

Evaluation and Development of Vancomycin Dosing Schemes to Meet New AUC/MIC Targets in Intermittent Hemodialysis Using Monte Carlo Simulation Techniques

The Journal of Clinical Pharmacology 2021, 61(2) 211–223 © 2020, The American College of Clinical Pharmacology DOI: 10.1002/jcph.1727

Susan J. Lewis, PharmD^{1,2} (D) and Bruce A. Mueller, PharmD, FCCP, FASN, FNKF³ (D)

Abstract

Published vancomycin dosing recommendations for patients receiving maintenance hemodialysis were not designed to meet newly recommended 24-hour area under the curve/minimum inhibitory concentration (AUC_{24h}/MIC) pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic targets. The aims of this study were to predict pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic target attainment rates with a commonly used vancomycin regimen and to design a new dosing scheme incorporating therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) to maximize target attainment in patients receiving vancomycin and hemodialysis with high- or low-flux hemodialyzers. Vancomycin pharmacokinetic- and dialysis-specific parameters were incorporated into Monte Carlo simulations (MCS). A commonly used vancomycin regimen was modeled to determine its likelihood of attaining AUC_{24h}/MIC targets for I week of thrice-weekly hemodialysis treatments. MCS was then used to develop optimal initial vancomycin dosing for patients receiving intradialytic or postdialytic vancomycin administration with either high- or low-flux hemodialyzers. Finally, a new MCS model incorporating TDM was built to further optimize the probability of pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic target attainment. Traditional vancomycin dosing methods are unlikely to meet AUC_{24h}/MIC targets. Vancomycin doses necessary to attain AUC_{24h}/MIC targets are significantly influenced by hemodialyzer permeability and whether vancomycin is administered intradialytically or after hemodialysis. Depending on dialyzer type and whether vancomycin is administered during or after hemodialysis, loading doses of 25 to 35 mg/kg followed by maintenance doses of 7.5 to 15 mg/kg are necessary to reach minimum AUC_{24h}/MIC targets in 90% of virtual patients. For a 3-day interdialytic period, a 30% higher maintenance dose is required to maintain target attainment. Dosing based on a single vancomycin serum concentration obtained prior to the second dialysis session greatly enhances the probability of target attainment.

Keywords

Monte Carlo simulation, pharmacodynamics, pharmacokinetics, renal dialysis, vancomycin

Clinical success of vancomycin therapy in nondialysis patients is associated with the attainment of the 24hour area under the curve/minimum inhibitory concentration (AUC_{24h}/MIC) ratio of \geq 400.¹ A low initial steady-state AUC_{24h}/MIC (<430 by E-test; <398.5 by broth microdilution) is a significant risk factor for treatment failure and increases the risk of treatment failure by 2-fold.² A recent study in nondialysis patients suggests that improved patient outcomes are associated with attainment of an AUC_{24h}/MIC of at least 550 and 650 on the first and second days, respectively, of vancomycin therapy.³ Conversely, an $AUC_{24h} > 700 \text{ mg} \cdot h/L$ has been reported as the nephrotoxicity threshold in nondialysis patients.^{3–7} Previous vancomycin guidelines recommended targeting trough concentrations of 10 to 20 mg/L as a surrogate to attain the optimal pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic efficacy index of AUC_{24h}/MIC \geq 400.⁸ However, recent evidence has demonstrated that trough concentration is a poor predictor of true AUC_{24h} and that targeting high troughs significantly increases the risk of nephrotoxicity in nondialysis patients.^{6,9–14} Consequently, the new guidelines recommend AUC-guided vancomycin dosing to target AUC_{24h}/MIC of 400 to 600 for maximal efficacy and minimal nephrotoxicity.¹ In dialysis patients, no prospective studies have been conducted to evaluate patient outcomes associated with an AUCbased vancomycin dosing strategy.

Vancomycin is the most commonly prescribed antibiotic among end-stage kidney disease (ESKD) patients receiving intermittent hemodialysis (IHD)^{15,16} because of the high prevalence of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) infections. Nonetheless, the optimal vancomycin dosing strategy in IHD

Submitted for publication 9 June 2020; accepted 3 August 2020.

Corresponding Author:

¹Department of Pharmacy Practice, University of Findlay College of Pharmacy, Findlay, Ohio, USA

²Pharmacy Department, Mercy Health—St. Anne Hospital, Toledo, Ohio, USA

³Department of Clinical Pharmacy, University of Michigan College of Pharmacy, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

Susan J. Lewis, PharmD, Department of Pharmacy Practice, University of Findlay College of Pharmacy, 1000 N. Main Street, Findlay, OH 45840 Email: slewis@findlay.edu

Table I.	Pharmacokinetic	Model	Indut Pa	rameters ^{20,25,26,30,31}
----------	-----------------	-------	----------	------------------------------------

Pharmacokinetic Parameter	High-Flux Dialyzer	Low-Flux Dialyzer
Weight, kg	75 ± 23	(40-150)
Volume of distribution, L/kg	0.9 ± 0.27	(0.38-1.55)
k _{el_off} , I/h	0.0035 ± 0.001	(0.0010-0.0061)
t _{1/2_off} , h	198.0 (11	3.6-693.0)
k _{el_on} , I/h	0.110 ± 0.02 (0.066-0.154)	0.055 ± 0.011 (0.033-0.077)
t _{1/2_on} , h	6.3 (4.5-10.5)	12.6 (9.0-21.0)
Vancomycin bioavailability (F)	0.74 ± 0.15 (0.56-0.84)	0.84 ± 0.17 (0.75-1)

 k_{el_off} , the elimination rate constant off hemodialysis; k_{el_on} , the elimination rate constant during hemodialysis; $t_{1/2_off}$, half-life off hemodialysis; $t_{1/2_off}$, half-life of

patients is unclear because of widely varied pharmacokinetic alterations from ESKD and the influence of dialysis itself. Vancomycin is removed substantially by high-flux hemodialyzers.^{17–19} In addition, vancomycin frequently is administered during the dialysis procedure itself, resulting in immediate removal of a fraction of the vancomycin infusion before it can distribute to the tissues.²⁰ Many studies have generated a wide range of vancomycin dosing recommendations and nomograms for IHD patients based on selected pre- or postdialysis concentration targets but not AUC_{24h}/MIC targets.²⁰⁻³³ Of note, a single study found that predialysis concentrations of \geq 18.6 mg/L was associated with improved patient outcomes in IHD patients with MRSA bacteremia.³⁴ Suboptimal vancomycin treatment likely has contributed to IHD patients being the source of development of vancomycin-intermediate S. aureus or vancomycin-resistant S. aureus. 35,36 Infection remains as the second-leading cause of mortality in these patients,³⁷ suggesting that a better vancomycin dosing approach is needed.

To date, scant data exist to provide an AUC-based dosing approach in patients receiving IHD, and previously published IHD vancomycin dosing recommendations have not been assessed about whether they would attain appropriate AUC_{24h}/MIC targets. The objective of the present study was (1) to evaluate the drug exposure (AUC) achieved with a commonly used contemporary IHD vancomycin dosing protocol proposed by Zelenitsky et al,^{30,38} (2) to determine an initial vancomycin dosing scheme to attain an AUC_{24h}/MIC target of \geq 400, and (3) to devise a dosing nomogram to individualize the subsequent dosing to attain an AUC_{24h}/MIC \geq 400 in virtual IHD patients, using Monte Carlo simulation (MCS).

Methods

Part I. Evaluation of Contemporary Dosing Protocol and Determination of Optimal Initial Vancomycin Dosing

Pharmacokinetic Model Development. A 1-compartment pharmacokinetic model^{26,39} with zero-order input

and first-order elimination was developed to predict vancomycin disposition in adult patients receiving IHD. A literature search obtained relevant vancomycin pharmacokinetic data. Studies published prior to 1997 were excluded for review because they were likely to employ old vancomycin bioanalysis known to be inaccurate in patients with renal insufficiency⁴⁰⁻⁴² and/or utilized hemodialyzers with poor vancomycin permeability unlike contemporary hemodialyzers.^{21,22,24,43} Pharmacokinetic input data used in this in silico study were derived from studies conducted in contemporary hemodialysis settings^{20,25,26,30,31} as outlined in Table 1. The blood and dialysate flow rates employed in these studies approximately ranged from 350 to 450 and from 500 to 800 mL/min, respectively.^{20,25,26,30,31} The pharmacokinetic input parameters were assumed to have log-Gaussian distribution. Body weights <40 or >150 kg were truncated based on the obtained data from those relevant pharmacokinetic studies.^{20,25,26,30,31} Ranges of pharmacokinetic parameters were obtained from these studies and used as limits for all input variables to avoid spurious simulations. Residual renal function of patients in these studies was minimal.^{20,25,26,30,31} The elimination rate constant (k_{el}) during hemodialysis was separately determined for IHD with high-flux and low-flux hemodialyzers. Vancomycin bioavailability (F), the proportion of vancomycin that is not immediately removed by hemodialvsis during intradialytic drug infusion, was calculated using the reported vancomycin removal rate (%) during intradialytic infusion²⁰ and was separately estimated for IHD with high-flux and low-flux hemodialyzers. The equations used in the model are provided in the supplementary material.

Zelenitsky's vancomycin dosing protocol was evaluated in a scenario using intradialytic drug administration and high-flux IHD in concordance with their recommendations.³⁰ A 4-hour high-flux IHD was modeled to occur 3 times a week (Monday, Wednesday, and Friday), and vancomycin therapy was initiated on Monday. As recommended in the protocol, 3 intradialytic regimens were applied based on body weight—(1) 1000 mg loading dose (LD), followed by a 500 mg maintenance dose (MD) for patients <70 kg; (2) 1250 mg LD, followed by 750 mg MD for patients 70 to 100 kg; and (3) 1500 mg LD, then 1000 mg MD for patients >100 kg³⁰—and were simulated for a full week (ie, Monday through Sunday). These recommended doses were infused during the last 30 minutes of an IHD session for a vancomycin dose of 500 mg, during the last 1 hour for vancomycin doses of 750 to 1000 mg, and during the last 1.5 hours for a vancomycin dose of 1500 mg, as described in the protocol.³⁰

For the determination of the optimal initial vancomycin dosing attaining the AUC_{24h}/MIC target in IHD, other clinical practice scenarios were modeled in addition to that using Zelenitsky's dosing protocol. The different types of hemodialyzers and drug dose administration timings in relation to dialysis have been found to be the significant factors that influence pharmacokinetics during dialysis.^{20,44} Hence, 4 different dialysis and vancomycin administration combination scenarios were schemed into the model. They were: (1) intradialytic vancomycin dosing (ie, infuse over the last 1 to 2 hours of dialysis) in high-flux IHD, (2) intradialytic vancomycin dosing in low-flux IHD, (3) postdialytic vancomycin dosing (ie, infuse immediately after dialysis over 1 to 2 hours) in high-flux IHD, and (4) postdialytic vancomycin dosing in low-flux IHD. A vancomycin regimen in each of the 4 scenarios was simulated to commence on either Monday, Wednesday, or Friday with a 2- to 3-day interdialytic period to construct a broad range of realistic clinical scenarios. A variety of weight-based vancomycin regimens were tested for 4 to 5 days depending on the initiating day of the vancomycin regimen. Each IHD was 4 hours long, and vancomycin infusion time was 1 hour if a vancomycin dose was ≤ 15 mg/kg and 2 hours if a vancomycin dose was >15 mg/kg. The maximum vancomycin dose was capped as 4 g per dose.^{8,45}

MCS and Probability of Pharmacodynamic Target Attain*ment.* The efficacy target was AUC_{24h} of \geq 400 mg·h/L for each day of vancomycin therapy, assuming that the pathogens are MRSA species with a MIC of 1 mg/L.¹ MCS (Crystal Ball Classroom Edition, Oracle) was conducted to predict total serum vancomycin concentration-time profiles in a virtual cohort of 5000 for each tested vancomycin regimen. AUC_{24h} on each day of vancomycin therapy was computed with the linear trapezoidal rule. Probability of target attainment (%) was determined by summing up the number of virtual patients attaining AUC_{24h} of \geq 400 mg·h/L and then dividing by the total number in the virtual cohort (n = 5000). Vancomycin-induced nephrotoxicity is of less concern for patients with ESKD requiring IHD. However, we took into consideration the accepted drug exposure threshold associated with vancomycin nephrotoxicity $(AUC_{24h} \ge 700 \text{ mg}\cdot\text{h/L})^{3-7}$ in determining the optimal dosing regimen. A dosing regimen was considered "optimal" if it attained a AUC_{24h} $\ge 400 \text{ mg}\cdot\text{h/L}$ in $\ge 90\%$ of the virtual cohort with the mean AUC_{24h}/MIC of 400 to 700 mg $\cdot\text{h/L}$. The new guidelines recommend narrower drug exposure targets of AUC_{24h}/MIC of 400 to 600 mg $\cdot\text{h/L}$,¹ but considering the wider variability of vancomycin pharmacokinetic parameters and nephrotoxicity being less an issue in IHD patients, more lenient drug exposure targets (eg, mean AUC_{24h}/MIC of 400 to 700 mg $\cdot\text{h/L}$) were used in this analysis.

Part II. Development of Therapeutic Drug Monitoring-Guided Dosing Algorithm

Vancomycin dosing is routinely adjusted based on therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) results to ensure pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic target attainment. Thus, we incorporated TDM into our model to find out how TDM could be effectively utilized to ensure pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic target attainment in patients with IHD with only a single predialysis serum concentration. This TDM-guided dosing nomogram individualizes the optimal subsequent vancomycin dosing to attain and/or maintain AUC_{24h} of 400 to 700 mg·h/L.

The nomogram was developed based on the vancomycin concentrations predicted from the initial vancomycin dosing recommendations derived from Part I simulations. Two assumptions were made regarding the measurement of vancomycin concentrations; (1) the "virtual vancomycin assay" was accurate, and (2) it reflected the model-derived vancomycin concentrations at that point. A predialysis concentration immediately prior to the second IHD session was used as the basis for TDM-directed dosing adjustment. Utilizing the predialysis concentrations and the virtual patients' pharmacokinetic profiles used in the Part I simulation, vancomycin concentrations occurring after a TDM-based dosage adjustment were further constructed to calculate AUC_{24h} for a total of 14 days of vancomycin therapy, which is the minimum recommended duration to treat MRSA bacteremia⁴⁶ in each of the same virtual patients. The equation was developed to individualize each subsequent MD attaining an AUC_{24h} of 400 to 700 mg·h/L for most virtual patients.

Statistical analysis. After MCS was performed to determine the optimal initial vancomycin regimen in IHD, a post hoc analysis was conducted to examine the association between pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic target attainment and different input variables. Simulated pharmacokinetic and demographic variables in virtual patients with AUC_{24h} <400, 400-700, and

			(Percent of	Probabili Modeled Patients AUC ₂	ty of Target Attainn Attaining AUC _{24h} _{4h} (mg·h/L), mean ∃	nent, % <400/400-700/>70 <u>-</u> SD	0 mg·h/L)	
Body Weight	Vancomycin Dosing ^a	Day I (Monday)	Day 2 (Tuesday)	Day 3 (Wednesday)	Day 4 (Thursday)	Day 5 (Friday)	Day 6 (Saturday)	Day 7 (Sunday)
45-70 kg	1000 mg LD, 500 mg MD	26 (74/25/1), 341 ± 111	18 (82/18/0), 313 ± 103	42 (58/39/3), 394 ± 140	23 (77/22/1), 332 ± 112	42 (58/39/3), 396 ± 133	33 (67/31/2), 365 ± 125	20 (80/19/1), 318 ± 111
70-100 kg	1250 mg LD, 750 mg MD	10 (89/10/1), 283 ± 91	8 (92/8/0), 265 ± 86	31 (69/30/1), 360 ± 117	16 (84/15/1), 305 ± 100	30 (70/29/1), 356 ± 117	22 (78/21/1), 331 ± 110	13 (87/12/1), 289 ± 99
100-150 kg	1500 mg LD, 1000 mg MD	3 (97/3/0), 231 ± 76	2 (98/2/0), 216 ± 71	17 (83/16/1), 310 ± 103	7 (93/7/00, 263 ± 88	19 (81/18/1), 315 ± 106	14 (86/13/1), 293 ± 100	7 (93/7/0), 256 ± 89

Table 2. PTA and AUC_{24h} Predicted From a Week of a Commonly Used Intradialytic Vancomycin Dosing Protocol³⁰ for Thrice-Weekly High-Flux IHD

PTA, probability of target attainment; IHD, intermittent hemodialysis; LD, loading dose; MD, maintenance dose.

^a Each dosing was modeled to be infused intradialytically during the last 0.5-1.5 hours of hemodialysis scheduled on Monday-Wednesday-Friday (shaded boxes) in 5000 virtual patients. First dose was given on Monday.

>700 mg·h/L were compared using analysis of variance. The proportions of patients attaining pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic target after the initial optimal doses and the TDM-adjusted doses were compared with a chi-square analysis. A P < .05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

Part I. Evaluation of Zelenitsky's Dosing Protocol and Determination of Optimal Initial Vancomycin Dosing

The simulated results of probability of target attainment (PTA) and mean AUC_{24h} for a week of Zelenitsky's intradialytic vancomycin dosing regimen are presented in Table 2. All vancomycin regimens, regardless of body weight stratification, yielded very low PTA (2% to 42%), and the mean AUC_{24h} was $<400 \text{ mg}\cdot\text{h/L}$ on all days of the week. Particularly, the PTA on the first 2 days after the LD was lower than the rest of the days with only 18% to 26%, 8% to 10%, and 2%to 3% PTA in patients with 45 to 70, 70 to 100, and 100 to 150 kg, respectively. In addition, the dosing for patients weighing 100 to 150 kg resulted in the lowest PTA (<20%) and mean AUC_{24h} throughout the week among all patient size groups. However, up to 3% of the simulated patient cohort had AUC_{24h} of >700 mg·h/L with the Zelenitsky regimen.

Table 3 displays the simulation results of selected "intradialytic" vancomycin dosing regimens that are initiated on either Monday, Wednesday, or Friday, whereas Table 4 shows those for those receiving "postdialytic" vancomycin dosing regimens. In these 4 different dialyzer and vancomycin infusion combination scenarios, none of the simulated vancomycin dosing regimens consisting of an LD and an MD successfully attained the efficacy target of PTA \geq 90% while meeting the safety goal of a mean AUC_{24h} <700 mg·h/L during the initial 4 to 5 days of vancomycin therapy (Tables 3 and 4). Our model predicts that an intradialytic regimen using an LD of 35 mg/kg and an MD of 15 mg/kg in high-flux IHD or an LD of 30 mg/kg and an MD of 7.5 mg/kg in low-flux IHD and a postdialytic regimen with an LD of 25 mg/kg and an MD 10 mg/kg in high-flux IHD or an LD of 25 mg/kg and an MD of 7.5 mg/kg in low-flux IHD would initially meet "best-possible" or "acceptable" PTA with a mean AUC_{24h} of closest to 400 to 700 mg·h/L (bolded in Tables 3 and 4) and thus are recommended as initial doses. Notably, these model-recommended LDs attained acceptable PTA over a 2- or 3-day interdialytic period, but the model-recommended MD yielded below-acceptable PTA by the time a 3-day intradialytic period occurred. Hence, anytime a MD is followed by a 3-day interdialytic period, a 30% higher dose is necessary to attain appropriate PTA on day 3. This is illustrated in Tables 3 and 4, where model-recommended (bolded) MDs given on Fridays are 30% higher. Subsequent MDs following the initial model-recommended regimens should be determined by TDM as reported in the Part II section below.

The type of hemodialyzer and vancomycin administration time in relation to IHD significantly altered PTA and mean AUC_{24h} for any single vancomycin dosing regimen. Intradialytic administration required 20% to 40% higher LD and up to 50% higher MD to attain PTA \geq 90% during 2 or 3 days of an interdialytic period compared with postdialytic administration because of significant drug removal by hemodialysis during intradialytic drug infusion. Dialyzer type had a profound effect on intradialytic doses, with

						(Percent	t of modeled p	Probability of Target atients attaining AU0 AUC _{24h} mg·h/L	Attainment,% C _{24h} <400 / 400- Mean±SD	700 / > 700 mg·l	h/L)				
			Vancomycin Init	iated on Monday			Vancon	ycin Initiated on We	ednesday			Vancom	iycin Initiated or	n Friday	
Hemodialyzer Type	Dosing	Day I (Monday)	Day 2 (Tuesday)	Day 3 (Wednesday)	Day 4 (Thursday)	Day I (Wednesday)	Day 2 (Thursday)	Day 3 (Friday) —30% Higher MD	Day 4 (Saturday)	Day 5 (Sunday)	Day I (Friday)	Day 2 (Saturday)	Day 3 (Sunday)	Day 4 (Monday)	Day 5 (Tuesday)
		(1		:		:	ţ	:			
High flux	25 mg/kg LD,	65	58	84	74	65	28	85	75	64	65	60	51	77	70
	I5 mg/kg MD	(35/58/7),	(42/52/6),	(16/62/22),	(26/61/13),	(35/58/7),	(42/53/5),	(15/63/22),	(25/62/13),	(36/56/8),	(35/57/8),	(40/54/6),	(49/47/4),	(23/62/15),	(30/58/12),
		473 ± 146	448 ± 139	575 ± 179	516 ± 163	473 土 143	48 ± 131	575 土 176	520 ± 161	472 ± 150	476 ± 148	455 ± 143	425 ± 136	532 ± 169	498 土 161
	30 mg/kg LD,	84	79	68	53	84	79	68	54	42	84	79	72	54	44
	7.5 mg/kg MD	(16/65/19),	(21/64/15),	(32/59/9),	(47/48/5),	(16/64/20),	(21/63/16),	(32/58/10),	(46/49/5),	(58/39/3),	(16/65/19),	(21/64/15),	(28/62/10),	(46/49/5),	(56/41/3),
		566 ± 171	537 ± 163	$\textbf{486} \pm \textbf{151}$	430 ± 136	570 ± 176	540 ± 168	489 ± 155	$\textbf{436} \pm \textbf{140}$	395 ± 130	562 ± 170	537 ± 164	502 ± 156	$\textbf{436}\pm\textbf{138}$	402 ± 130
	30 mg/kg LD,	84	79	78	65	84	62	78	66	54	84	79	72	67	58
	10 mg/kg MD	(16/65/19),	(21/64/15),	(22/63/15),	(35/57/8),	(16/64/20),	(21/63/16),	(22/63/15),	(34/57/9),	(46/50/4),	(16/65/19),	(21/63/16),	(28/61/11),	(33/58/9),	(42/53/5),
		564 ± 171	534 ± 163	532 ± 165	472 ± 149	567 ± 172	538 ± 164	$\textbf{536} \pm \textbf{165}$	480 ± 150	$\textbf{436} \pm \textbf{139}$	565 ± 168	539 ± 162	504 ± 154	484 ± 149	450 ± 141
	35 mg/kg LD,	94	16	86	75	94	91	87	77	66	94	16	86	78	68
	10 mg/kg MD	(6/58/36),	(9/62/29),	(14/63/23),	(25/61/14),	(6/58/36),	(9/61/30),	(13/63/24),	(23/62/15),	(34/56/10),	(6/60/34),	(9/62/29),	(14/62/23),	(22/63/15),	(32/58/10),
		657 ± 202	623 ± 193	590 ± 185	523 ± 167	659 ± 201	624 ± 191	590 ± 184	527 ± 167	$\textbf{478} \pm \textbf{154}$	655 ± 202	625 ± 194	584 ± 184	531 ± 168	490 ± 158
	35 mg/kg LD,	94	16	95	89	94	91	95	89	82	94	16	86	91	84
	15 mg/kg MD	(6/57/37).	(0/61/30),	(5/54/41),	(11/62/27),	(6/59/35),	(9/62/29),	(5/55/40),	(11/62/27),	(18/63/19),	(6/58/36),	(9/60/31),	(14/62/24),	(9/60/31),	(16/61/23),
		659 ± 201	624 ± 192	687 ± 213	613 ± 193	655 ± 199	621 ± 189	684 ± 210	615 ± 191	558 ± 177	657 ± 201	627 ± 193	586 ± 184	626 ± 196	582 ± 186
	35 mg/kg LD,	94	16	66	96	94	96	66	96	16	94	16	87	98	94
	20 mg/kg MD	(6/58/36),	(9/61/30),	(1/34/65),	(4/52/44),	(6/59/35),	(10/61/29]	(1/35/64),	(4/52/44),	(9/59/32),	(6/59/35),	(9/61/30),	(13/63/24),	(2/50/48),	(6/56/38),
		$\textbf{659}\pm\textbf{198}$	624 ± 189	825 ± 150	700 ± 216	$\textbf{657}\pm\textbf{201}$	(623 ± 192	823 ± 254	704 ± 222	639 ± 206	653 ± 195	624 ± 187	587 ± 179	$\textbf{722}\pm\textbf{219}$	667 ± 206
Low flux	25 mg/kg LD,	87	83	66	97	88	83	66	67	93	88	84	78	98	95
	I5 mg/kg MD	(13/64/23),	(17/65/18),	(1/39/60),	(3/51/46),	(12/66/22),	(17/65/18),	(1/39/60),	(3/50/47),	(7/58/35),	(12/66/22),	(16/67/17),	(22/65/13),	(2/51/47),	(5/56/39),
		585 ± 172	557 ± 164	$\textbf{794}\pm\textbf{235}$	714 ± 215	583 ± 168	555 ± 161	791 ± 230	715 ± 212	651 ± 197	582 ± 170	$\textbf{556} \pm \textbf{164}$	524 ± 157	723 ± 215	679 ± 206
	30 mg/kg LD,	97	95	97	16	97	95	97	16	84	97	96	92	92	86
	7.5 mg/kg MD	(3/55/42),	(5/59/36),	(3/54/43),	(9/63/28),	(3/53/44),	(5/58/37),	(3/52/45),	(9/61/30),	(16/62/22),	(3/54/43),	(5/59/37),	(8/62/30),	(9/61/31),	(14/63/23),
		696 ± 204	662 ± 196	696 ± 208	618±188	703 ± 206	669 ± 198	704 ± 210	628 ± 192	572 ± 180	699 ± 204	668 ± 196	630 ± 188	630 ± 189	583 ± 179
	30 mg/kg LD,	67	95	66	95	67	95	66	96	90	97	95	92	96	92
	10 mg/kg MD	(3/54/43),	(5/57/38),	(1/45/54),	(5/56/39),	(3/54/43),	(5/59/36),	(1/45/54),	(4/57/39),	(10/62/28),	(3/52/45),	(5/56/39),	(8/60/32),	(4/53/43),	(8/58/34),
		700 ± 209	666 ± 200	760 ± 230	677 ± 208	698 ± 204	664 ± 195	757 ± 224	678 ± 204	618 ± 190	703 ± 205	671 ± 197	633 ± 190	690 ± 207	642 ± 197
	35 mg/kg LD,	66	66	66	98	66	66	66	98	95	66	66	98	66	97
	10 mg/kg MD	(1/37/62),	(1/43/56),	(1/33/66),	(2/46/52),	(1/35/64),	(1/41/58),	(2/31/68),	(2/44/54),	(5/54/41),	(1/36/63),	(1/42/57),	(2/48/49),	(1/45/54),	(3/52/45),
		804 ± 234	764 ± 225	834 ± 247	742 ± 224	814 ± 241	774 ± 230	844 ± 251	753 ± 257	686 ± 212	815 ± 243	779 ± 234	734 ± 225	$\textbf{763}\pm\textbf{234}$	708 ± 221
	35 mg/kg LD,	66	66	66	66	66	66	001	66	66	66	66	98	66	66
	I5 mg/kg MD	(1/35/64),	(1/42/57),	(1/19/81),	(1/30/69),	(1/36/63),	(1/42/57),	(0/18/82),	(1/29/70),	(1/40/59),	(1/36/63),	(1/42/57),	(2/48/49),	(1/28/71),	(1/36/63),
		814 ± 243	774 ± 232	964 ± 290	863 ± 264	812 ± 238	772 ± 229	961 ± 286	863 ± 262	$\textbf{786} \pm \textbf{244}$	$\textbf{816}\pm\textbf{245}$	780 ± 236	735 ± 227	880 ± 270	821 ± 257
	35 mg/kg LD,	66	66	001	66	66	66	001	001	66	66	66	98	100	66
	20 mg/kg MD	(1/36/63),	(1/42/57),	(0/9/91),	(1/17/82),	(1/36/63),	(1/41/58),	(0/9/91),	(1/17/83),	(1/15/84),	(1/35/64),	(1/41/58),	(2/47/51),	(0/15/85),	(1/21/78),
		814 ± 246	774 ± 236	$\textbf{l,094}\pm\textbf{334}$	975 ± 302	812 ± 240	772 ± 231	$1,091 \pm 326$	975 ± 296	889 ± 277	815 ± 238	778 ± 230	739 ± 223	1003 ± 299	931 ± 284
Data illustrate "ir	ıtradialytic" vancor	nycin therapy	initiated on €	sither Monday, ∿	Vednesday, c	or Friday in er	nd-stage kid	ney disease patie	ints receiving t	hrice-weekly	intermittent	: hemodialysi	s scheduled o	on Monday-V	/ednesday-

Fridzy. Shadad haves indicate the dave of a 4-hour hemodialveic session and intradialveic vancomvcin infusion

Shaded boxes indicate the days of a 4-hour hemodialysis session and intradialytic vancomycin infusion.

Note that when a maintenance dose is given when there will be a 3-day interdialytic period afterward (eg. Friday), a 30% higher dose is used in the model. The 30% higher dose is necessary to attain PTA \geq 90% on the **Bold** dosing regimens are those attaining ≥90% of probability of target attainment (PTA) while a mean AUC_{24h} closest to <700 mg·h/L over a 2- or 3-day interdialytic period. third day of a 3-day interdialytic period.

Table 3. Intradialytic Vancomycin Dosing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-Friday) Intermittent Hemodialysis Schedule With Probability of Target Attainment and Mean AUC_{24h}

눈
5
9
٦
ì
Sal
ž
P
Ĕ
ťа
L.
ň
Ē
tai
7
ť
e B
ar,
Ê
ď
~
Ë:
ē
ĝ
2
9
t-
Ś
>
lle
٩٢
e
Ċ,
ŝ
SI:
Ę.
÷₿
ğ
E
Ť
÷
S D
Ĕ
1
L.
Ę
<u>-</u>
Ň
ъ
÷.
<u> </u>
- L
lay-
sday-
nesday-
ednesday-
Vednesday-
-Wednesday-
ay-Wednesday-
-Wednesday
onday-Wednesday-
Monday-Wednesday-
y (Monday-Wednesday-
kly (Monday-Wednesday-
eekly (Monday-Wednesday-
Neekly (Monday-Wednesday-
3-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
ce-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
ırice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
d in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
ted in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
lated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
nulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
s Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
ans Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
mens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
gimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
g Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
ing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
ssing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
Dosing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
n Dosing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
cin Dosing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
mycin Dosing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
omycin Dosing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
ncomycin Dosing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
'ancomycin Dosing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
: Vancomycin Dosing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
tic Vancomycin Dosing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
lytic Vancomycin Dosing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
ilialytic Vancomycin Dosing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
stdialytic Vancomycin Dosing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
bostdialytic Vancomycin Dosing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
Postdialytic Vancomycin Dosing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
4. Postdialytic Vancomycin Dosing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
e 4. Postdialytic Vancomycin Dosing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
ble 4. Postdialytic Vancomycin Dosing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-
Table 4. Postdialytic Vancomycin Dosing Regimens Simulated in a Thrice-Weekly (Monday-Wednesday-

	I							AUC _{24h} (mg·h/L),	Mean ± SD						
	I		Vancomycin Initi	ated on Monday			Vancom	ycin Initiated on W	ednesday			Vancomy	cin Initiated on	Friday	
Type of Hemodialyzer	Dosing	Day I (Monday)	Day 2 (Tuesday)	Day 3 (Wednesday)	Day 4 (Thursday)	Day I (Wednesday)	Day 2 (Thursday)	Day 3 (Friday) –30% Higher MD	Day 4 (Saturday)	Day 5 (Sunday)	Day I (Friday)	Day 2 (Saturday)	Day 3 (Sunday)	Day 4 (Monday)	Day 5 (Tuesday)
High flux 2	10 me/ke LD.	8	72	93	17	8	72	94	80	67	8	76	72	84	72
0	10 mg/kg MD	(19/67/14),	(28/63/9),	(7/62/31),	(23/64/13),	(19/66/15),	(28/62/10),	(6/62/32),	(20/64/16),	(33/59/8),	(19/67/14),	(24/65/11),	(28/64/8),	(16/67/17),	(28/63/9),
)	536 ± 152	497 ± 142	631 ± 181	521 ± 153	538 ± 152	499 ± 143	634 ± 182	540 ± 158	480 ± 144	538 ± 152	513 ± 146	495 ± 142	557 ± 161	499 ± 148
.7	25 mg/kg LD,	97	93	94	78	97	94	95	83	70	97	95	92	85	73
	7.5 mg/kg MD	(3/59/38),	(7/64/29),	(6/61/32),	(22/64/14),	(3/58/39),	(6/64/30),	(5/62/33),	(17/66/17),	(30/61/9),	(3/58/39),	(5/61/34),	(8/63/29),	(15/66/19),	(27/63/10),
		669 ± 190	620 ± 177	641 ± 186	528 ± 157	680 ± 191	6 30 ± 179	651 ± 186	552 ± 162	491 ± 148	676 ± 190	646 ± 183	620 ± 177	562 ± 163	503 ± 149
2	5 mg/kg LD,	96	93	66	88	96	93	66	16	80	96	94	89	93	84
-	10 mg/kg MD	(4/59/37),	(7/65/28),	(1/53/46),	(12/65/23),	(4/58/38),	(7/65/28),	(1/51/47),	(9/65/26),	(20/65/15),	(4/59/37),	(6/62/32),	(11/66/23),	(7/63/30),	(16/65/19),
		668 ± 189	619 ± 177	714 ± 205	588 ± 174	670 ± 189	621 ± 177	715 ± 204	607 ± 177	539 ± 162	671 ± 190	641 ± 184	$\textbf{590} \pm \textbf{172}$	$\textbf{627}\pm\textbf{183}$	$\textbf{563}\pm\textbf{168}$
. 4	25 mg/kg LD,	97	93	66	95	97	93	66	97	90	97	95	93	98	93
	13 mg/kg MD	(3/59/38),	(7/65/28),	(1/43/56),	(5/59/36),	(3/58/39),	(7/64/29),	(1/36/63),	(3/56/41),	(10/62/28),	(3/59/38),	(5/62/33),	(7/64/29),	(2/52/46),	(7/61/32),
		669 ± 187	620 ± 175	769 ± 220	663 ± 193	673 ± 188	625 ± 176	809 ± 229	688 ± 199	611±182	674 ± 188	644 ± 181	621 ± 177	712 ± 203	639 ± 187
.7	25 mg/kg LD,	96	93	66	98	96	92	001	66	93	97	95	94	66	97
	15 mg/kg MD	(4/58/38),	(7/65/28),	(1/33/66),	(2/52/46),	(4/58/38),	(8/62/30),	(0/29/71),	(1/48/51),	(7/58/35),	(3/58/39),	(5/62/33),	(6/65/29),	(1/42/57),	(3/55/42),
		669 ± 189	620 ± 177	826 ± 232	713 ± 208	672 ± 194	623±182)	868 ± 254	739 ± 221	656 ± 202	678 ± 192	648 ± 185	626 ± 181	772 ± 229	694 ± 205
	30 mg/kg LD,	001	66	66	95	100	66	66	96	89	001	66	66	98	92
	10 mg/kg MD	(0/35/65),	(1/46/53),	(1/42/57),	(5/58/37),	(0/37/63),	(1/47/52),	(1/38/61),	(4/57/39),	(11/64/25),	(0/36/64),	(1/42/57),	(1/48/51),	(2/54/44),	(8/62/30),
		$\textbf{810}\pm\textbf{228}$	751 ± 214	771 ± 222	664 ± 195	803 ± 226	744 ± 212	$\textbf{798}\pm\textbf{230}$	677 ± 200	602 ± 182	$\textbf{810}\pm\textbf{230}$	774 ± 222	743 ± 215	702 ± 207	629 ± 190
Low flux	20 mg/kg LD,	82	75	67	89	82	76	66	16	83	82	76	74	93	85
	10 mg/kg MD	(18/66/17),	(25/64/11),	(2/55/32),	(11/63/26),	(18/68/14),	(24/65/11),	(1/53/46),	(9/65/26),	(17/67/16),	(18/68/14),	(24/66/10),	(26/65/9),	(7/64/29),	(15/66/19),
		541 ± 153	508 ± 146	688 ± 198	601 ± 177	539 ± 152	507 ± 144	717 ± 202	609 ± 176	549 ± 163	536 ± 151	512 ± 145	504 ± 144	624 ± 179	568 ± 166
2	5 mg/kg LD,	97	94	66	92	96	93	66	92	85	96	94	93	94	88
2	.5 mg/kg MD	(3/59/38),	(6/63/31),	(1/47/52),	(8/64/28),	(4/59/38),	(7/63/30),	(1/48/51),	(8/62/30),	(15/65/20),	(4/58/38),	(6/62/32),	(7/63/30),	(6/61/33),	(12/66/12),
		673 ± 189	633 ± 180	746 ± 212	623 ± 182	71 ± 190	31 ± 180	742 ± 211	629 ± 184	567 ± 170	671 ± 190	64I ± 183	627 ± 181	643 ± 188	583 ± 174
. 4	25 mg/kg LD,	67	94	66	97	97	94	66	97	16	97	95	94	98	94
	10 mg/kg MD	(3/59/38),	(6/63/31),	(1/40/59),	(3/56/41),	(3/58/39),	(6/63/31),	(1/35/64),	(3/54/43),	(9/62/29),	(3/59/38),	(5/63/32),	(6/64/30),	(2/52/46),	(6/60/34),
		674 ± 193	634 ± 183	$\textbf{786}\pm\textbf{228}$	686 ± 202	672 ± 189	631 ± 180	817 ± 233	693 ± 204	624 ± 204	671 ± 187	64I ± 18I	629 ± 179	712 ± 204	647 ± 190
. 4	25 mg/kg LD,	67	94	66	66	96	93	001	66	67	97	95	94	66	98
	13 mg/kg MD	(3/58/39),	(6/63/31),	(1/26/73),	(1/44/55),	(4/58/38),	(7/62/31),	(0/23/77),	(1/43/56),	(3/54/43),	(3/60/37),	(5/64/31),	(6/64/30),	(1/39/60),	(2/51/47),
		674 ± 188	634 ± 179	872 ± 247	762 ± 220	67I ± 192	6 30 ± 182	906 ± 262	769 ± 227	692 ± 209	671 ± 189	640 ± 182	630 ± 180	793 ± 227	721 ± 211
. 4	25 mg/kg LD,	67	94	001	66	96	94	100	66	98	97	94	93	66	66
	15 mg/kg MD	(3/59/38),	(6/63/31),	(0/22/78),	(1/38/61),	(4/58/38),	(6/64/30),	(0/15/85),	(1/34/65),	(2/46/52),	(3/59/38),	(6/63/31),	(7/63/30),	(1/31/68),	(1/29/70),
		669 ± 191	629 ± 182	922 ± 267	806 ± 238	673 ± 189	633 ± 179	970 ± 274	824 ± 238	742 ± 220	668 ± 189	638 ± 182	628 ± 181	844 ± 243	$\textbf{768}\pm\textbf{226}$
	30 mg/kg LD,	100	66	66	66	100	66	100	66	67	001	66	66	66	98
	10 mg/kg MD	(0/36/64),	(1/44/56),	(1/25/75),	(1/42/57),	(0/37/63),	(1/45/54),	(0/22/78),	(1/42/57),	(3/53/44),	(0/37/63),	(1/42/57),	(9/45/54),	(1/38/61),	(2/49/49),
		807±227)	759 ± 215	883 ± 253	770 ± 225	801 ± 227	753 ± 215	916 ± 263	776 ± 228	699 ± 211	804 ± 227	767 ± 218	751 ± 214	$\textbf{797}\pm\textbf{229}$	723 ± 212
					101	-		-	- - - -			-		-	

Data illustrate "postdialytic" vancomycin therapy initiated on either Monday, Wednesday, or Friday in end-stage kidney disease patients receiving thrice-weekly intermittent hemodialysis scheduled on Monday-Wednesday-Friday.

Shaded boxes indicate the days of a 4-hour hemodialysis session and vancomycin infusion delivered "after" dialysis session ended.

Bold dosing regimens are those attaining \ge 90% of probability of target attainment (PTA) while a mean AUC_{24h} close to <700 mgh/L over a 2- or 3-day interdialytic period.

Note that when a maintenance dose is given when there will be a 3-day interdialytic period afterward (eg, Friday), a 30% higher dose is used in the model. The 30% higher dose is necessary to attain a PTA ≥90% on the third day of a 3-day interdialytic period.

recommended MD needing to be twice as high with high-flux dialyzers (15 mg/kg) compared with lowflux dialyzers (7.5 mg/kg) to achieve targets (Table 3). Recommended MD given after dialysis with high-flux dialyzers were only slightly higher than when low-flux dialyzers were used (10 vs 7.5 mg/kg; Table 4).

Part II. Development of Therapeutic Drug Monitoring-Guided Dosing Algorithm

Figure 1A-C portrays the distribution of vancomycin AUC_{24h} prior to and after TDM is used to individualize dosing, when the model-recommended vancomycin regimen was initiated on Monday with a thrice-weekly (Monday-Wednesday-Friday) IHD schedule. Modelrecommended doses were able to maintain the majority of simulated patients within AUC_{24h} 400 to 700 mg·h/L after the LD and the first MD. These figures also illustrate the relatively low AUC_{24h} attainment by Zelenitsky's dosing regimens. Although model-recommended LDs did ensure that $\geq 90\%$ of simulated patients met efficacy targets, there was great variability in these AUC_{24h}, and many patients had values of $>700 \text{ mg}\cdot\text{h/L}$ to ensure that $\geq 90\%$ met efficacy targets (Figure 2A). The first modeled MDs reduced variability (Figure 2C), but again many patients still had an AUC_{24h} well above 700 mg·h/L. However, once TDM was used to determine MD, a more acceptable AUC was attained (Figure 2E). In contrast, Figure 2B,D,F describes those in simulated patients receiving Zelenitsky's different weight-based dosing regimen, and in these instances AUC_{24h} \geq 400 mg·h/L was attained in less than 50% in all cases.

The post hoc analysis showed that differences of volume of distribution, nonrenal clearance, and vancomycin bioavailability during intradialytic administration were significant (P < .05) between the simulated patient groups with AUC_{24h} <400, 400-700, and >700 mg·h/L. Compared with those that attained an AUC_{24h} of 400 to 700 mg·h/L, the group with a result of AUC_{24h} <400 mg·h/L was characterized with a larger volume of distribution, faster nonrenal clearance (k_{e_off}), and lower vancomycin bioavailability during intradialytic administration. Conversely, the virtual group with AUC_{24h} >700 mg·h/L had a smaller volume of distribution, slower nonrenal clearance, and higher vancomycin bioavailability.

Simulation results suggest that predicted predialysis vancomycin serum concentrations correlate well with AUC_{24h} in IHD patients, except the initial 2 days with model-recommended LD (Figure 2A,C,E). A predialysis concentration of 20 mg/L ensures an AUC_{24h} of >480 mg·h/L; thus, the new MD is to be adjusted proportionally from the previous MD to achieve a predialysis concentration of 20 mg/L.

New subsequent maintenance dose

 $= \frac{\text{Previous maintenance dose } \bullet 20}{\text{Predialysis vancomycin concentration}}$

(If new MD is administered over a 3-day interdialytic period, a 30% higher dose is necessary.)

Figure 1C displays the AUC_{24h} distribution on the seventh day (Sunday) of vancomycin therapy following the application of the new subsequent MD, which was determined by TDM and given on day 5 (Friday). Of note, this new MD was 30% higher than the dose calculated using the equation above, as are all recommended MDs given before a 3-day interdialytic period. As soon as the individualized dose was administered, most simulated patients attained AUC_{24h} \geq 400 mg·h/L, and the proportion of patients achieving an AUC_{24h} of 400-700 mg·h/L was increasingly higher over a 3-day interdialytic period. Figure 2E portrays the distribution of predicted AUC_{24h} and predialysis vancomycin serum concentrations produced after TDM-guided dosing individualization that were narrower than those with the initial LD (Figure 2A) and MD (Figure 2C).

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first in silico study to determine initial vancomycin dosing to attain an efficacy target of AUC_{24h}/MIC \geq 400 in patients receiving thrice-weekly IHD in all its forms. Many studies have attempted to determine optimal vancomycin dosing in patients with IHD, but recommended doses have been rarely evaluated regarding their ability to reach this pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic index of AUC_{24h}/MIC \geq 400. Our simulation results support using predialysis concentrations as a surrogate marker to attain target AUC_{24h} and to guide optimal dosing in IHD patients. Although the Bayesian approach is recommended to estimate AUC_{24h} in the new guidelines,¹ this method has not been prospectively validated in IHD patients^{3,6}; thus, its utility in this population remains limited.⁴⁷ Conversely, our MCS technique enabled us to assess the impact of different pharmacokinetic and IHD variables as well as those of vancomycin administration time in relation to HD on drug exposure (AUC_{24h}) to predict optimal dosing in thousands of virtual patients constructed from published vancomycin pharmacokinetic variables. Finally, this is the first study to incorporate "virtual TDM" to guide individualized dosing within an MCS.

All dosing scenarios were tested with vancomycin therapy initiated on Monday, Wednesday, or Friday. We attempted to determine the optimal initial doses that work in all clinical scenarios. However, because of the substantial variability in vancomycin pharmacokinetics,^{48,49} simulated vancomycin doses



A. Attained AUC_{24h} on day 2 after LD





C. Attained AUC_{24h} on day 7 after Zelenitsky's second intradialytic MD vs. the first individualized dose with TDM following the initial model-recommended doses



Figure 1. Comparison of AUC_{24h} attainment rates by dialyzer type and dosing technique. ID, intradialytic; PD, postdialytic; HF, high flux; LF, low flux; HD, hemodialysis; TDM, therapeutic drug monitoring; ID dosing in HF-HD, LD 35 mg/kg, then MD 15 mg/kg; ID dosing in LF-HD, LD 30 mg/kg, then MD 7.5 mg/kg; PD dosing in HF-HD, LD 25 mg/kg; then MD 10 mg/kg; PD dosing in LF-HD, 25 mg/kg, then MD 7.5 mg/kg; then MD 7.5 mg/kg; VD dosing in end-stage kidney disease patients receiving thrice-weekly intermittent hemodialysis scheduled on Monday-Wednesday-Friday. Zelenitsky's doses were based on reference 30.

800

600

400

200

0

0



60

AUC_{24h} 400-700 mg•h/L = 66.1%

40

Pre-HD Vancomycin Serum Concentrations (mg/L)

800 600

400

200

0

0



20



20



E. After the first TDM-adjusted MD (second MD) F. After Zelenitsky's second MD



Figure 2. Predicted relationship of mean AUC_{24h} and predialysis vancomycin serum concentrations in patients receiving commonly used intradialytic regimens (n = 15,000) versus patients receiving the model-recommended dosing regimens (n = 20,000). (A, C, E) Relationship of mean AUC_{24h} and predialysis concentrations in all simulated patients (n = 20,000) with 4 combination scenarios receiving model-recommended initial doses and the first TDM dose on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. (B, D, F) Relationship of mean AUC_{24h} and predialysis concentrations in all simulated patients (n = 15,000) with all different weight ranges (40-70, 70-100, and 100-150 kg) receiving a week of Zelenitsky's intradialytic doses on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. [§]Mean AUC_{24h} (A, B) from days I and 2 of vancomycin therapy after LDs, (C, D) Days 3 and 4 after first MDs. (E, F) Days 5 to 7 after first TDM-adjusted MD and Zelenitsky's second MD, respectively.¹ Two straight horizontal lines in each figure indicate mean AUC_{24h} of 400 and 700 mg·h/L, and the values (%) denote the proportion of patients who attained a mean AUC_{24h} of 400 to 700 mg·h/L with the given doses. Zelenitsky's doses were based on reference 30.

60

 AUC_{24h} 400-700 mg•h/L = 10.8%

40

Pre-HD Vancomycin Serum Concentrations (mg/L)

yielded broad ranges of AUC_{24h} values, and none of them perfectly met PTA \geq 90% with the mean AUC_{24h} within the 400-700 mg·h/L target. In general, the model-recommended LD from the simulation results (30 to 35 mg/kg for intradialytic administration and 25 mg/kg for postdialytic administration) was similar to or higher than previously published recommended doses.^{6,24,25,28,29,31} To attain $AUC_{24h} \ge 400 \text{ mg·h/L}$ in \geq 90% of patients over both a 2- or 3-day interdialytic period, a high LD was necessary. These modelrecommended LDs are similar to 25- to 30-mg/kg doses recommended in patients with normal renal function. However, this is not surprising, as vancomycin LD is independent of renal function, and ESKD patients are often volume-overloaded, 29,50 which may cause a larger vancomycin volume of distribution. The MCS results further highlight that patients receiving IHD should not be given reduced LD. Another MCS study by Rungprai et al determining optimal vancomycin dosing among patients with "high-efficiency IHD" also highlighted the necessity of a higher LD in the treatment of similar patients.33 This study evaluated achievability of AUC_{24h} \geq 400 mg·h/L only during the first day of vancomycin therapy in a different simulation scenario in which vancomycin was administered 8 to 16 hours prior to a 4-hour IHD treatment.³³ These authors proposed an LD of 30 mg/kg, with a 25 mg/kg of postdialytic supplemental dose or an LD of 35 mg/kg with 10 mg/kg of a postdialytic supplemental dose,³³ which can require a total of 45 to 55 mg/kg on the first day of vancomycin therapy. These regimens are even higher than our recommended doses.

Published vancomycin MD recommendations in IHD patients range widely in terms of dose and frequency.^{26,28,30,31,51} Our simulation results show that MDs of 7.5 to 15 mg/kg are required to maintain the pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic efficacy target following the recommended LD. Notably, these MDs resulted in a PTA of 80% to 85% on the third day if given prior to a 3-day interdialytic period shown in Tables 3 and 4. To maintain a PTA of $\geq 90\%$ on the third day of a 3-day interdialytic period, a 30% higher MD (eg, 10 to 20 mg/kg) was needed, but unavoidably, the mean AUC_{24h} on the first day of a 3-day interdialytic period exceeded the safety AUC_{24h} threshold depicted in Tables 3 and 4.

Not only have published vancomycin dosing recommendations for IHD been inconsistent, but also it remains elusive how best to perform TDM to optimize the the subsequent MD. The optimal TDM sampling time and efficacy target of vancomycin therapy for IHD patients have not been studied extensively. With the previous guideline,⁸ a predialysis serum concentration of 5 to 20 mg/L has been extrapolated from the trough target for patients with normal renal function and has been commonly used in clinical practice assuming its correlation with AUC_{24h} \geq 400 mg·h/L.²⁹ In general, the attainment of an AUC_{24h} of 400-700 mg·h/L with the model-recommended initial vancomycin doses was correlated with predialysis concentrations of 15 to 25 mg/L. Because targeting higher predialysis concentrations (eg, ≥ 18.6 mg/L) was associated with better clinical outcomes,³⁴ virtual TDM was designed to target a predialysis concentration of 20 mg/L in the model. TDM-guided individualized dosing following the model-recommended initial doses resulted in a higher proportion of AUC_{24h} of 400 to 700 mg·h/L attainment with a significantly reduced number of patients with AUC_{24h} < 400 or > 700 mg·h/L. The mean proportion of patients with AUC_{24h} 400 to 700 mg·h/L after receiving the first TDM adjusted dose over a 3-day interdialytic period was 78.9% compared with 66.1% and 58.5% after LD and MD, respectively (P < .00001; Figure 2A,C,E). Importantly, the mean AUC_{24h} with the TDM-adjusted doses was maintained as 500 to 600 mg·h/L over 14 days of modeled vancomycin therapy. The mean intradialytic vancomycin MDs adjusted by TDM following the initial regimens were 13 to 14 mg/kg and 7 mg/kg for high-flux and low-flux IHD, respectively. The mean adjusted postdialytic MDs were 9 mg/kg and 6-7 mg/kg for high-flux and low-flux IHD, respectively. If the dose was administered on Friday for a 3-day interdialytic period, 30% higher doses were still required. Any changes to patient clinical status and/or IHD treatment warrant another TDM to ensure the therapeutic target attainment in these patients.

Some limitations should be noted prior to the application of the findings from this in silico study. First, pharmacokinetic modeling and simulation were conducted with the assumption that patients are adults receiving a typical 4-hour IHD thrice weekly and have stable pharmacokinetic parameters. The subjects had demographic and pharmacokinetic characteristics with variances consistent with those derived from the literature with ESKD patients on maintenance IHD. Vancomycin doses were also given on the day of IHD treatment. Thus, application of our recommended doses would be appropriate only for those with similar demographic characteristics and clinical scenarios. We did not model what would happen if vancomycin therapy is initiated on a non-IHD day. If clinicians were faced with this scenario, we would recommend using the same LD with MD determined by TDM. Second, the maximum vancomycin dose in our simulation was capped at 4 g per dose, and all doses were infused over 1 or 2 hours. Thus, a dose >2 g given over 2 hours may be faster than some institutional vancomycin infusion rate policies. We modeled infusion rates in this fashion because standardization was necessary to simultaneously simulate 5000 virtual patients with different

vancomycin doses. Last, the model-recommended initial vancomycin doses were selected primarily based on the attainment of the "efficacy" target (AUC_{24h} \geq 400 mg·h/L) in \geq 90% of simulated cohorts assuming a MRSA MIC of 1 mg/L. Inevitably, these selected doses yielded high drug exposure in some virtual patients, exceeding the reported toxicity threshold of $AUC_{24h} > 700 \text{ mg} \cdot h/L$. Although nephrotoxicity is less of a concern in these patients, a higher AUC_{24h} may increase the risk of other vancomycin toxicities such as ototoxicity. Interestingly, up to 10% of patients still did not achieve n AUC_{24h} \geq 400 mg·h/L with the model-recommended initial doses (Figure 2A). Hence, clinicians should consider their patient's body weight, IHD setting, and clinical condition to weigh the benefit versus risk prior to the application of our modelrecommended initial doses (bolded values in Tables 3 and 4). After initiation of the model-recommended doses, TDM must be performed to individualize the subsequent doses to target or maintain the optimal drug exposure.

Conclusion

The optimization of vancomycin dosing in ESKD patients receiving IHD has been a challenge because of multifaceted patient and dialysis variables influencing pharmacokinetics and a paucity of data regarding optimal vancomycin dosing to attain the efficacy target of AUC_{24h} \geq 400 mg·h/L. Our in silico study used MCS to predict the initial doses that are most likely to attain an AUC_{24h} \geq 400 mg·h/L in these patients with MRSA infections with a MIC of 1 mg/L in 4 different clinical scenarios as follows: (1) intradialytic administration of an LD of 35 mg/kg and an MD of 15 mg/kg in highflux IHD, (2) intradialytic administration of an LD of 30 mg/kg and an MD of 7.5 mg/kg in low-flux IHD, (3) postdialytic administration of an LD of 25 mg/kg and an MD of 10 mg/kg in high-flux IHD, and (4) postdialytic administration of an LD of 25 mg/kg and an MD of 7.5 mg/kg in low-flux IHD. After the modelrecommended initial dosing, TDM targeting predialysis concentration of 20 mg/L can assist clinicians in individualizing the subsequent optimal doses. In the absence of an appropriate pharmacokinetic study, the findings from this in silico study can guide clinicians' selection of more appropriate vancomycin doses attaining AUC_{24h} \geq 400 mg·h/L, whereas clinical validation is necessary to confirm our dosing recommendations.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Funding

The authors have no funding sources to report.

Data Sharing

Data for this study can be accessed by contacting the corresponding author.

Author Contributions

Susan J. Lewis and Bruce A. Mueller have contributed to the conception or design of the work, the execution, analysis and interpretation for the work, and writing the article; approved the final version; and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

References

- Rybak MJ, Le J, Lodise TP, et al. Therapeutic monitoring of vancomycin for serious methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus infections: A revised consensus guideline and review by the American Society of Health-System Pharmacists, the Infectious Diseases Society of America, the Pediatric Infectious Diseases Society, and the Society of Infectious Diseases Pharmacists, American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy. *Am J Health Syst Pharm.* 2020;77(11):835-864.
- Jung Y, Song KH, Cho Je, et al. Area under the concentrationtime curve to minimum inhibitory concentration ratio as a predictor of vancomycin treatment outcome in methicillinresistant *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteraemia. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2014;43(2):179-183.
- Lodise TP, Drusano GL, Zasowski E, et al. Vancomycin exposure in patients with methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* bloodstream infections: how much is enough? *Clin Infect Dis.* 2014;59(5):666-675.
- Suzuki Y, Kawasaki K, Sata Y, et al. Is peak concentration needed in therapeutic drug monitoring of vancomycin? A pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic analysis in patients with methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* pneumonia. *Chemotherapy*. 2012;58(4):308-312.
- Holmes NE, Turnidge JD, Munckhof WJ, et al. Vancomycin AUC/MIC ratio and 30-day mortality in patients with *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteremia. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2013;57(4):1654-1663.
- Neely MN, Youn G, Jones B, et al. Are vancomycin trough concentrations adequate for optimal dosing? *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2014;58(1):309-316.
- Le J, Ny P, Capparelli E, et al. Pharmacodynamic characteristics of nephrotoxicity associated with vancomycin use in children. *J Pediatric Infect Dis Soc.* 2015;4(4):e109-e116.
- Rybak MJ, Lomaestro BM, Rotschafer JC, et al. Therapeutic monitoring of vancomycin in adults summary of consensus recommendations from the American Society of Health-System Pharmacists, the Infectious Diseases Society of America, and the Society of Infectious Diseases Pharmacists. *Pharmacotherapy*. 2009;29(11):1275-1279.
- Pai MP, Neely M, Rodvold KA, Lodise TP. Innovative approaches to optimizing the delivery of vancomycin in individual patients. *Adv Drug Deliv Rev.* 2014;77:50-57.
- 10. Hale CM, Seabury RW, Steele JM, Darko W, Miller CD. Are vancomycin trough concentrations of 15 to 20 mg/L associated with increased attainment of an AUC/MIC \geq 400 in patients with presumed MRSA infection? *J Pharm Pract*. 2017;30(3):329-335.
- Kishk OA, Lardieri AB, Heil EL, Morgan JA. Vancomycin AUC/MIC and corresponding troughs in a pediatric population. *J Pediatr Pharmacol Ther*. 2017;22(1):41-47.

- Álvarez R, López Cortés LE, Molina J, Cisneros JM, Pachón J. Optimizing the clinical use of vancomycin. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2016;60(5):2601-2609.
- Finch NA, Zasowski EJ, Murray KP, et al. A quasiexperiment to study the impact of vancomycin area under the concentration-time curve-guided dosing on vancomycinassociated nephrotoxicity. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2017;61(12):e01293-e01317.
- Neely MN, Kato L, Youn G, et al. Prospective trial on the use of trough concentration versus area under the curve to determine therapeutic vancomycin dosing. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2018;62(2):e02042-e02117.
- Snyder GM, Patel PR, Kallen AJ, Strom JA, Tucker JK, D'Agata EM. Antimicrobial use in outpatient hemodialysis units. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2013;34(4):349-357.
- Hui K, Nalder M, Buising K, et al. Patterns of use and appropriateness of antibiotics prescribed to patients receiving haemodialysis: an observational study. *BMC Nephrol.* 2017;18(1):156.
- Quale JM, O'Halloran JJ, DeVincenzo N, Barth RH. Removal of vancomycin by high-flux hemodialysis membranes. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 1992;36(7):1424-1426.
- Scott MK, Mueller BA, Clark WR. Vancomycin mass transfer characteristics of high-flux cellulosic dialysers. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 1997;12(12):2647-2653.
- Lucksiri A, Scott MK, Mueller BA, Hamburger RJ, Sowinski KM. CAHP-210 dialyzer influence on intra-dialytic vancomycin removal. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2002;17(9):1649-1654.
- Scott MK, Macias WL, Kraus MA, Clark WR, Carfagna MA, Mueller BA. Effects of dialysis membrane on intradialytic vancomycin administration. *Pharmacotherapy*. 1997;17(2):256-262.
- Moellering RC Jr, Krogstad DJ, Greenblatt DJ. Pharmacokinetics of vancomycin in normal subjects and in patients with reduced renal function. *Rev Infect Dis.* 1981;3(suppl):S230-S235.
- Tan CC, Lee HS, Ti TY, Lee EJ. Pharmacokinetics of intravenous vancomycin in patients with end-stage renal failure. *Ther Drug Monit*. 1990;12(1):29-34.
- 23. DeSoi CA, Sahm DF, Umans JG. Vancomycin elimination during high-flux hemodialysis: kinetic model and comparison of four membranes. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 1992;20(4):354-360.
- Barth RH, DeVincenzo N. Use of vancomycin in high-flux hemodialysis: experience with 130 courses of therapy. *Kidney Int.* 1996;50(3):929-936.
- Mason NA, Neudeck BL, Welage LS, Patel JA, Swartz RD. Comparison of 3 vancomycin dosage regimens during hemodialysis with cellulose triacetate dialyzers: post-dialysis versus intradialytic administration. *Clin Nephrol.* 2003;60(2):96-104.
- Ariano RE, Fine A, Sitar DS, Rexrode S, Zelenitsky SA. Adequacy of a vancomycin dosing regimen in patients receiving high-flux hemodialysis. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2005;46(4):681-687.
- Crawford BS, Largen RF, Walton T, Doran JJ. Once-weekly vancomycin for patients receiving high-flux hemodialysis. *Am J Health Syst Pharm.* 2008;65(13):1248-1253.
- Panais R, Hirsch DJ, Dipchand C, Storsley L, Finkle SN. A protocolized approach to vancomycin dosing in conventional hemodialysis. *J Nephrol.* 2010;23(5):569-574.
- Vandecasteele SJ, De Bacquer D, De Vriese AS. Implementation of a dose calculator for vancomycin to achieve target trough levels of 15–20 microg/mL in persons undergoing hemodialysis. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2011;53(2):124-129.
- Zelenitsky SA, Ariano RE, McCrae ML, Vercaigne LM. Vancomycin dosing protocol to achieve therapeutic serum concentrations in patients undergoing hemodialysis. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2012;55(4):527-533.

- El Nekidy WS, El-Masri MM, Umstead GS, Dehoorne-Smith M. Factors influencing vancomycin loading dose for hospitalized hemodialysis patients: prospective observational cohort study. *Can J Hosp Pharm.* 2012;65(6):436-442.
- El Nekidy WS, El-Masri MM, Umstead GS, Dehoorne-Smith M. Predicting maintenance doses of vancomycin for hospitalized patients undergoing hemodialysis. *Can J Hosp Pharm.* 2016;69(5):341-347.
- Rungprai D, Jaruratanasirikul S, Wongpoowarak W, et al. Vancomycin dosing regimen by Monte Carlo simulation in patients on intermittent high-efficiency hemodialysis (HEHD). *J Med Assoc Thai.* 2015;98(6):606-615.
- 34. Fu CF, Huang JD, Wang JT, Lin SW, Wu CC. The ratio of predialysis vancomycin trough serum concentration to minimum inhibitory concentration is associated with treatment outcomes in methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* bacteremia. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(3):e0193585.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Staphylococ*cus aureus with reduced susceptibility to vancomycin–United States, 1997. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 1997;46(33): 765-766.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Staphylococcus aureus resistant to vancomycin–United States, 2002. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2002;51(26):565-567.
- Lafrance JP, Rahme E, Lelorier J, Iqbal S. Vascular accessrelated infections: definitions, incidence rates, and risk factors. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2008;52(5):982-993.
- Vancomycin. *Micromedex*. Greenwood Village, CO: Thomson Micromedex; 2018. http://www.micromedexsolutions.com. Accessed August 23, 2018.
- Wu G, Furlanut M. Prediction of serum vancomycin concentrations using one-, two- and three-compartment models with implemented population pharmacokinetic parameters and with the Bayesian Method. *J Pharm Pharmacol.* 1998;50(8):851-856.
- Morse GD, Nain DK, Bertino JS, Walshe JJ. Overestimation of vancomycin concentrations utilizing fluorescence polarization immunoassay in patients on peritoneal dialysis. *Ther Drug Monit*. 1987;9(2):212-215.
- Peckman HJ, Dupuis RE, Sawyer WT, Brouwer KLR, Cross RE. Vancomycin serum concentrations in patients with renal dysfunction: a comparison of fluorescence polarization immunoassay and the enzyme-multiplied immunoassay technique. *Ther Drug Monit*. 1996;18(6):647–653.
- Trujillo TN, Sowinski KM, Venezia RA, Scott MK, Mueller BA. Vancomycin assay performance in patients with acute renal failure. *Intensive Care Med* 1999;25(11):1291-1296.
- Mueller BA, Smoyer WE. Challenges in developing evidencebased drug dosing guidelines for adults and children receiving renal replacement therapy. *Clin Pharmacol Ther*. 2009;86(5):479-482.
- 44. Scoville BA, Mueller BA. Medication dosing in critically ill patients with acute kidney injury treated with renal replacement therapy. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2013;61(3):490-500.
- 45. Lodise TP, Lomaestro B, Graves J, Drusano GL. Larger vancomycin doses (at least four grams per day) are associated with an increased incidence of nephrotoxicity. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2008;52(4):1330-1336.
- 46. Mermel LA, Allon M, Bouza E, et al. Clinical practice guidelines for the diagnosis and management of intravascular catheter-related infection: 2009 Update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2009;49(1): 1-45.
- 47. Sansot C, Kalbacher E, Lemoine S, Bourguignon L, Fauvel JP, Ducher M. A bayesian model to describe factors influencing

trough levels of vancomycin in hemodialysis patients. *Nephron*. 2015;131(2):131-137.

- Zvonar R, Natarajan S, Edwards C, Roth C. Assessment of vancomycin use in chronic hemodialysis patients: room for improvement. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2008;23(11):3690-3695.
- Ye ZK, Tang HL, Zhai SD. Benefits of therapeutic drug monitoring of vancomycin: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(10):e77169.
- Jeffres MN, Isakow W, Doherty JA, et al. Predictors of mortality for methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* healthcare-associated pneumonia: specific evaluation of vancomycin pharmacokinetic indices. *Chest.* 2006;130(4):947-955.
- Package insert, Vancomycin hydrochloride for injection, USP. Hospira, Inc., Lake Forest, IL, October 2015. http://www. hospira.com/products_and_services/drugs/VANCOMYCIN_ HYDROCHLORIDE. Accessed August 24, 2018.

Supplemental Information

Additional supplemental information can be found by clicking the Supplements link in the PDF toolbar or the Supplemental Information section at the end of webbased version of this article.