

1 **Supplementary material**

2

3 **Interface model**

4

5 The interface model is a nonlinear effect-compartmental model in which the elimination
6 mechanism is controlled by the state variable $y(t)$ (Meille *et al*, 2008). This latter variable
7 represents the effect of the drug and is related to the drug plasma concentration $c(t)$ as
8 follows:

9
$$\frac{dy}{dt} = -\alpha \exp(-\beta y)y + (c - \gamma)H(c - \gamma)$$

10 with an initial condition $y(0) = 0$. Here, α , β and γ are constants, and H is the Heaviside
11 function, i.e., $H(x) = 1$ for $x \geq 0$ and 0 otherwise. Parameters α and β control the shape of
12 the output $y(t)$. Parameter γ is a threshold parameter with adjustment for the input $c(t)$. In
13 the case with $\alpha = 0$ and $\gamma = 0$, the interface model coincides with the area under the curve
14 model.

15

16 **PK**

17

18 The first five equations of the model represent the pharmacokinetic models for etoposide and
19 cisplatin. Etoposide kinetics are usually described by a model with two compartments that have
20 elimination in the central compartment (Tranchand *et al*, 1999). The equations are:

21

$$\frac{dc_1}{dt} = -(k_e + k_{12})c_1 + k_{12}c_2 + \frac{u_1(t)}{V_1}$$

$$\frac{dc_2}{dt} = k_{21}(c_1 - c_2)$$

22 where c_1 and c_2 represent the etoposide concentrations in the central and peripheral
 23 compartments, respectively. For cisplatin, we use a three-compartment model (Monjanel-
 24 Mouterde *et al*, 2003):

25

$$\frac{dc_3}{dt} = -(k_e + k_{12} + k_{13})c_3 + k_{12}c_4 + k_{13}c_5 + \frac{u_2(t)}{V_1}$$

$$\frac{dc_4}{dt} = k_{21}(c_3 - c_4)$$

$$\frac{dc_5}{dt} = k_{31}(c_3 - c_5)$$

26 where c_3 , c_4 and c_5 represent the concentrations in the central compartment and the second
 27 and third compartments, respectively. Parameter values are given in Table 8.

28

29 Interfaces

30

31 A particularity of our model is that there is an interface-type model related to the neutrophils,
 32 platelets and tumour volume for each drug.

33 Equations of the ANC interface model are as follows:

34

$$\frac{dy_1}{dt} = -\alpha_1 \exp(-\beta_1 y_1) y_1 + (c_1 - \gamma_1) H(c_1 - \gamma_1)$$

$$\frac{dy_2}{dt} = -\alpha_2 \exp(-\beta_2 y_2) y_2 + (c_3 - \gamma_2) H(c_3 - \gamma_2),$$

35 where y_1 and y_2 represent the ANC interface variables for etoposide and cisplatin, respectively.

36 Equations of the PLT interface model are:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dy_3}{dt} &= -\alpha_3 \exp(-\beta_3 y_3) y_3 + (c_1 - \gamma_3) H(c_1 - \gamma_3) \\ \frac{dy_4}{dt} &= -\alpha_4 \exp(-\beta_4 y_4) y_4 + (c_3 - \gamma_4) H(c_3 - \gamma_4), \end{aligned}$$

where y_3 and y_4 represent the PLT interface variables of etoposide and cisplatin, respectively.

Equations of the tumour interface model are:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dy_5}{dt} &= -\alpha_5 \exp(-\beta_5 y_5) y_5 + (c_1 - \gamma_5) H(c_1 - \gamma_5) \\ \frac{dy_6}{dt} &= -\alpha_6 \exp(-\beta_6 y_6) y_6 + (c_3 - \gamma_6) H(c_3 - \gamma_6). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, here y_5 and y_6 represent the tumour regression interface variables for etoposide and cisplatin, respectively. The parameter values are given in Table 9.

Haemotoxicity model

We consider a simple, physiologically realistic model for haematopoiesis to describe the dynamics of neutrophils and platelets. We assume that the production rate of progenitor cells u is regulated by a homeostatic feedback mechanism controlled by the mature neutrophils w . Due to maturation and replication in the haematopoietic chain, progenitors control the production of mature neutrophils after a time delay, τ . This process is described by the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{du}{dt} &= k_u \text{Re } g - (k_u + N)u \\ \frac{dw}{dt} &= \delta u(t - \tau) - k_w w, \end{aligned}$$

with $\delta = k_w w_0$. The constants k_u and k_w are associated with natural elimination of neutrophils

54 and progenitors. $\text{Re } g$ represents the neutrophil-mediated regulation of the progenitors via
55 cytokines. We considered

$$56 \quad \text{Re } g = \left(\frac{w_0}{w} \right)^\phi,$$

57 where w_0 is the standard number of neutrophils without the effect of drugs, and ϕ is a positive
58 constant. N represents the cytotoxic effect of both drugs. We set

$$59 \quad N = \alpha y_1 + \beta y_2$$

60 where parameters α and β are associated with the effects of etoposide and cisplatin,
61 respectively.

62 Similarly, for the platelets, we used the following equations:

$$63 \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{dv}{dt} &= k_v \text{Re } g_1 - (k_v + N_1)u \\ \frac{dp}{dt} &= \delta_1 v(t - \tau_1) - k_p p, \end{aligned}$$

64 with $\delta_1 = k_p p_0$, $\text{Re } g_1 = (p_0 / p)^\phi$ and $N_1 = \alpha_1 y_3 + \beta_1 y_4$. The parameter values are given in Table
65 10.

66

67 **Modelling tumour growth**

68

69 Several studies have shown that the Gompertz model reproduces significant tumour growth. In
70 our model, we used a Gompertz type growth that is described by the following equation:

$$71 \quad \frac{dn}{dt} = \lambda \log \left(\frac{M}{n} \right) n - Kn.$$

72 In this latter equation, n represents the number of cancer cells, M is a carrying capacity or the

73 maximal number of cells that can be attained and K represents the cytotoxic effects of both
74 drugs. Letting $K = 0$ means that there is no treatment. We set the initial tumour mass equal to
75 30 g, such that $n(0) = 30$ and $M = 1000$ g, which is equivalent to 10^{12} cells. The coefficient λ
76 was chosen such that the doubling time is equal to 30 days, which corresponds to the observed
77 doubling time for SCLC (Hasegawa *et al*, 2000; Al-Ajam *et al*, 2005; Harris *et al*, 2012). We set

78
$$K = e_{eto}y_5 + e_{cis}y_6 + 2 \cdot syn \cdot \sqrt{(e_{eto}y_5)(e_{cis}y_6)}$$

79 where e_{eto} and e_{cis} are two constants that calibrate the cytotoxic effects of etoposide and
80 cisplatin, respectively. Finally, syn is a synergy coefficient between the two drugs. Parameter
81 values are given in Table 11.

82

83 **Bibliography**

84 Al-Ajam M, Seymour A, Mooty M, Leaf A (2005) Ten years of disease-free survival between two
85 diagnoses of small-cell lung cancer: a case report and a literature review. *Med Oncol Northwood*
86 *Lond Engl* **22**: 89–97, doi:10.1385/MO:22:1:089.

87 Harris K, Khachaturova I, Azab B, Maniatis T, Murukutla S, Chalhoub M, Hatoum H, Kilkenny T,
88 Elsayegh D, Maroun R, Alkaied H (2012) Small cell lung cancer doubling time and its effect on
89 clinical presentation: a concise review. *Clin Med Insights Oncol* **6**: 199–203,
90 doi:10.4137/CMO.S9633.

91 Hasegawa M, Sone S, Takashima S, Li F, Yang ZG, Maruyama Y, Watanabe T (2000) Growth rate
92 of small lung cancers detected on mass CT screening. *Br J Radiol* **73**: 1252–1259,
93 doi:10.1259/bjr.73.876.11205667.

94 Meille C, Iliadis A, Barbolosi D, Frances N, Freyer G (2008) An interface model for dosage
95 adjustment connects hematotoxicity to pharmacokinetics. *J Pharmacokinet Pharmacodyn* **35**:
96 619–633, doi:10.1007/s10928-008-9106-4.

97 Monjanel-Mouterde S, Ciccolini J, Bagarry D, Zonta-David M, Duffaud F, Favre R, Durand A
98 (2003) Population pharmacokinetics of cisplatin after 120-h infusion: application to routine
99 adaptive control with feedback. *J Clin Pharm Ther* **28**: 109–116.

100 Tranchand B, Amsellem C, Chatelut E, Freyer G, Iliadis A, Ligneau B, Trillet-Lenoir V, Canal P,
101 Lochon I, Ardiet CJ (1999) A limited-sampling strategy for estimation of etoposide
102 pharmacokinetics in cancer patients. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol* **43**: 316–322,
103 doi:10.1007/s002800050901.

104