) or unbound serum concentrations (orange) of linezolid until food intake (0–4 h after infusion). (B) The relationship between saliva concentrations and total (red) or unbound serum concentrations (orange) of linezolid after food intake (5–10 h after infusion). Each dot represents the concentration measured at one time point for one individual. The Pearson correlation was calculated, and the *P* value and r value and general linear regression lines are shown.

399

# Figure S3. Concentration-time curves for tedizolid in total and unbound serum and saliva of each individual

Concentration–time curves in total (red) and unbound serum (orange) and saliva (blue) for tedizolid (n = 6) in participants 1 to 6. Each dot represents the concentration measured at one time point for one individual.

405

## Figure S4. Correlation between total or unbound serum and saliva concentrations of

## 407 tedizolid in each individual

The relationship between saliva concentrations and total (red) or unbound serum concentrations (orange) of tedizolid in participants 1 to 6. Total and unbound serum concentrations at  $T_{max}$  (vertical dotted line) are shown for each individual. Each dot represents the concentration measured at one time point for one individual. The Pearson correlation was calculated, and the *P* value and r value and general linear regression lines are shown.

414

## Figure S5. Correlation between saliva and total or unbound serum AUCs of tedizolid

The relationship of the area under the concentration-time curve from 0 to 10 h (AUC<sub>0-10</sub>)

between in saliva and in (A) total or (C) unbound serum for tedizolid (n = 6). The relationship

of AUC extrapolated to infinity  $(AUC_{0-\infty})$  between in saliva and in **(B)** total or **(D)** unbound

serum for tedizolid (n = 6). Each dot represents an individual value. The Pearson correlation

420 was calculated, and the *P* value and r value and general linear regression lines are shown.

421

## Table 1. Pharmacokinetic parameters of linezolid and tedizolid in serum (total and

## 424 unbound) and in saliva (n = 6)

	Median value (IQR) for sample type			
Drug and parameter	Total	Unbound	Saliva	
Linezolid				
Participants	6			
Age (years)	31.0 (27.0–48.0)			
Body weight (kg)	67.0 (59.5–71.3)			
$AUC_{0-10} \text{ (mg} \cdot \text{h/L)}$	86.8 (81.9–105.3) <sup>b</sup>	73.9 (67.4–84.2) <sup>a</sup>	79.9 (73.1–89.7)	
$AUC_{0\text{-}\infty}$ (mg $\cdot$ h/L)	197.4 (173.5–250.6) <sup>b,</sup> 164.5 (139.6–191.3) <sup>a</sup> 148.6			
	с		(129.2–183.5) <sup>a</sup>	
C <sub>max</sub> (mg/L)	15.6 (13.3–17.0) <sup>b</sup>	12.7 (10.9–13.6) <sup>a, c</sup>	15.5 (14.2–16.9) <sup>b</sup>	
T <sub>max</sub> (h)	1.0 (1.0–1.0)	1.0 (1.0–1.0)	1.0 (1.0–1.0)	
t <sub>1/2</sub> (h)	11.4 (10.1–12.1) <sup>c</sup>	10.9 (9.0–12.0)	9.0 (7.4–10.0) <sup>a</sup>	
Protein-binding rate	18.2 (15.8–19.8)		_	
(%)				
Tedizolid				
Participants	6			
Age (years)	29.0 (28.5–35.8)			
Body weight (kg)	72.0 (65.3–77.8)			
AUC₀-10 (mg ⋅ h/L)	16.3 (15.1–18.3) <sup>c</sup>	2.5 (2.3–2.9)	1.0 (0.8–1.3) <sup>a</sup>	
$AUC_{\mathtt{0-\infty}}$ (mg $\cdot$ h/L)	27.4 (25.0–31.6) <sup>c</sup>	3.8 (3.4–4.6)	1.5 (1.1–2.0) <sup>a</sup>	
C <sub>max</sub> (mg/L)	4.9 (3.7–6.0) <sup>c</sup>	0.9 (0.6–1.0)	0.2 (0.1–0.3) <sup>a</sup>	
T <sub>max</sub> (h)	1.0 (1.0–1.1)	1.0 (0.9–1.1)	2.0 (1.0–3.0)	

t <sub>1/2</sub> (h)	8.6 (7.7–9.1)	6.5 (6.0–7.4)	6.1 (4.1–7.6)
----------------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

Protein-binding rate 60.3 (48.0–71.1)

(%)

 $_{425}$  <sup>a</sup>, *P* < 0.05 versus total, as determined by Fisher's exact test.

426 <sup>b</sup>, P < 0.05 versus unbound, as determined by Fisher's exact test.

<sup>427</sup> <sup>c</sup>, *P* < 0.05 versus saliva, as determined by Fisher's exact test.

428

429

Time (h) after	Infusion	Collection		Comment
infusion		Saliva	Serum	
0		X	Х	Just before infusion
0.25	Linezolid (Zyvox <sup>©</sup> IV	х		
0.5	bag 600 mg / 300 mL)	Х	Х	
0.75	were infused intravenously for 1 h.	Х		
1		X	Х	At the end of infusion
1.25		Х		
15		Х	Х	
2		Х	Х	
2.5		Х	Х	
3		Х	Х	
4		Х	Х	
4–5		Food intake		
5		Х	Х	
6		Х	Х	
8		Х	Х	
10		Х	Х	

## 431 Table S1 Time schedule of linezolid study

Saliva samples were taken at 15 time points (X) just before and after the start of the linezolid infusion. To collect saliva samples, participants were asked to drink 50 mL of distilled water to promote saliva secretion before saliva collection. Subsequently, the saliva samples were collected by chewing on a cotton roll and processed using Salivette (Sarstedt, Nu mbrecht, Germany). Peripheral venous blood samples were also taken simultaneously with saliva at 12 time points (X) just before and after the start of the infusion, through a short venous

- 438 catheter inserted in the forearm opposite the infusion site. During the study, participants ate
- the same food between 4 and 5 h (4–5 h) after the start of the infusion and drank only water,
- 440 which was unrestricted, from the start to the end of sampling.

441

443	Table S2	Time schedule	of tedizolid study
-----	----------	---------------	--------------------

Time (h) after	Infusion	Collection		Comment
infusion		Saliva	Serum	
0	Tedizolid phosphate (Sivectro <sup>®</sup> 200mg) were infused intravenously for 1 h.	X	X	Just before infusion
0.25		X	Х	
1		X	Х	At the end of infusion
1.25 15		X X	Х	
2		Х	Х	
2.5 3		x x	X X	
3–4		Food intake		
4		Х	Х	
5		X	X	
6 6–8		X Food intake	Х	
8		Х	Х	
8–10		Food intake		
10		Х	Х	

Saliva samples were taken at 15 time points (X) just before and after the start of the tedizolid infusion. To collect saliva samples, participants were asked to drink 50 mL of distilled water to promote saliva secretion before saliva collection. Subsequently, the saliva samples were

- 447 collected by chewing on a cotton roll and processed using Salivette (Sarstedt, Nu mbrecht,
- Germany). Peripheral venous blood samples were also taken simultaneously with saliva at
- 12 time points (X) just before and after the start of the infusion, through a short venous
- 450 catheter inserted in the forearm opposite the infusion site. During the study, participants ate
- the same food at 3–4, 6–8, and 8–10 h after the start of the infusion and drank only water,
- 452 which was unrestricted, from the start to the end of sampling.
- 453
- 454

## 455 **REFERENCES**

- Turner NA, Sharma-Kuinkel BK, Maskarinec SA, Eichenberger EM, Shah PP,
   Carugati M, Holland TL, Fowler VG. 2019. Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus: an overview of basic and clinical research. Nature Reviews Microbiology 17:203-218.
- 2. Kawasuji H, Nagaoka K, Tsuji Y, Kimoto K, Takegoshi Y, Kaneda M, Murai Y, Karaushi 460 461 H, Mitsutake K, Yamamoto Y. 2023. Effectiveness and Safety of Linezolid Versus against Teicoplanin, Daptomycin 462 Vancomycin, or Methicillin-Resistant 463 Staphylococcus aureus Bacteremia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. 464 Antibiotics (Basel) 12.
- Cairns KA, Udy AA, Peel TN, Abbott IJ, Dooley MJ, Peleg AY. 2023. Therapeutics for
   Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococcal Bloodstream Infections. Clinical Microbiology
   Reviews 36:e00059-22.
- 4684.World Health Organization (WHO) (2019) WHO consolidated guidelines on469drug-resistant tuberculosis treatment. WHO G.
- 470 5. Agyeman AA, Ofori-Asenso R. 2016. Efficacy and safety profile of linezolid in the
  471 treatment of multidrug-resistant (MDR) and extensively drug-resistant (XDR)
  472 tuberculosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Ann Clin Microbiol Antimicrob
  473 15:41.
- Daley CL, Iaccarino JM, Lange C, Cambau E, Wallace RJ, Jr, Andrejak C, Böttger EC, Brozek J, Griffith DE, Guglielmetti L, Huitt GA, Knight SL, Leitman P, Marras TK, Olivier KN, Santin M, Stout JE, Tortoli E, van Ingen J, Wagner D, Winthrop KL. 2020. Treatment of Nontuberculous Mycobacterial Pulmonary Disease: An Official ATS/ERS/ESCMID/IDSA Clinical Practice Guideline. Clinical Infectious Diseases 71:e1-e36.
- Garrabou G, Soriano À, Pinós T, Casanova-Mollà J, Pacheu-Grau D, Morén C,
  García-Arumí E, Morales M, Ruiz-Pesini E, Catalán-Garcia M, Milisenda JC, Lozano
  E, Andreu AL, Montoya J, Mensa J, Cardellach F. 2017. Influence of Mitochondrial
  Genetics on the Mitochondrial Toxicity of Linezolid in Blood Cells and Skin Nerve
  Fibers. Antimicrob Agents Chemother 61.
- 485 8. Wasserman S, Meintjes G, Maartens G. 2016. Linezolid in the treatment of
   486 drug-resistant tuberculosis: the challenge of its narrow therapeutic index. Expert Rev
   487 Anti Infect Ther 14:901-15.
- 9. Bandín-Vilar Ε. García-Quintanilla L. Castro-Balado Α, Zarra-Ferro Ι, 488 González-Barcia M, Campos-Toimil M, Mangas-Sanjuan V, Mondelo-García C, 489 Fernández-Ferreiro A. 2023. Correction: A Review of Population Pharmacokinetic 490 491 Analyses of Linezolid. Clinical Pharmacokinetics 62:1331-1331.
- 10. Mabilat C, Gros MF, Nicolau D, Mouton JW, Textoris J, Roberts JA, Cotta MO, van

Belkum A, Caniaux I. 2020. Diagnostic and medical needs for therapeutic drug
 monitoring of antibiotics. European Journal of Clinical Microbiology & Infectious
 Diseases 39:791-797.

- Pea F, Viale P, Cojutti P, Del Pin B, Zamparini E, Furlanut M. 2012. Therapeutic drug
   monitoring may improve safety outcomes of long-term treatment with linezolid in adult
   patients. J Antimicrob Chemother 67:2034-42.
- Cojutti PG, Merelli M, Bassetti M, Pea F. 2019. Proactive therapeutic drug monitoring
  (TDM) may be helpful in managing long-term treatment with linezolid safely: findings
  from a monocentric, prospective, open-label, interventional study. J Antimicrob
  Chemother doi:10.1093/jac/dkz374.
- Kawasuji H, Tsuji Y, Ogami C, Kimoto K, Ueno A, Miyajima Y, Kawago K, Sakamaki I,
   Yamamoto Y. 2021. Proposal of initial and maintenance dosing regimens with
   linezolid for renal impairment patients. BMC Pharmacology and Toxicology 22:13.
- Kawasuji H, Tsuji Y, Ogami C, Kaneda M, Murai Y, Kimoto K, Ueno A, Miyajima Y,
   Fukui Y, Sakamaki I, Yamamoto Y. 2021. Initially Reduced Linezolid Dosing Regimen
   to Prevent Thrombocytopenia in Hemodialysis Patients. Antibiotics (Basel) 10.
- van den Elsen SHJ, Oostenbrink LM, Heysell SK, Hira D, Touw DJ, Akkerman OW,
   Bolhuis MS, Alffenaar JC. 2018. Systematic Review of Salivary Versus Blood
   Concentrations of Antituberculosis Drugs and Their Potential for Salivary Therapeutic
   Drug Monitoring. Ther Drug Monit 40:17-37.
- 51316.Davies Forsman L, Kim HY, Nguyen TA, Alffenaar J-WC. 2024. Salivary Therapeutic514Drug Monitoring of Antimicrobial Therapy: Feasible or Futile? Clinical515Pharmacokinetics 63:269-278.
- van den Elsen SHJ, Akkerman OW, Jongedijk EM, Wessels M, Ghimire S, van der
   Werf TS, Touw DJ, Bolhuis MS, Alffenaar JC. 2020. Therapeutic drug monitoring
   using saliva as matrix: an opportunity for linezolid, but challenge for moxifloxacin. Eur
   Respir J 55.
- 52018.Zailani NNB, Ho PC-L. 2023. Dried Blood Spots—A Platform for Therapeutic Drug521Monitoring (TDM) and Drug/Disease Response Monitoring (DRM). European Journal522of Drug Metabolism and Pharmacokinetics 48:467-494.
- Seyfinejad B, Ozkan SA, Jouyban A. 2021. Recent advances in the determination of
   unbound concentration and plasma protein binding of drugs: Analytical methods.
   Talanta 225:122052.
- 526 20. Bolhuis MS, van Altena R, van Hateren K, de Lange WCM, Greijdanus B, Uges DRA, Kosterink JGW, van der Werf TS, Alffenaar JWC. 2013. Clinical Validation of the 527 Analysis of Linezolid and Clarithromycin in Oral Fluid of Patients with 528 529 Multidrug-Resistant Tuberculosis. Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy 530 57:3676-3680.

- Hara S, Uchiyama M, Yoshinari M, Matsumoto T, Jimi S, Togawa A, Takata T,
   Takamatsu Y. 2015. A simple high-performance liquid chromatography for the
   determination of linezolid in human plasma and saliva. Biomed Chromatogr
   29:1428-31.
- 535 22. Anonymous. Pfizer 2005. Zyvoxid. Product information. Pfizer, New York, NY.
- Moran GJ, Fang E, Corey GR, Das AF, De Anda C, Prokocimer P. 2014. Tedizolid for
   6 days versus linezolid for 10 days for acute bacterial skin and skin-structure
   infections (ESTABLISH-2): a randomised, double-blind, phase 3, non-inferiority trial.
   Lancet Infect Dis 14:696-705.
- Lee AS, de Lencastre H, Garau J, Kluytmans J, Malhotra-Kumar S, Peschel A,
   Harbarth S. 2018. Methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus. Nature Reviews
   Disease Primers 4:18033.
- 54325.Ruiz P, Causse M, Vaquero M, Casal M. 2019. In Vitro Activity of Tedizolid against544Mycobacterium tuberculosis.Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy54563:10.1128/aac.01939-18.
- 54626.Brown-Elliott BA, Wallace RJ. 2017. In Vitro Susceptibility Testing of Tedizolid against547Nontuberculous Mycobacteria. Journal of Clinical Microbiology 55:1747-1754.
- Ruth MM, Koeken VACM, Pennings LJ, Svensson EM, Wertheim HFL, Hoefsloot W,
   van Ingen J. 2019. Is there a role for tedizolid in the treatment of non-tuberculous
   mycobacterial disease? Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy 75:609-617.
- 551 28. Kumar K, Daley CL, Griffith DE, Loebinger MR. 2022. Management of
   552 <a href="https://www.emsteinable.com/seases/emsteinable.com/seases-com/s
- Iqbal K, Milioudi A, Wicha SG. 2022. Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics of
   Tedizolid. Clinical Pharmacokinetics 61:489-503.
- Tsuji Y, Holford NHG, Kasai H, Ogami C, Heo YA, Higashi Y, Mizoguchi A, To H,
   Yamamoto Y. 2017. Population pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of
   linezolid-induced thrombocytopenia in hospitalized patients. Br J Clin Pharmacol
   83:1758-1772.
- Inoue Y, Sato Y, Kashiwagi H, Nashimoto S, Sugawara M, Takekuma Y. 2023.
   Monitoring Salivary Concentrations of Tedizolid and Linezolid Using Rats. Eur J Drug
   Metab Pharmacokinet 48:387-395.
- Tsuji Y, Numajiri M, Ogami C, Kurosaki F, Miyamoto A, Aoyama T, Kawasuji H,
   Nagaoka K, Matsumoto Y, To H, Yamamoto Y. 2021. Development of a simple method
   for measuring tedizolid concentration in human serum using HPLC with a fluorescent
   detector. Medicine (Baltimore) 100:e28127.
- 33. Elmongy H, Abdel-Rehim M. 2016. Saliva as an alternative specimen to plasma for

- <sup>569</sup> drug bioanalysis: A review. TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry 83:70-79.
- 57034.Aps JK, Martens LC. 2005. Review: The physiology of saliva and transfer of drugs571into saliva. Forensic Sci Int 150:119-31.
- 572 **35.** Patsalos PN, Berry DJ. 2013. Therapeutic drug monitoring of antiepileptic drugs by 573 use of saliva. Ther Drug Monit 35:4-29.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.30.24309749; this version posted July 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license.

Α В Unbound serum concentrations Total serum concentrations 20 ] <sup>20</sup>] LZD LZD of linezolid (mg/L) of linezolid (mg/L) 15-**15** 10-10 5-5 r = 0.94, r = 0.95, *P* < 0.0001 0 10 15 20 Saliva concentrations of linezolid (mg/L) С r = 0.57, P < 0.0001 ... 0.2 0.3 0.0 0.4 0.5 **Saliva concentrations** Saliva concentrations of tedizolid (mg/L) of tedizolid (mg/L)

Α Total serum AUC<sub>0-10</sub> (mg · h/L) Total serum AUC<sub>0-∞</sub> (mg·h/L) 120-300 J LZD LZD 110-250-100· 200 **90 80**· **150** 70- $\begin{array}{c} & f \\ & f \\$ 100 60r = 0.90, *P* = 0.016 100 150 200 250 300 Saliva  $AUC_{0-\infty}$  (mg · h/L) С Multiple of the second r = 0.73, P = 0.101 \_ . . . . . . . . . . . 100 150 200 250 300 Saliva AUC<sub>0-10</sub> (mg · h/L) Saliva  $AUC_{0-\infty}$  (mg·h/L)

В

