

DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF AN RP- HPLC METHOD FOR ESTIMATION OF CHLORPHENIRAMINE MALEATE AND PHENYLEPHRINE IN PHARMACEUTICAL DOSAGE FORMShweta R. Yadav*¹ and Prof. Chetana Babu Gavale²¹Assistant Professor, Department of Quality Assurance, NES'S Gangamai College of Pharmacy, Nagaon, Dhule.²Department of Quality Assurance, NES'S Gangamai College of Pharmacy, Nagaon, Dhule.***Corresponding Author: Shweta R. Yadav**

Assistant Professor, Department of Quality Assurance, NES'S Gangamai College of Pharmacy, Nagaon, Dhule.

Article Received on 04/03/2021

Article Revised on 25/03/2021

Article Accepted on 14/04/2021


ABSTRACT

The main objective of this paper is to developed a simple, precise, accurate, and reproducible reversed phase high performance liquid chromatographic method for the quantitative determination of chlorpheniramine maleate and phenylephrine hydrochloride in pharmaceutical dosage form. A reversed-phase C-18 column (250 mm × 8 mm i.d., particle size 10 μm) column with mobile phase consisting of acetonitrile and phosphate buffer 55:45 (v/v) (pH 5.6 ± 0.02, adjusted with triethylamine) was used. The flow rate was 1.0 ml/ min and effluents were monitored at 255 nm. The retention times of chlorpheniramine maleate and phenylephrine were found to be 3.13 min and 4.58 min, respectively. The method was validated in terms of linearity, range, specificity, accuracy, precision, limit of detection (LOD) and limit of quantitation (LOQ). The linearity for both the drugs was found in the range of 10-70 μg/ml. The % recoveries of chlorpheniramine maleate and phenylephrine were found to be between 101.09 and 98.99. The proposed method was successfully applied to the estimation of chlorpheniramine maleate and phenylephrine in combined tablet dosage forms.


KEYWORDS: Chlorpheniramine maleate, phenylephrine, RP-HPLC, tablet dosage forms.**INTRODUCTION**

Chlorpheniramine maleate (CM) chemically, 3-(4-chlorophenyl)-N, N-dimethyl-3-pyridin-2-ylpropan-1-amine is an antihistamine drug that is widely used in pharmaceutical preparations for symptomatic relief of common cold and allergic diseases. Phenylephrine (PE) chemically, (1R)-1-(3hydroxy-phenyl)-2-(methylamino) ethanol hydrochloride is used as a sympathomimetic. 1-4 The structures of CM and PE are shown in (Figure 1).

Numerous UV, HPLC and HPTLC based methods have been reported for estimation of these drugs alone as well as in combination with other drugs in pharmaceutical dosage forms. 5-14 But no method had yet been reported for simultaneous estimation of these two drugs using HPLC in bulk drug and pharmaceutical dosage forms. Therefore, the present work was aimed to develop and validate a new RP- HPLC method for estimation of CM and PE in pharmaceutical dosage forms.



chlorpheniramine maleate (CM)



phenylephrine (PE)

Figure 1: The structures of chlorpheniramine maleate (CM) and phenylephrine (PE).**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

Chemicals and Reagents - Reference standards of CM and PE were procured as gift samples from Torrent Pharmaceutical (Gandhinagar, India). HPLC grade acetonitrile, water and triethylamine were obtained from Rankem, RFCL Limited, New Delhi, India. Potassium dihydrogen orthophosphate AR and ortho phosphoric

acid AR grade were procured from Central Drug House (P) Limited, New Delhi, India.

Instrumentation- HPLC (Make: Shimadzu LC-2010AHT), Detector PDA or UV. Ultra-sonic Cleaner (Make: OSCAR), Weighing Balance. (Make: Mettler Toledo)

Chromatographic Conditions- The isocratic mobile phase was consisted of acetonitrile and phosphate buffer 55:45 (v/v) (pH 5.6 ± 0.02 , adjusted with triethylamine). The mobile phase was sonicated for 15 min and filtered through a 0.45μ membrane filter paper. Flow rate of mobile phase was 1.0 ml/min. The variable wavelength UV-visible detector was set at 255 nm. All analyses were performed at ambient temperature.

Preparation of Standard Stock Solution- 25 mg CM and 25 mg PE were accurately weighed and transferred to 100 ml volumetric flasks separately and dissolved in the mobile phase to give stock solutions of 250 μ g/ml each of CM and PE.

Preparation of Sample Solution - Twenty tablets (T-MINIC Tab, Novartis) were weighed and powdered finely. Tablet powder equivalent to 2 mg of CM and 2.5 mg of PE was transferred to a 100 ml volumetric flask and dissolved in 50 ml of mobile phase. The solution was ultrasonicated for 15 min and filtered through 0.45-micron membrane filter. The solutions were further diluted with mobile phase to obtain concentration of 10 μ g/ml of CM and 12.5 μ g/ml of PE and were subjected to HPLC analysis as described earlier. From the peak area of CM and PE, the number of drugs in samples was computed.

Method Validation

Specificity: Specificity was tested against standard compounds and against potential interferences in the presence of placebo. No interference was detected at the retention time of CM and PE in sample solution.

Linearity: Linearity is studied to determine the range over which analyte response is a linear function of concentration. This study was performed by preparing standard solutions at seven different concentrations and analyses were performed in triplicate. The responses were measured as peak area. The calibration curves were obtained by plotting peak area against concentration.

Precision: The precision of an analytical method is the closeness of replicate results obtained from analysis of the same homogeneous sample. Precision was considered at two levels, i.e., repeatability and intermediate precision, in accordance with ICH recommendations. Repeatability, or intra-day precision, was determined by performing nine analyses at three concentrations on the same day. Intermediate precision was determined by analysing the same sample in the same way on different days. Results from determination of repeatability and intermediate precision were expressed as SD and RSD.

Accuracy: The accuracy of an analytical method is the closeness of results obtained by that method to the true value for the sample. It is expressed as recovery (%), which is determined by the standard addition method. Samples were spiked with 80, 100, and 120% of the standard and analysed. The experiment was performed in

triplicate. Recovery (%) and RSD (%) were calculated for each concentration.

Limits of Detection and Limit of Quantitation: The LOD and LOQ were separately determined on the basis of standard calibration curve. The residual standard deviation of the regression line or the standard deviation of y-intercepts of regression lines was used to calculate LOD and LOQ. Following formulae were used; $LOD = 3.3 \times D/S$ and $LOQ = 10 \times D/S$, where, D is the standard deviation of the y-intercepts of regression line and S is the slope of the calibration curve.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Method Development Several mobile phase compositions were tried to resolve the peaks of CM and PE. The optimum mobile phase containing Acetonitrile and phosphate buffer 55:45 (v/v) (pH 5.6 ± 0.02 , adjusted with triethylamine) was selected because it could resolve the peaks of CM (RT = 3.09 ± 0.03 min) and PE (RT = 4.35 ± 0.05 min) with a resolution factor of 9.0. Quantification was achieved with UV detection at 255 nm on the basis of peak area at 1.0 ml/min flow rate. A typical HPLC chromatogram obtained during simultaneous determination of CM and PE is given in (Figure 2).




Figure 2: HPLC chromatogram obtained during simultaneous determination of CM and PE

Method Validation

Linearity and Range: Seven different concentrations (10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60 and 70 μ g/ml) of the mixture of two drugs were prepared for linearity studies. The calibration curves obtained by plotting peak area against concentration showed linear relationship over a concentration range of 10-70 μ g/ml for both the drugs. The linear regression equations for CM and PE were found to be $y = 2521.4x - 1428.6$ and $y = 2000x - 428.57$ respectively. The regression coefficient values (r^2) were found to be 0.9995 and 0.9993 respectively indicating a high degree of linearity. Calibration curves of CM and PE are shown in (Figure 3). Regression characteristics of the proposed HPLC method are given in (Table 1).




Figure 3: Calibration curves of CM and PE.

Specificity

Specificity is the ability to measure desired analyte in a complex mixture. Specificity is the ability to assess unequivocally the analyte in the presence of components, which may be expected to be present. Typically, these might include impurities, degradants, matrix etc. If impurity or degradation product standards are unavailable, specificity may be demonstrated by comparing the test results of samples containing impurities or degradation products to a second well-characterized procedure, e.g., pharmacopeial method or other validated analytical procedure (independent procedure). As appropriate, this should include samples stored under relevant stress conditions: Light, heat, humidity, acid/base hydrolysis, and oxidation.

Precision: From the standard stock solutions, mixed standards containing CM and PE were prepared. Standard solutions (n=3) were injected using a universal rheodyne injector with injection volume of 20 µl. The intra-day and inter-day precisions were assessed by analysing standard solutions. The % RSD was found to be between 0.78 and 0.60 for both the drugs. The lower values of % RSD indicate that the method is precise.

Accuracy: Recovery studies were carried out by applying the standard addition method. Known amounts of standard CM and PE corresponding to 80%, 100%, and 120% of the label claim were added to sample of tablet dosage form separately. The average % recoveries for CM and PE in marketed formulation were found to be between 101.09 and 98.99. The results revealed that there was no interference of excipients.

Table 01: % recovery data.

Drug	% dosage nominal	% mean(n=3)	SD	RSD (%)
CM	80	100.60	0.34	0.60
PE	80	101.00	0.68	0.75
CM	100	99.12	0.10	0.80
PE	100	98.65	0.54	0.32
CM	120	100.10	0.94	0.54
PE	120	101.25	0.28	0.14

Limit of Detection (LOD) and Limit of Quantitation (LOQ): The limit of detection and limit of quantitation were found to be 0.23 and 0.40 µg/ml for CM and 0.15 and 0.32 µg/ml for PE. The values indicate that the method is sensitive.

System Suitability Parameters - For system suitability parameters, seven replicate injections of mixed standard solution were injected and parameters such as the resolution, capacity factor, tailing factor, theoretical plate, retention volume and asymmetry factor of the peaks were calculated. The results are shown in Table 02.

Table 02: System Suitability data.

Parameters	CM	PE
Resolution	-	5.9
Capacity factor	0.10	0.55
Tailing factor	1.01	1.35
Theoretical plates	13440	15335
Asymmetry factor	1.13	1.29

CONCLUSION

A novel RP- HPLC method has been developed for the estimation of CM and PE in marketed formulations. The method gave good resolution for both the drugs with a short analysis time below 6 minutes. The developed method was validated. It was found to be novel, simple, precise, accurate, and sensitive. The good % recovery in tablet forms suggests that the excipients present in the dosage forms have no interference in the determination. The %RSD was also less than 2% showing high degree of precision of the proposed method. The proposed method can be used for routine analysis of CM and PE in combined dosage form. It can be also used in the quality control in bulk manufacturing.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to sincerely thankful to Glenmark Pharmaceuticals Company, Mumbai, India for providing gift samples of CM and PE.

REFERENCES

1. Quality System Part II Specification for manufacture and installation (BS 5750: Part II). London, British standard Page No-1.
2. L.Huber, Laboratory accreditation, part III, Validation and Calibration of equipment,

- international Laboratory, September 1995 9/12. Page no 1, 2.
3. Leonard A. Grunbaun, Do it Right first time, Journal of Validation Technology, February 2000; 6: 536.
 4. Levy M.C, and andry M.C: International journal of pharmaceutics, 1990; 62: 162-167.
 5. Nash R.A, Berry. I.R, Pharmaceutical Process validation Second Edition Marcel Dekker Inc page no-351 to 368.
 6. Paul, W.L, USP Prospective on analytical method validation Pharmaceutical Page no.1, 22,23,24,25.
 7. British Pharmacopeia 2008, volume I and volume II fifth edition of the European pharmacopoeia 2004 as amended by supplement 5.1 to 5.8 page. 498, 672, 1714.
 8. Indian pharmacopeia, 1996 volume-1 and 2, published by the controller of publications, Delhi Page.no.176, 237,587.
 9. International conference on harmonization of technical requirements for registration of pharmaceuticals for human use. Validation of analytical procedures: Text and Methodology ICH Q2 (R1), 2005.
 10. Patel RB, "A review on an Introduction to Analytical Method Development for Pharmaceutical Formulations", Pharmaceutical information, Articles and blogs, Pharmainfo.net, 2008; 4(1).
 11. British Pharmacopoeia, London: The stationary office, Vol. 2, 3 and 4 Page. no 1849, 4683 and 6214(2009).
 12. Marin and C. Barbas; LC/MS for the degradation profiling of cough-cold products under forced conditions. J. pharma. Biomed. Anal, 2004; 35: 5. 1035-1045.
 13. Palabryik I M, Onur F; The Simultaneous Determination of Phenylephrine Hydrochloride, Paracetamol, Chlorpheniramine Maleate and Dextromethorphan Hydrobromide in Pharmaceutical Preparations. Chromatographic, 2007; 66: 93-96.
 14. Milenkova K, Dimitrovska A, Ugrinova L, Trajkovid Jolevska S; Simultaneous Determination of Paracetamol, Pseudoephedrine Hydrochloride and Dextromethorphen Hydrobromide in Tablets by HPLC. Bulletin of the Chemists and Technologists of Macedonia, 2003; 22(1): 33-37.