



## Targeting Anti-Epileptic Drug Therapy Without Collateral Damage: Nanocarrier-Based Drug Delivery

### Nanostructure-Based Drug Delivery Systems for Brain Targeting.

Haque S, Md S, Alam MI, Sahni JK, Ali J, Sanjula Baboota S. *Drug Dev Ind Pharm* 2012;38:387–411.

**CONTEXT:** It is a well-known fact that the blood brain barrier (BBB) hinders the penetrance and access of many pharmacotherapeutic agents to the central nervous system (CNS). Many diseases of the CNS remain undertreated and the inability to treat most CNS disorders is not due to the lack of effective CNS drug discovery, rather, it is due to ineffective CNS delivery. Therefore, a number of nanostructured drug delivery carriers have been developed and explored over the past couple of years to transport the drugs to brain. **OBJECTIVE:** The present review will give comprehensive details of extensive research being done in the field of nanostructured carriers to transport the drugs through the BBB in a safe and effective manner. **METHODS:** The method includes both the polymeric- and lipid-based nanocarriers with emphasis on their utility, methodology, advantages, and the drugs which have been worked on using a particular approach to provide a noninvasive method to improve the drug transport through BBB. **RESULTS:** Polymeric- and lipid-based nanocarriers enter brain capillaries before reaching the surface of the brain microvascular endothelial cells without the disruption of BBB. These systems are further modified with specific ligands vectors and pegylation aiming to target and enhance their binding with surface receptors of the specific tissues inside brain and increase long circulatory time which favors interaction and penetration into brain endothelial cells. **CONCLUSION:** This review would give an insight to the researchers working on neurodegenerative and non-neurodegenerative diseases of the CNS including brain tumor.

### Commentary

Medically refractory epilepsy is estimated to occur in about 500,000 individuals of the nearly 3 million in the United States with epilepsy. Medication resistance in epilepsy is due, in part, to tolerance related to molecular mechanisms that eliminate, or minimize the persistence of antiepileptic drug (AED) molecules in the brain. Currently, drug discovery for CNS disorders is almost exclusively limited to small molecular weight lipophilic molecules that can cross the blood brain barrier (BBB), and blood-cerebral spinal fluid barrier (BCSFB). This simple prerequisite eliminates a majority of potential AED molecule candidates early in the drug discovery process. The recent review by Haque et al. offers a comprehensive up-to-date understanding of the strategies that facilitate drug efficacy by focusing on creative drug delivery mechanisms rather than drug discovery. This article reviews the challenges of overcoming the array of active and passive transporter systems at the BBB and BCSFB that shuttle drug molecules toward and away from neural tissue. The authors compare drug molecule transport across the BBB and neural cell membranes in a number of disorder-based platforms including epilepsy. These transporters play the role of “gatekeepers” limiting ac-

cess of molecules to the brain. Specifically, several transporter superfamilies mediate access of therapeutic drug molecules to the brain. The adenosine triphosphate binding cassette (ABC), and solute carrier (SLC) transporters comprise the two major known drug superfamily transporters in the brain. P-glycoprotein is the most extensively studied BBB transporter of the ABC family. P-glycoprotein in animal models can play a role in eliminating antiepileptic drug molecules, such as phenytoin, phenobarbital (1), and levetiracetam. However, the extent to which this transporter is involved in drug tolerance in humans remains unclear. The SLC transporter superfamily includes the organic anion transporters localized on neurons themselves. This system probably plays a significant role in eliminating valproic acid. Also noteworthy, is an associated monocarboxylate transporter, associated with CNS uptake of medium-chain fatty acids that play a dominant role in transporting valproic acid into the brain. The system L-transporters bidirectionally transport gabapentin and pregabalin. In addition, the multi-drug resistance-associated proteins (MRP) found at the BBB and BCSFB can restrict brain entry of phenytoin (2).

Manipulating these transporter gatekeepers can potentially increase the entry and persistence of drug molecules in the brain. Haque et al. focus on reviewing the growing field of nanotechnology utilized as innovative tools to deliver drugs across the BBB, and through the brain parenchyma. They do not extensively discuss drug molecule modifications currently used to minimize peripheral AED side effects. These latter approach-

**TABLE. Epilepsy-Related Drug-Molecule Carrier Systems and Delivery Strategies**

Drug Delivery System	Drug Candidate
Prodrug (3)	Fosphenytoin, lecithin-valproic acid (DP-VPA), XP13512 (4)
Nanoemulsion	Diazepam, lorazepam, midazolam, clonazepam
Microemulsion	Carbamazepine (5)
Efflux pump inhibitors	P-glycoprotein inhibitors, verapamil (6) and dizolcipine (7); MRP inhibitor, probenecid
Convection-enhanced delivery	Adenosine (8)

es for the treatment of epilepsy include prodrugs (3) and efflux pump inhibition (6) (see Table). Utilization of nanocarriers can potentially bypass molecule transporters, increasing cell specificity, while improving diffusion of even hydrophilic molecules across the BBB and BCSFB. Drug molecules and other biologically active molecules can be potentially dissolved, entrapped, or encapsulated in these nanocarriers. Such nanoscale carriers can be used as biocompatible shuttles to ferry therapeutic molecules to their central targets. Candidate nanoparticles are similar in size to large biological molecules such as enzymes and cell membrane receptors. Because of their subcellular size, these nano-sized drug carriers can interact with biomolecules on both cell surfaces and inside of them. Nanoparticles smaller than 50 nm can easily cross the BBB and enter neural cells themselves. The small size of the particles can dramatically increase the “surface area to volume” ratio. This means relatively large amounts of therapeutic agent can be associated with the nanocarriers facilitating shuttling drug to their target. Such an approach can minimize peripheral side effects by lowering systemic drug concentrations.

Moreover, these nanocarrier systems have been shown to protect drug molecules from in vivo degradation, while reducing neural toxicity resulting from lower effective concentrations in the brain. Drug-delivery systems include nanoemulsions for intranasal drug delivery, including a number of benzodiazepines, and intravenous administration of AED-microemulsions, including carbamazepine, may emerge in the near future as a rapid delivery option for efficiently targeting epileptic networks (see Table).

Haque et al. have comprehensively outlined the extent to which nanostructure-based drug delivery systems are already available for disorders outside of epilepsy, most notably cancer. The novel delivery mechanisms already in practice for the treatment of cancers highlight the underutilization

of these treatment approaches for epilepsy. It is promising that first-generation drug delivery approaches are at various levels of development and deployment for the treatment of epilepsy. However, it is important to aggressively pursue next-generation drug delivery systems. Such novel mechanisms will facilitate access to potentially more effective molecules aimed at stabilizing so-called medication-resistant epilepsy.

by Marvin A. Rossi, MD, PhD

#### References

1. Volk HA, Loscher W. Multidrug resistance in epilepsy: Rats with drug-resistant seizures exhibit enhanced brain expression of P-glycoprotein compared with rats with drug responsive seizures. *Brain* 2005;128:1358–1368.
2. Potschka H, Fedrowitz M, Loscher W. Multidrug resistance protein MRP2 contributes to blood-brain barrier function and restricts anti-epileptic drug activity. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 2003;306:124–131.
3. Bennewitz MF, Saltzman WM. Nanotechnology for the delivery of drugs to the brain for epilepsy. *Neurotherapeutics* 2009;6:323–336.
4. Rautio J, Kumpulainen H, Heimback T. Prodrugs: Design and clinical applications. *Nat Rev Drug Discov* 2008;7:225–270.
5. Madhusudhan B, Rambhau D, Apte SS, Gopinath D. 1-O-alkylglycerol stabilized carbamazepine intravenous o/w nanoemulsions for drug targeting in mice. *J Drug Target* 2007;15:154–161.
6. Iannetti P, Spalice A, Parisi P. Calcium-channel blocker verapamil administration in prolonged and refractory status epilepticus. *Epilepsia* 2005;46:967–969.
7. Bankstahl JP, Hoffman K, Bethman K, Loscher W. Glutamate is critically involved in seizure-induced overexpression of P-glycoprotein in the brain. *Neuropharmacology* 2008;54:1006–1016.
8. Yildirim M, Marangoz C. Anticonvulsant effects of focal and intracerebroventricular adenosine on penicillin-induced epileptiform activity in rats. *Brain Res* 2007;1127:193–200.



# American Epilepsy Society

## *Epilepsy Currents Journal*

### Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest

#### **Instructions**

The purpose of this form is to provide readers of your manuscript with information about your other interests that could influence how they receive and understand your work. Each author should submit a separate form and is responsible for the accuracy and completeness of the submitted information. The form is in four parts.

#### **1. Identifying information.**

Enter your full name. If you are NOT the main contributing author, please check the box “no” and enter the name of the main contributing author in the space that appears. Provide the requested manuscript information.

#### **2. The work under consideration for publication.**

This section asks for information about the work that you have submitted for publication. The time frame for this reporting is that of the work itself, from the initial conception and planning to the present. The requested information is about resources that you received, either directly or indirectly (via your institution), to enable you to complete the work. Checking “No” means that you did the work without receiving any financial support from any third party – that is, the work was supported by funds from the same institution that pays your salary and that institution did not receive third-party funds with which to pay you. If you or your institution received funds from a third party to support the work, such as a government granting agency, charitable foundation or commercial sponsor, check “Yes”. Then complete the appropriate boxes to indicate the type of support and whether the payment went to you, or to your institution, or both.

#### **3. Relevant financial activities outside the submitted work.**

This section asks about your financial relationships with entities in the bio-medical arena that could be perceived to influence, or that give the appearance of potentially influencing, what you wrote in the submitted work. For example, if your article is about testing an epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) antagonist in lung cancer, you should report all associations with entities pursuing diagnostic or therapeutic strategies in cancer in general, not just in the area of EGFR or lung cancer.

Report all sources of revenue paid (or promised to be paid) directly to you or your institution on your behalf over the 36 months prior to submission of the work. This should include all monies from sources with relevance to the submitted work, not just monies from the entity that sponsored the research. Please note that your interactions with the work’s sponsor that are outside the submitted work should also be listed here. If there is any question, it is usually better to disclose a relationship than not to do so.

For grants you have received for work outside the submitted work, you should disclose support ONLY from entities that could be perceived to be affected financially by the published work, such as drug companies, or foundations supported by entities that could be perceived to have a financial stake in the outcome. Public funding sources, such as government agencies, charitable foundations or academic institutions, need not be disclosed. For example, if a government agency sponsored a study in which you have been involved and drugs were provided by a pharmaceutical company, you need only list the pharmaceutical company.

#### **4. Other relationships**

Use this section to report other relationships or activities that readers could perceive to have influenced, or that give the appearance of potentially influencing, what you wrote in the submitted work.



# American Epilepsy Society

## Epilepsy Currents Journal

### Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest

#### Section #1 Identifying Information

1. Today's Date: 8/28/2012
2. First Name Marvin Last Name Rossi Degree MD, PhD
3. Are you the Main Assigned Author?  Yes  No

If no, enter your name as co-author:

4. Manuscript/Article Title: Targeting Anti-Epileptic Drug Therapy Without Collateral Damage: Nanocarrier-Based Drug Delivery
5. Journal Issue you are submitting for: 12.5

#### Section #2 The Work Under Consideration for Publication

Did you or your institution at any time receive payment or services from a third party for any aspect of the submitted work (including but not limited to grants, data monitoring board, study design, manuscript preparation, statistical analysis, etc.)?

Complete each row by checking "No" or providing the requested information. If you have more than one relationship just add rows to this table.

Type	No	Money Paid to You	Money to Your Institution*	Name of Entity	Comments**
1. Grant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
2. Consulting fee or honorarium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
3. Support for travel to meetings for the study or other purposes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
4. Fees for participating in review activities such as data monitoring boards, statistical analysis, end point committees, and the like	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
5. Payment for writing or reviewing the manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
6. Provision of writing assistance, medicines, equipment, or administrative support.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
7. Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

\* This means money that your institution received for your efforts on this study.

\*\* Use this section to provide any needed explanation.

**Section #3 Relevant financial activities outside the submitted work.**

Place a check in the appropriate boxes in the table to indicate whether you have financial relationships (regardless of amount of compensation) with entities as described in the instructions. Use one line for each entity; add as many lines as you need by clicking the “Add” box. You should report relationships that were present during the 36 months prior to submission.

Complete each row by checking “No” or providing the requested information. If you have more than one relationship just add rows to this table.

Type of relationship (in alphabetical order)	No	Money Paid to You	Money to Your Institution*	Name of Entity	Comments**
1. Board membership	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
2. Consultancy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
3. Employment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
4. Expert testimony	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
5. Grants/grants pending	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
6. Payment for lectures including service on speakers bureaus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
7. Payment for manuscript preparation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
8. Patents (planned, pending or issued)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
9. Royalties	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
10. Payment for development of educational presentations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
11. Stock/stock options	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
12. Travel/accommodations/meeting expenses unrelated to activities listed.**	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
13. Other (err on the side of full disclosure)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				

\* This means money that your institution received for your efforts.

\*\* For example, if you report a consultancy above there is no need to report travel related to that consultancy on this line.

**Section #4 Other relationships**

Are there other relationships or activities that readers could perceive to have influenced, or that give the appearance of potentially influencing, what you wrote in the submitted work?

- No other relationships/conditions/circumstances that present a potential conflict of interest.  
 Yes, the following relationships/conditions/circumstances are present:

Marvin A Rossi MD, PhD

Thank you for your assistance.  
*Epilepsy Currents* Editorial Board