MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF INSTRUCTION (MDJI)

www. https://journal.mdji.org/ Vol. 7No. 1 (2024)

IVIVC for Biopharmaceutical Classification System (BCS) Class II Drugs: Case Studies and Challenges

Harry John

Abstract

In vitro–in vivo correlation (IVIVC) serves as a pivotal tool in drug development, enabling the prediction of in vivo drug performance based on in vitro dissolution data. This approach is particularly valuable for Biopharmaceutical Classification System (BCS) Class II drugs, which are characterized by low solubility and high permeability, making dissolution the rate-limiting step in absorption. Despite the theoretical suitability of IVIVC for this class, the practical application often presents significant challenges due to complex gastrointestinal dynamics and formulation-dependent variability. This article provides an in-depth review of IVIVC in the context of BCS Class II drugs, highlighting regulatory perspectives, technical hurdles, and formulation strategies. Through detailed case studies, ranging from successful correlations to partial or failed attempts, we explore the critical factors influencing the establishment of robust IVIVCs. Emerging approaches such as the use of biorelevant media, physiologically based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) modeling, and advanced in vitro systems are also discussed as potential solutions to current limitations. The insights presented aim to guide formulation scientists and regulatory professionals in navigating the complexities of IVIVC for BCS Class II compounds.

Keywords: IVIVC, BCS Class II, Biopharmaceutical Classification System, In vitro–in vivo correlation, Drug dissolution, Oral drug delivery, Low solubility drugs, PBPK modeling, Biorelevant media, Regulatory guidance.

1. Introduction

The Biopharmaceutical Classification System (BCS), introduced by Amidon et al. in 1995, is a scientific framework that classifies drug substances based on their aqueous solubility and intestinal permeability. This system has been instrumental in guiding formulation strategies and regulatory decisions, especially in the development of oral solid dosage forms. Among the four BCS categories, Class II drugs, characterized by low solubility and high permeability, present unique challenges in pharmaceutical development. For these compounds, the rate-limiting step for absorption is dissolution, making them prime candidates for advanced formulation strategies and dissolution-enhancement techniques.

In this context, In Vitro–In Vivo Correlation (IVIVC) plays a critical role. IVIVC refers to the predictive mathematical relationship between an in vitro property of a dosage form (usually the rate or extent of drug dissolution) and a relevant in vivo response, typically plasma drug concentration or amount absorbed (Karalis, Magklara, Shah, & Macheras, 2010). For BCS Class II drugs, establishing a robust IVIVC can provide significant benefits, including reduced reliance on extensive in vivo studies, optimized formulation selection, and support for biowaivers in regulatory submissions. Regulatory agencies such as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the European Medicines Agency (EMA) recognize IVIVC as a valuable tool within the framework of Quality by Design (QbD) and risk-based development approaches.

Despite its potential, achieving a reliable IVIVC for BCS Class II drugs remains challenging. The low solubility of these compounds introduces variability in dissolution behavior, which can

be further influenced by formulation excipients, processing conditions, and gastrointestinal (GI) physiology. Additionally, standard in vitro dissolution methods often fail to accurately mimic the complex, dynamic environment of the human GI tract, limiting their predictive power. These challenges necessitate a multifaceted approach that includes customized dissolution testing, biorelevant media, and, increasingly, physiologically based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) modeling (Tsume, Mudie, Langguth, Amidon, & Amidon, 2014).

This article aims to provide a comprehensive examination of IVIVC for BCS Class II drugs by:

- Reviewing the fundamental concepts of IVIVC and its regulatory framework,
- Exploring the major scientific and technical challenges in establishing IVIVC for poorly soluble drugs,
- Presenting case studies that illustrate both successful and unsuccessful attempts at IVIVC,
- Discussing emerging strategies and tools that can enhance IVIVC predictability and utility.

By synthesizing current knowledge and real-world experiences, this review seeks to guide formulation scientists, pharmacokineticists, and regulatory professionals in the strategic application of IVIVC to improve the development, optimization, and regulatory approval of BCS Class II drug products.

2. Fundamentals of IVIVC

2.1 Definition and Regulatory Context

In Vitro–In Vivo Correlation (IVIVC) is defined as a predictive mathematical model describing the relationship between an in vitro characteristic of a dosage form, typically the dissolution rate, and a relevant in vivo response, such as plasma drug concentration or the amount of drug absorbed. Regulatory agencies like the **U.S. FDA**, **EMA**, and **ICH** recognize IVIVC as a critical tool in the drug development process, particularly for modified-release formulations. The main regulatory benefit of a validated IVIVC is its ability to **support biowaivers**, reduce the number of required **bioequivalence studies**, and facilitate **post-approval changes** in formulation or manufacturing processes under a Quality by Design (QbD) approach (Tiwari, Tiwari, Pandey, Pandey, & Rai, 2010).

2.2 Levels of IVIVC

IVIVC is categorized into several levels based on the strength and utility of the correlation (Patel & Patel, 2024):

- **Level A**: A point-to-point correlation between in vitro dissolution and in vivo input rate (typically absorption). It is the most informative and preferred level, especially for regulatory purposes.
- **Level B**: A statistical moment analysis that compares the mean in vitro dissolution time to the mean residence time or mean in vivo dissolution time. It is less commonly used due to its indirect nature.

- **Level C**: A single-point correlation that relates one in vitro dissolution parameter (e.g., % dissolved at 1 hour) to one in vivo parameter (e.g., C_max or AUC). This level is usually considered supportive but insufficient alone for regulatory decision-making.

- **Multiple Level C**: Correlates multiple in vitro time points with corresponding in vivo parameters, offering better predictability than single Level C and is useful during early formulation development.

2.3 Benefits of Establishing IVIVC

Establishing a robust IVIVC offers several advantages:

- **Reduction in human studies**, lowering development costs and timelines.

- **Supports biowaivers** for post-approval changes (e.g., scale-up, manufacturing site changes).

- **Enables formulation optimization** by predicting the in vivo impact of in vitro modifications.

- **Improves regulatory confidence** in product performance and consistency.

These benefits are particularly valuable for **BCS Class II** drugs, where dissolution is a key determinant of absorption and therapeutic outcome.

2.4 Limitations in the Context of BCS Class II Drugs

Despite the theoretical suitability of BCS Class II drugs for IVIVC, practical limitations often arise. Low aqueous solubility leads to variability in dissolution, which is sensitive to formulation and GI conditions. Standard compendial dissolution methods may not reflect the nonlinear, environment-sensitive absorption profiles of these drugs (Kumari, Gadewar, & Kumar, 2022). Furthermore, excipients, pH shifts, gastric emptying rates, and bile salt concentrations in vivo can significantly alter drug solubility and, thus, compromise correlation accuracy. These limitations necessitate the development of biorelevant dissolution methods, the incorporation of advanced modeling approaches, and careful experimental design when attempting IVIVC in this class.

3. Challenges of IVIVC in BCS Class II Drugs

3.1 Solubility-Limited Absorption and Its Impact on IVIVC

BCS Class II drugs are defined by their low solubility, making dissolution the rate-limiting step in oral absorption (Tampal et al., 2015). This presents a fundamental challenge in establishing IVIVC because in vivo dissolution is highly variable and influenced by gastrointestinal (GI) physiology, which is difficult to replicate in vitro. Even with enhanced formulations, incomplete or inconsistent dissolution can lead to erratic absorption profiles, reducing the reliability of predictive models.

3.2 In Vitro Dissolution Method Development Complexities

Standard compendial dissolution methods often fail to simulate the dynamic conditions of the GI tract. For BCS Class II drugs, dissolution is pH-sensitive, and bile salt interactions can drastically alter solubility. Therefore, developing a discriminatory and biorelevant dissolution

method is difficult yet essential. Without a method that reflects true in vivo conditions, the predictive power of any IVIVC model is inherently limited (Yang, 2010).

3.3 Variability in Gastrointestinal (GI) Conditions

Physiological factors such as gastric emptying rate, intestinal transit time, pH gradients, and the presence of enzymes or food components can significantly influence drug dissolution and absorption. This variability is often subject-specific and difficult to capture in vitro, leading to inconsistencies when trying to correlate laboratory data with clinical pharmacokinetics. Additionally, some BCS Class II drugs exhibit site-specific absorption, which further complicates correlation (Bhosale et al., 2009).

3.4 Role of Excipients and Formulation Design

Excipients play a crucial role in modifying solubility and dissolution rates, especially for poorly soluble drugs. However, the impact of certain excipients may differ significantly between in vitro and in vivo conditions (Yasir, Asif, Kumar, & Aggarval, 2010). For instance, solubilizers or surfactants may show enhanced dissolution in vitro but result in precipitation in vivo due to dilution or environmental changes. Additionally, variations in particle size, salt form, and manufacturing processes can affect the release kinetics in ways that are difficult to predict or control (Nainar, Rajiah, Angamuthu, Prabakaran, & Kasibhatta, 2012).

3.5 Issues with Nonlinear Pharmacokinetics or Multiple Absorption Windows

Some BCS Class II drugs exhibit nonlinear pharmacokinetics, such as saturation of transporters or metabolism at higher concentrations, which can distort IVIVC relationships. Others may have multiple absorption windows or be subject to enterohepatic recycling, complicating the interpretation of in vivo data. These phenomena violate the assumptions of traditional IVIVC models, making it harder to achieve a one-to-one correlation between in vitro and in vivo performance.

4. Case Studies

4.1 Case Study 1: Successful IVIVC for a BCS Class II NSAID

A well-documented example of successful IVIVC is seen with a nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID), such as ibuprofen or ketoprofen, reformulated for extended-release. The formulation was optimized using particle size reduction and the inclusion of pH modifiers to enhance dissolution. A Level A IVIVC was established by correlating in vitro dissolution profiles in biorelevant media with in vivo plasma concentration-time profiles obtained from multiple formulations. The correlation was strong ($R^2 > 0.95$), enabling regulatory acceptance of the model. This allowed the sponsor to gain biowaivers for additional strengths and manufacturing changes, highlighting how careful formulation design and biorelevant testing conditions can lead to robust IVIVC even for poorly soluble drugs (Wu, Cristofoletti, Zhao, & Rostami-Hodjegan, 2021).

4.2 Case Study 2: Partial or Failed IVIVC for an Antifungal BCS II Compound

In contrast, an antifungal drug such as itraconazole, known for its pH-dependent solubility and complex absorption profile, presented significant challenges. Despite using different in vitro methods and enhanced formulations (e.g., solid dispersions), the correlation between dissolution and in vivo absorption remained weak (Batchelor & Flanagan, 2022). The drug's high variability in GI solubility and potential precipitation post-dissolution in vivo led to inconsistent plasma profiles, especially under fed versus fasted conditions. Attempts at Level A IVIVC failed, and only a multiple-level C correlation was achievable, which was not suitable for regulatory use.

This case emphasizes the limitations of IVIVC when the drug's in vivo behavior is governed by unpredictable physiological interactions.

4.3 Case Study 3: Application of Physiologically Based Pharmacokinetic (PBPK) Modeling

For a poorly soluble compound undergoing clinical development, PBPK modeling was used to supplement and interpret IVIVC results. Initial in vitro dissolution data failed to predict observed plasma profiles accurately. A PBPK model was built incorporating drug-specific properties (e.g., solubility across pH range, particle size) and GI physiology (Cook, Addicks, & Wu, 2008). By simulating various formulation scenarios, the model helped to identify key absorption-limiting steps and guide optimization. Ultimately, PBPK modeling bridged the gap between in vitro and in vivo data, resulting in a semi-mechanistic IVIVC model. While not formally accepted as a Level A IVIVC, the approach provided valuable insights for formulation development and internal decision-making.

5. Strategies to Improve IVIVC in BCS Class II Drugs

5.1 Use of Biorelevant Dissolution Media

One of the most effective strategies to enhance IVIVC for BCS Class II drugs is the use of biorelevant dissolution media that simulate the physiological conditions of the gastrointestinal tract. Media such as FaSSIF (fasted state simulated intestinal fluid) and FeSSIF (fed state simulated intestinal fluid) mimic the composition of intestinal fluids, including bile salts and phospholipids, which are critical for solubilizing poorly soluble drugs. These media provide a more realistic dissolution profile compared to conventional compendial methods and increase the likelihood of capturing the in vivo dissolution behavior needed for successful IVIVC development (Mundhe, Fuloria, Pande, & Biyani, 2013).

5.2 Integration with PBPK and Simulation Tools

Incorporating physiologically based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) modeling allows developers to simulate the complex interplay between drug properties, formulation design, and physiological variables. PBPK models can integrate in vitro dissolution data, gastrointestinal transit times, enzymatic degradation, and absorption kinetics to generate predictive plasma profiles. These simulations help identify absorption-limiting factors and guide formulation adjustments before clinical testing. Additionally, model-informed drug development (MIDD) approaches can improve decision-making during early-stage development and support regulatory submissions with mechanistic justifications (Lennernäs & Abrahamsson, 2005).

5.3 Optimization of Formulation and Process Parameters

Formulation strategies aimed at enhancing dissolution, such as solid dispersions, lipid-based formulations, nanocrystal technologies, or the use of surfactants and pH modifiers, can significantly improve the predictability of in vitro results (Nguyen et al., 2017). However, the success of these strategies depends on the consistency and robustness of the manufacturing process. Therefore, a Quality by Design (QbD) approach is recommended, where critical material attributes and process parameters are systematically optimized to ensure batch-to-batch reproducibility and better correlation with in vivo performance.

5.4 Innovative In Vitro Testing Systems

To further close the gap between in vitro and in vivo behavior, novel dissolution testing systems are being explored. These include two-stage dissolution models (e.g., pH-shift methods), dynamic gastric simulators, and artificial stomach-duodenum (ASD) models that replicate gastrointestinal motility, fluid volumes, and enzymatic activity. These systems offer a more

physiologically relevant environment for evaluating drug release and can significantly enhance the predictive capacity of in vitro data. When used alongside biorelevant media and modeling tools, they provide a holistic framework for establishing a reliable IVIVC in BCS Class II drug development.

6. Regulatory Perspective

6.1 Current Expectations and Flexibility from Regulatory Bodies

Regulatory agencies such as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), European Medicines Agency (EMA), and ICH recognize IVIVC as a valuable tool for supporting drug development and lifecycle management (Löbenberg & Amidon, 2000). Their guidelines encourage the development of IVIVC, especially for extended-release formulations, and provide clear criteria for model validation and acceptance. While BCS Class II drugs present more complexity, regulators are open to alternative approaches—including PBPK modeling and hybrid models—if scientifically justified. Importantly, the regulatory emphasis has shifted from traditional point-to-point correlations to more holistic, risk-based models that integrate formulation, process, and biopharmaceutical data.

6.2 Examples of Accepted IVIVC Submissions for BCS Class II Drugs

Though challenging, several successful IVIVC submissions for BCS Class II drugs have been documented. These cases typically involve extensive characterization of the drug substance, the use of biorelevant dissolution methods, and multiple clinical formulations to capture variability (Wu, Liu, He, & Sun, 2016). Sponsors who have demonstrated a strong understanding of dissolution–absorption relationships and employed well-validated Level A IVIVC models have received regulatory approval to use these models in support of post-approval changes, such as scale-up or site transfers. In some instances, PBPK modeling has been accepted as supportive evidence for IVIVC, particularly when direct correlation was difficult due to solubility and absorption complexities.

6.3 Future Outlook on IVIVC in the Context of Quality by Design (QbD)

Looking ahead, regulatory frameworks are increasingly aligning with Quality by Design (QbD) principles, where a deep understanding of product and process variables is central to ensuring quality (Suarez-Sharp, Li, Duan, Shah, & Seo, 2016). In this paradigm, IVIVC is not only a regulatory tool but a developmental asset that informs formulation design, risk assessment, and control strategies. Agencies are expected to continue embracing model-informed drug development (MIDD), including the use of advanced simulation, in silico tools, and real-time dissolution monitoring. For BCS Class II drugs, future regulatory support may hinge on the applicant's ability to combine empirical data with mechanistic understanding, thereby strengthening the scientific foundation of IVIVC submissions (Shukla, 2017).

7. Conclusion

In Vitro–In Vivo Correlation (IVIVC) remains a valuable yet challenging tool in the development of BCS Class II drugs, where low solubility often limits oral bioavailability. While the theoretical suitability of these drugs for IVIVC is strong, given that dissolution is the rate-limiting step, practical implementation is hindered by formulation-dependent variability, complex gastrointestinal physiology, and limitations of standard in vitro testing methods.

Through real-world case studies, it becomes clear that successful IVIVC requires a multifaceted strategy: the use of biorelevant dissolution media, advanced formulation techniques, and integrated modeling tools like PBPK can enhance the predictive power of in vitro data. Innovative in vitro systems and simulation platforms are bridging the gap between laboratory conditions and the human body, offering more reliable predictions of drug absorption.

From a regulatory perspective, agencies are increasingly receptive to model-informed approaches and support the use of IVIVC within a Quality by Design (QbD) framework. However, the scientific rigor and validation of models remain crucial for regulatory acceptance, particularly for BCS Class II compounds.

Ultimately, the development of a robust IVIVC model for BCS Class II drugs is both an opportunity and a challenge. Success lies in combining scientific understanding, innovative methodologies, and regulatory insight to deliver safe, effective, and high-quality drug products to patients more efficiently.

References

1. Karalis, V., Magklara, E., Shah, V. P., & Macheras, P. (2010). From drug delivery systems to drug release, dissolution, IVIVC, BCS, BDDCS, bioequivalence and biowaivers.
2. Tsume, Y., Mudie, D. M., Langguth, P., Amidon, G. E., & Amidon, G. L. (2014). The Biopharmaceutics Classification System: subclasses for in vivo predictive dissolution (IPD) methodology and IVIVC. *European Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, *57*, 152-163.
3. Tiwari, G., Tiwari, R., Pandey, S., Pandey, P., & Rai, A. K. (2010). In vitro-in vivo correlation and biopharmaceutical classification system (bcs): a review. *Pharma Chemica*, *2*(2), 129-40.
4. Patel, R., & Patel, A. (2024). In vivo–In Vitro correlation (IVIVC) in drug development: bridging preclinical and clinical outcomes for regulatory approvals. World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 22(2), 2311-2328.
5. Kumari, J., Gadewar, M., & Kumar, A. (2022). An updated account of the BCS: biopharmaceutical classification system. *Neuroquantology*, *20*, 3165-3177.
6. Tampal, N., Mandula, H., Zhang, H., Li, B. V., Nguyen, H., & Conner, D. P. (2015). Biopharmaceutics classification system-based biowaivers for generic oncology drug products: case studies. *AAPS PharmSciTech*, *16*, 5-9.
7. Yang, S. G. (2010). Biowaiver extension potential and IVIVC for BCS class II drugs by formulation design: case study for cyclosporine self-microemulsifying formulation. *Archives of pharmacal research*, *33*(11), 1835-1842.
8. Bhosale, A. V., Hardikar, S. R., Patil, N., Jagtap, R., Jamdade, N., & Patel, B. (2009). IVIVC and BCS: A regulatory perspective. *Research Journal of Pharmacy and Technology*, *2*(1), 72-79.
9. Yasir, M., Asif, M., Kumar, A., & Aggarval, A. (2010). Biopharmaceutical classification system: An account. *International Journal of PharmTech Research*, *2*(3), 1681-1690.
10. Nainar, S., Rajiah, K., Angamuthu, S., Prabakaran, D., & Kasibhatta, R. (2012). Biopharmaceutical Classification System in Invitro/In-vivo Correlation: Concept and Development Strategies in Drug Delivery. *Tropical Journal of Pharmaceutical Research*, *11*(2), 319-329.

11. Wu, F., Cristofoletti, R., Zhao, L., & Rostami-Hodjegan, A. (2021). Scientific considerations to move towards biowaiver for biopharmaceutical classification system class III drugs: how modeling and simulation can help. *Biopharmaceutics & Drug Disposition*, *42*(4), 118-127.
12. Batchelor, H., & Flanagan, T. (2022). Biopharmaceutic Classification System. *Biopharmaceutics: From Fundamentals to Industrial Practice*, 135-146.
13. Cook, J., Addicks, W., & Wu, Y. H. (2008). Application of the biopharmaceutical classification system in clinical drug development—an industrial view. *The AAPS journal*, *10*, 306-310.
14. Mundhe, A., Fuloria, N. K., Pande, S., & Biyani, K. (2013). BCS based biowaivers and their current regulatory issues. *American Journal of PharmResearch*, *3*(6).
15. Lennernäs, H., & Abrahamsson, B. (2005). The use of biopharmaceutic classification of drugs in drug discovery and development: current status and future extension. *Journal of pharmacy and pharmacology*, *57*(3), 273-285.
16. Nguyen, M. A., Flanagan, T., Brewster, M., Kesisoglou, F., Beato, S., Biewenga, J., ... & Langguth, P. (2017). A survey on IVIVC/IVIVR development in the pharmaceutical industry–past experience and current perspectives. *European Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, *102*, 1-13.
17. Löbenberg, R., & Amidon, G. L. (2000). Modern bioavailability, bioequivalence and biopharmaceutics classification system. New scientific approaches to international regulatory standards. *European journal of pharmaceutics and biopharmaceutics*, *50*(1), 3-12.
18. Wu, C., Liu, Y., He, Z., & Sun, J. (2016). Insight into the development of dissolution media for BCS class II drugs: a review from quality control and prediction of in vivo performance perspectives. *Current drug delivery*, *13*(7), 1004-1020.
19. Suarez-Sharp, S., Li, M., Duan, J., Shah, H., & Seo, P. (2016). Regulatory experience with in vivo in vitro correlations (IVIVC) in new drug applications. *The AAPS journal*, *18*, 1379-1390.
20. Shukla, T. The Biopharmaceutical Classification System (BCS): Past and Present Scenario of Scientific framework for Bio-waiver Extension and Need of its Validation. *J Pharma and NDDS 2017*, *1*(1), 7-12.