





C.J. MORENO PEREZ<sup>1</sup>, A. COMES ESCODA<sup>1</sup>, A. CASALDÀLIGA TORRECILLAS<sup>1</sup>, N. MAS MALAGARRIGA<sup>1</sup>, J.L. VINENT GENESTAR<sup>1</sup>, H. COLOM CODINA<sup>2</sup>. <sup>1</sup>SANT JOAN DE DEU, PHARMACY, ESPLUGUES DE LLOBREGAT, SPAIN. <sup>2</sup>UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA, PHARMACOKINETICS, BARCELONA, SPAIN.

# EXTERNAL VALIDATION OF POPULATION PHARMACOKINETIC MODELS OF HIGH DOSING METHOTREXATE IN PEDIATRIC PATIENTS WITH ACUTE LYMPHOBLASTIC LEUKEMIA

## **Background and importance**



High-dose methotrexate (HDMTX) as a 24h infusion is essential to treat ALL



Monitoring methotrexate plasma concentrations must be performed to prevent toxicities

### Aim and objectives



Evaluate the predictive ability of two methotrexate pharmacokinetic models in pediatric oncology

#### **Material and Methods**

2 pharmacokinetic models: A & B

Variables collected at 24-48h post-infusion (high risk patients 2-48h):

✓ Individual prediction concentrations (Cipred)

Individual prediction error = ((Cipred – PCmtx)/PCmtx)\*100

✓ Methotrexate plasma concentrations (PCmtx)

✓ Creatinine levels

Median of individual prediction error (MDIPE): Accuracy

Absolute median of individual prediction error (MAIPE): Precision

**Goal: MDIPE ≤±10% & MAIPE ≤25%** 

#### Results



560 PCmtx from 57 patients with ALL (aged 2-17) received HDMTX 1-5 g/m<sup>2</sup>

#### **MODEL A**

**MODEL B** 

24h

MDIPE = 6.7% (95%CI: 3.767-9.633)

MAIPE = 8.7%

**42h** 

MDIPE = -2.2% (95%CI: -8.608-4.208) **MAIPE** = 7.5%

MDIPE = 31.1% (95%CI: 22.139-40.061) X

MAIPE = 31.1%

MDIPE = 6.3% (95%CI: -0.771-13.371) < **MAIPE** = 9.7%

#### **Conclusion and Relevance**



Model A's predictive ability is higher at all times.



Model A exhibited high accuracy and precision.



Model A proved to be superior and more reliable.

