QBD APPROACH IN FORMULATION AND EVALUATION OF SUMATRIPTAN SUCCINATE BILAYER BUCCAL TABLETS
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ABSTRACT

The present investigation was focused on application of QbD approach to see the effect of formulation variables on buccal mucoadhesive tablets containing anti-depressant drug, Sumatriptan succinate to circumvent the first pass effect. Risk assessment of critical material and process parameters are linked to critical quality attributes (CQAs) of the product with respect to obtain target quality product profile (TQPP). The effects of critical parameters (concentration of HPMC K100LV, Carbopol 974P) were investigated by executing design of experimentation (DoE) using 3² factorial designs. Drug release, mucoadhesive strength and mucoadhesion time were considered critical quality attributes (CQAs). Sumatriptan succinate buccal mucoadhesive tablets were prepared by direct compression method and were evaluated as per pharmacopoeia procedure. Multiple regression analysis and ANOVA were employed to identify and to estimate the effect of important parameters and establish their relationship with CQAs and to obtain design space for optimization purpose. The best in–vivo drug release profile, mucoadhesive strength, Mucoadhesion time and desired product quality was achieved with the formulation prepared in theregion of design space.3D response graph and Overlay plot were successfully implemented to interpret effects and selection of significant parameters on CQAs. Formulation parameters which affect the Sumatriptan succinate buccal mucoadhesive tablets can be successfully optimized.
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INTRODUCTION

Buccal delivery of drug, as an alternative to the oral route of drug administration, is a subject of growing interest because of its numerous advantages such as good accessibility, robustness of epithelium, facilitereoval of dosage form in case of need, relatively low enzymatic activity, prevent drug degradation in gastrointestinal tract and avoid hepatic first-pass metabolism. Buccal route provides potential routes fortypically large, hydrophilic, unstable proteins, oligonucleotides and polysaccharides as well as small drug molecules. Among the various transmucosal sites available, mucosa of the buccal cavity was found to be the most convenient and easily available site for delivery of therapeutic agents for both local and systemic delivery as retentive dosage forms, because it has expanse of smooth muscle which is relatively immobile, abundant vascularization, rapid recovery time after exposure to stress.

Sumatriptan succinate is an antimigraine and pain inhibitory drug. Sumatriptan succinate has half-life of 2.5 hrs. Its total bioavailability in the body is 06% due to first pass metabolism. Also Sumatriptan succinate is an acid sensitive that is readily react in the gastric environment thus reduces its oral bioavailability. Transmucosal administration of drugs that undergo first pass metabolism can improve the bioavailability and reduce the dosing frequency compared with the oral route, while maintaining the antimigraine profile for a longer period of time.

The application of quality-by-design (QbD) approach in formulation development has provided an opportunity for a harmonized pharmaceutical quality system based on continuous quality improvement which can yield safer, more efficacious product. Design of experimentation, selection of appropriate model is important and criteria for selection can vary based on number and type of factors, number of levels for factor, type of study, time and cost for experiments. In this paper, we used QbD approach for better understanding of relationship of critical formulation and process parameters to CQAs relating to quality product profile of buccal mucoadhesive tablet of Sumatriptan succinate. Tablets were prepared using HPMC K100LV and Carbopol 974P by direct compression techniques. Based on risk assessment understanding for tablets, high risk variables were selected and 3² factorial designs was employed for design of experimentation. Tablets were evaluated for in-vitro drug release, swelling study, mucoadhesion time and strength etc. We presented different graphs, polynomial equations, ANOVA and P (Probe >F) value
to understand correlation and significance of critical parameters on QTPP. Based on effects of critical formulation variables on QTPP, proposed design space to obtain robust formulation.

MATERIALS AND METHOD
Sumatriptan succinate was received as gift sample from Lupin Ltd., Aurangabad. HPMC K100LV and Ethylcellulose were procured as gift samples from colorcon ltd., Goa, India. All other reagents and chemicals used of analytical grade.

Risk assessment of Critical material and process attributes
Risk assessment for the experiment was carried out by basic risk management facilitation. Polymer concentration (HPMC K100LV and Carbopol 974P) were considered for design of experimentation of the Sumatriptan succinate buccal bilayer tablets.[19,20]

Formulation of unidirectional, bilayered, buccoadhesive tablet of Sumatriptan succinate
All the ingredients including drug, polymer and excipients were weighed accurately according to the batch formula (Table:3), the ingredients except lubricant were mixed in the order of ascending weights and blended for 10 min in a glass mortar. After uniform mixing of ingredients, lubricant was added and again mixed for 2 min. The prepared blend (150 mg) of each formulation was pre-compressed, on a rotary tablet punching machine (Karnavati mini press, India) to form single layered flat-faced tablet of 8 mm diameter. Upper punch was raised, the backing layer of ethyl cellulose powder (50 mg) was placed on the above compact and two layers were compressed with a total weight of 200 mg/tablet.

Evaluation of bilayered buccal tablets[28,29]
Thickness
The thickness of tablet was determined using micrometer screw gauge. Tablets from each batch of formulation were measured and mean thickness value and standard deviation were calculated for each formulation.

Weight variation
The weight variation test was performed as perprocedure of IP. The weight (mg) of each of 20 individual tablets, selected randomly from each formulation was determined by dusting each tablet off and placing it in an electronic balance. The weight data from the tablets were analyzed for sample mean and percent deviation.

Friability
Twenty tablets were weighed and subjected to friability test in Roche friabilator. The preweighedsample was placed in friabilator which revolves at 25rpm for 4 min. dropping the tablets through a distance of 6 inch with each revolution. This process was repeated for all formulations and the percentage friability was calculated.

F=(W_{\text{initial}}−W_{\text{final}})/W_{\text{initial}}×100

Where,
W_{\text{initial}}= Weight of tablet before test
W_{\text{final}}= weight of tablet after test
% Friability of tablets less than 1% is considered acceptable.

Hardness
Tablets require a certain amount of strength, or hardness and resistance to friability, to withstandmechanical shocks of handling in manufacture, packaging and shipping. The hardness of the tablets was determined using Monsanto Hardness tester. It is expressed in Kg/cm². Three tablets were randomly picked from each formulation and the mean and standard deviation values were calculated.

Content uniformity
Ten tablets were weighed and grounded in a mortar with pestle to get fine powder. Powder equivalent to the mass of one tablet was dissolved in ethyl alcohol and filtered through a 0.45-µm filter paper. The filtrate was diluted with phosphate buffer (pH 6.8). The drug content was analyzed spectrophotometrically at 227.0 nm using an UV spectrophotometer using a reference to a standard calibration curve of the Sumatriptan succinate.

Swelling index
The formulated tablets were weighed (W1) and placed in petri dishes with 5 mL of phosphate buffer of pH 6.8. At the time interval of 1 hr tablets were removed and excess water was removed carefully using filter paper. The swollen tablets were reweighed (W2) and the percentage hydration were calculated using the following formula:

Percentage hydration =(W_2−W_1)/W_1×100

Determination of surface pH of tablet
A combined glass electrode was used for this purpose. The tablet was allowed to swell by keeping them in contact with 2 mL of phosphate buffer pH 6.8 in a test tube for 2 hrs. The pH was then noted by bringing the electrode in contact with the surface of the formulation and allowing it to equilibrate for 1 min.

Mucoadhesion time
The in-vitro residence time for buccal tablet was determined using a locally modified USP disintegration apparatus. The medium was composed of 500 mL of phosphate buffer pH 6.8 maintained at 37°C. A segment of sheep buccal mucosa 3 cm length was glued to glass slab. The tablet surface was hydrated using phosphate buffer pH 6.8 and then the hydrated surface was brought into contact with the mucosal membrane. The glass slab was vertically fixed to the tablet and was completely immersed into the buffer solution at the lowest point and was out at the highest point. The time necessary for complete erosion or detachment of the tablet from the mucosal surface was recorded.[28-30]
Mucoadhesive strength

Mucoadhesion strength of the tablet was measured on a modified physical balance. Fresh sheep buccal mucosa was obtained from a local slaughter house and it is used within 2 hrs of slaughtering. The mucosal membrane was washed with distilled Water and then with phosphate buffer pH 6.8. A double beam physical balance was taken and to the left arm of balance a thick thread of suitable length was hanged and to the bottom side of thread a glass stopper with uniform surface was tied. The buccal mucosa was tied tightly with mucosal side upward using thread over the base of inverted 50mL glass beaker which was placed in a 500 mL beaker filled with phosphate buffer pH 6.8 kept at 37°C. Such that the buffer reaches the surface of mucosal membrane and keeps it moist. The buccal tablet was then stuck to glass stopper from one side membrane using an adhesive. The two sides of the balance were made equal before the study, by keeping a weight on the right hand pan. A weight of 5 g was removed from the right hand pan, which lowered the glass stopper along with the tablet over the mucosal membrane with a weight of 5 g. The balance was kept in this position for 3 min. Then, the weights were increased on the right pan until tablet just separated from mucosal membrane. The excess weight on the right pan i.e. total weight minus 5 gm was taken as a measure of the mucoadhesive strength. The mean value of three trials was taken for each set of formulations. After each measurement, the tissue was gently and thoroughly washed with phosphate buffer and left for 5 min before placing a new tablet to get appropriate results for the formulation.²⁸,²⁹

In vitro drug release study

In vitro drug release studies of the prepared tablets were conducted for a period of 8 hrs using an eight station USP XXII type 2 apparatus (Labindia, Mumbai, India). The dissolution medium was 500 mL of phosphate buffer pH 6.8 and the study was performed at 37 ± 0.5°C, with a rotation speed of 50 rpm. The backing layer of buccal tablet was attached to the glass slide with instant adhesive. The slide was placed on the bottom of the dissolution vessel. Then 5 mL samples were withdrawn at predetermined time intervals and replaced with fresh medium. The samples were filtered through Whatman filter paper and analyzed after appropriate dilution by UV spectrophotometry at 227.0 nm.³⁰⁻³²

Validation of optimized formulations

Two optimized formulations were selected from yellow shaded region i.e. design space. The composition of the checkpoints, the predicted and experimental values of all the response variables (% Drug Release, Mucoadhesive strength, Mucoadhesion time) are shown in table: 5.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on QbD approach, risk assessment was carried out and high risk parameters, based on their strong correlation to Critical Quality Attributes (CQAs) were considered for Design of experimentation to ensure a predefined quality of the product. In order to define the “design space” the critical formulation variables (independent variables) and the responses able to measure the product quality were defined based on prior knowledge and preliminary studies. The independent variables considered for tablet formulations are concentration of HPMC K100LV and Carbopol 974P since they were considered critical in determining responses i.e. % Drug release, mucoadhesive strength and mucoadhesion time. Based on the nature of variables, number of formulation variables, levels of variables, optimization study, to estimate the main as well as interactive effects of variable and minimum number of experimental trials,²³ factorial design with 9 runs was selected to see the effect of formulation variables on Sumatriptan succinate bilayered buccal tablets. The tablets were prepared by direct compression method using HPMC K100LV and Carbopol 974P in different concentration. All prepared tablets were evaluated for thickness, hardness, friability, weight variation, surface pH, swelling study etc. The hardness of tablets were from 5.17-5.57 kg/cm². The average thickness of the tablets was observed in the range of 2.13-2.51 mm. All the tablets complies the standard for weight variation and friability. The surface pH of all the tablet formulation was in the range of 6.33-6.73, which was nearest to salivary pH (6.5-7.5) suggesting that the prepared tablets can be used without the risk of mucosal irritation. The content uniformity of the tablets was evaluated. The in vitro drug release profile of bilayered tablet of Sumatriptan succinate show variation in % Drug release according to concentration of matrix forming polymer. The F5 batch show highest % Drug release i.e. 94.9% in 12 hrs (Figure: 1). Results of all physicochemical parameter are presented in table: 4. It can be concluded that all the formulations are falling within the pharmacopoeial limits.

Statistical design and analysis

Prepared tablet formulations were evaluated in randomized order for % Drug release, mucoadhesive strength and mucoadhesion time. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied for testing the significance, P value 0.0363 indicated that the assumed regression model was significant and valid for the examined responses.

Establishing Design Space and Control Strategy

In general, the knowledge space within the QbD approach represents the whole range of interactions between critical parameters and their effects on CQAs that has been examined during process characterization studies. Whereas, “design space” is space within which desired quality of product can be built. Regulatory point of view changes within design space are not considered as changes, but changes outside design space would normally initiate regulatory post approval process. Concentration of Polymer (HPMCK 100LV and Carbopol 974P) were found to be critical on responses Drug release, mucoadhesive strength and mucoadhesion time. The variables ranked as high risk in the initial risk
assessment are included in the control strategy. Based on the requirement of product quality the criteria considered for responses were minimum of 85% Drug release, mucoadhesive strength more than 12 gm and mucoadhesion time minimum of 8 hrs. This study lead to the design space from multidimensional combination of polymer leads to the acceptable operating ranges for formulating Sumatriptan succinate buccal bilayer tablets with respect to target product profile. When critical variables operated within the established design space compliance to CQAs would be assured. Design space shown in figure: 5, also called as overlay plot which is shaded region with yellow color indicates that region of successful operating ranges.

Validation of optimized formulations
The composition of the checkpoints, the predicted and experimental values of all the response variables Drug Release, mucoadhesive strength, and mucoadhesion time were as shown in table: 5. This indicates statistical equivalence between experimental and predicted values, demonstrating the validity of the selected formulation variables, their levels and applied 32 factorial design to conduct design of experimentation. We could conclude that, if we keep the selected parameters within design space we would be able to achieve desired QTPP for Sumatriptan succinate buccal mucoadhesive tablets.

Table 1: Risk assessment of the drug

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug product CQA’s</th>
<th>Impact of HPMCK100LV</th>
<th>Impact of Carbopol 974P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug Release</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mucoadhesive Strength</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mucoadhesion Time</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Risk assessment of the drug product CQAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formulation Variables</th>
<th>CQA’s</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HPMC K100LV level</td>
<td>Assay</td>
<td>Polymer can impact the flow properties of the blend. This, in turn, can impact tablet CU. The risk is high. Occasionally, poor CU can also adversely impact assay. The risk is medium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dissolution</td>
<td>Release of drug from tablet depends on the amount of polymer in formulation so the risk is high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbopol 974P</td>
<td>Swelling index</td>
<td>Carbopol 974P level may influence the %swelling index of tablet, the risk is high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mucoadhesive Time</td>
<td>Change in concentration may have impact on mucoadhesive time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Formulation of factorial batches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ingredients (mg) / batch</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F5</th>
<th>F6</th>
<th>F7</th>
<th>F8</th>
<th>F9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sumatriptan Succinate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPMC K100LV</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbopol 974</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC (pH 102)</td>
<td>92.75</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>77.75</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg. stearate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannitol</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethyl cellulose (backing layer)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total weight of tablet(mg)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: % drug release of F1-F3 batches

Figure 2: % drug release of F4-F6 batches

Figure 3: % drug release of F7-F9 batches

Figure 4: Response surface plot for mucoadhesive time
Table 4: Evaluation of bilayer buccal tablets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Parameter</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>F5</th>
<th>F6</th>
<th>F7</th>
<th>F8</th>
<th>F9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thickness (mm)</td>
<td>2.13±0.02</td>
<td>2.16±0.0</td>
<td>2.29±0.01</td>
<td>2.46±0.01</td>
<td>2.37±0.02</td>
<td>2.13±0.1</td>
<td>2.48±0.1</td>
<td>2.24±0.2</td>
<td>2.51±0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablet Hardness (kg/cm²)</td>
<td>5.17±0.153</td>
<td>5.13±0.058</td>
<td>5.37±0.15</td>
<td>5.30±0.3</td>
<td>5.40±0.1</td>
<td>5.10±0.1</td>
<td>5.83±0.5</td>
<td>5.23±0.3</td>
<td>5.57±0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friability (%)</td>
<td>0.45±0.036</td>
<td>0.32±0.11</td>
<td>0.32±0.02</td>
<td>0.35±0.03</td>
<td>0.72±0.02</td>
<td>0.63±0.2</td>
<td>0.53±0.3</td>
<td>0.54±0.1</td>
<td>0.43±0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swelling index (%)</td>
<td>25.7±0.265</td>
<td>35.63±0.13</td>
<td>42.83±0.25</td>
<td>54.7±0.15</td>
<td>57.43±0.15</td>
<td>60.4±0.2</td>
<td>62.4±0.2</td>
<td>63.57±0.2</td>
<td>65.33±0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content (%)</td>
<td>99.3±0.275</td>
<td>95.63±0.25</td>
<td>99.5±0.2</td>
<td>99.3±0.26</td>
<td>100.0±0.07</td>
<td>99.5±0.3</td>
<td>100±0.2</td>
<td>99.5±0.3</td>
<td>98.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Response surface plot for mucoadhesive strength

Figure 6: Response surface plot for % drug release
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uniformity (%) | ±0.1 | ±0.1 | ±0.08
---|---|---|---
Surface PH | 6.63±0.058 | 6.5±0.1 | 6.37±0.153 | 6.43±0.115 | 6.53±0.231 | 6.33±0.2 | 6.73±0.2 | 6.33±0.1 | 6.47±0.306
Weight variation (mg) | 199.6±0.46 | 199.33±0.2 | 199.23±0.1 | 200.17±0.1 | 198.3±0.3 | 199.5±0.1 | 200.3±0.2 | 199.4±0.26 | 199.4±0.26
Mucoadhesive time(min) | 8±0.1 | 8±0.5 | 9±0.2 9 | 9±0.2 | 10.00±0.2 | 10.00±0.3 | 11.00±0.3 | 11.00±0.4 | 12.00±0.6
Mucoadhesive Strength (gm) | 11±0.44 | 12.5±0.2 | 12.5±0.53 | 13±0.53 | 13.6±0.78 | 16.20±0.26 | 14.00±0.2 | 15.00±0.2 | 18.00±0.1

Table 5: Comparison of predicted and experimental values of O.F.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>O.F.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug Release (%)</td>
<td>Predicted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mucoadhesive Strength (gm)</td>
<td>11.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mucoadhesive Time (min)</td>
<td>9.690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Evaluation parameter of formulation O.F.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Thickness (nm)</th>
<th>Weight variation (mg)</th>
<th>Hardness (kg/cm²)</th>
<th>Friability (%)</th>
<th>Content Uniformity (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O.F.3</td>
<td>2.1±0.3</td>
<td>199.1±0.01</td>
<td>5.14±0.2</td>
<td>0.1±0.5</td>
<td>99.5±0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Overlay plot showing design space

CONCLUSION

It can be concluded that QbD approach can be successfully implemented to see the effect formulation parameters on tablet formulation with predictable % Drug release, mucoadhesive strength and mucoadhesion time. All Critical parameters ranked as high risk in the initial risk assessment were included in the design of experimentation. Amount of HPMCK100 and Carbopol 974P were identified as critical parameters to achieve desired QTPP. Based on selection criteria, 3² factorial design (RSM) was employed to conduct design of experimentation.

Polynomial equations, ANOVA, different statistical values were utilized to interpret significance of formulation parameters on responses and design space.
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