When Size matters

Well, Miss Jones, it seems our scale up procedure worked. Question now, is, do we blister pack or bottle?
Performance Testing in Quality Control and Product Development, Where are We?

- Disintegration comparison 701 vs. 2040
- Beaker specifications and Harmonization
- Rupture test
- Disintegration vs. Dissolution
- BCS sub classification
- Buffer capacity and dissolution
Factor for oral drug absorption

dosage form  disintegration  dissolution  absorption

gastric emptying  transit time

motility

P_{\text{eff}}

Solubility (pH)

food effect

fraction absorbed
Tablet disintegration <701/2040>

- Disintegration
  - USP specifies for drugs and Dietary Supplements in vitro disintegration test a dosage form must pass

- 6 units are tested
- If one or two fail 12 additional units are tested...
Dissolution testing / Rapture test
Pharmaceutical vs. Dietary Supplement Chapters

Disintegration

2040 Disintegration

701 Disintegration

2040 Rupture App 2
Disintegration, Dissolution and Rupture

• **Disintegration** = Dosage form is dispersed

• **Dissolution** = rate and extend of release

• **Rupture** = non-aqueous content is exposed
Oral IR Dosage Forms

Solid Dosage Forms
- BCS I-IV

Dose/Solubility ≥ 250 ml (pH 1.2 - 6.8)
- Fast Dissolution @ lowest solubility (85%, 15 min)
- yes

Disintegration Test
- yes

Liquid filled Dosage Forms

API remains in Solution
- no

Dissolution Test
- no

Rupture Test
Disintegration study: Minerals and Vitamins on the Canadian Market

Conditions:
- 20 minutes pH 6.8
- No disk
Disintegration
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## Disintegration in USP 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dosage Form</th>
<th>&lt;701&gt; APP</th>
<th>&lt;701&gt; Medium</th>
<th>&lt;2040&gt; APP</th>
<th>&lt;2040&gt; Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncoated Tablets</td>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film Coated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plain Coated Tablets (other than Film Coated)</td>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>PCT</td>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sublingual Tablets</td>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buccal Tablets</td>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chewable Tablets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Release Tablets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed Release Tablets</td>
<td>DRT</td>
<td>SGF / SIF</td>
<td>DRT</td>
<td>SGF / SIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hard Shell Capsules</strong></td>
<td>DIS + WM</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>DIS + WM</td>
<td>Buffer 4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Shell Capsules</td>
<td>DIS + WM</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>RUP</td>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIS = Disintegration Test Apparatus A or B  
PCT = Plain Coated Tablets Test  
RUP = Rupture test  
DRT = Delayed Release Tablets Test  
WM = Wire Mesh to cover top of apparatus A  
😊 = not listed  
😊 = scientifically justified to be considered for disintegration tests
A number of changes made to the disintegration test since the USP 23 need to be evaluated as to whether they will have any impact on the measured disintegration time of dosage forms. Disintegration will continue to be a valuable quality control procedure, but clearly further work is required to strengthen its place among the tools that assess the performance of dosage forms.
Disintegration test

USP 27 and earlier

USP 28 and later
Problems with current Specifications

- **USP:** The moving range of the basket-rack assembly should be between 53 and 57 mm.
- **USP:** The height of the basket from the bottom should be at least 25 mm and 15 mm from the top.
- **Math:** This is a total height of 93 to 97 mm.
  - Taking the current beaker diameter specifications into account this adds up to a volume of between 687 and 1007 mL depending on the beaker diameter.
- For 900 mL the medium height in a beaker with 115 mm diameter will only be 87 mm.
- 900 mL will be too much in a 97 mm diameter beaker if the basket assembly should not be submerged.
Disintegration Times

amount of immersion fluid [ml]
Influence of the Changed USP Specifications on the Disintegration Test Performance
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ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to investigate if the changes made in the specifications of the disintegration procedure impact the performance of the disintegration test described in USP chapters <701> and <2040>. Different tablets and capsules were produced, and their disintegration times were determined. The following disintegration time parameters were analyzed: volume of the immersion fluid, type of apparatus (Apparatus A for method <701>; Apparatus B for method <2040>), and attachment of a wire cloth to the basket assembly. By adjusting the compaction force and lubricant level, the disintegration time of the tablets was standardized to 15 min. The disintegration time change was statistically significant when varying the volume of the immersion fluid. The type of apparatus and the attachment of a wire cloth resulted in no significant difference in the disintegration time of capsules. The USP requirements for immersion medium volume should be strictly followed to obtain correct and reproducible test results. The disintegration test is a suitable performance test for certain pharmaceutical and dietary dosage forms.
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ABSTRACT

The USP requirements for immersion medium volume should be strictly followed to obtain correct and reproducible test results. The disintegration test is a suitable performance test for certain pharmaceutical and dietary dosage forms.
ICH Harmonization

ICH Topic Q4B Annex 5
Disintegration Test General Chapter

Step 3

ANNEX 5 TO NOTE FOR EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION OF PHARMACOPOEIAL TEXTS FOR USE IN THE ICH REGIONS ON DISINTEGRATION TEST GENERAL CHAPTER
(EMEA/CHMP/ICH/308895/2008)
ICH Q4B Annex 5

**Disintegration Test**

This test is harmonized with the European Pharmacopoeia and the U.S. Pharmacopeia. The parts of the text that are not harmonized are marked with symbols ( ).

Disintegration Test is provided to determine whether tablets, capsules, granules or pills disintegrate within the prescribed time when placed in a liquid medium at the experimental conditions presented below.

For the purposes of this test, disintegration does not imply complete solution of the unit or even of its active constituent.

**Apparatus**

The apparatus consists of a basket-rack assembly, a 1000-mL, low-form beaker, 138 to 160 mm in height and having an **inside diameter of 97 to 115 mm** for the immersion fluid, a thermostatic arrangement for heating the fluid between 35 ° and 39 °, and a device for raising and lowering the basket in the immersion fluid at a constant frequency rate between 29 and 32 cycles per minute through a distance of not less than 53 mm and not more than 57 mm. The volume of the fluid in the vessel is such that at the highest point of the upward stroke the wire mesh remains at least 15 mm below the surface of the fluid and descends to not less than 25 mm from the bottom of the vessel on the downward stroke. At no time should the top of the basket-rack assembly become submerged. The time required for the upward stroke is equal to the time required for the downward stroke, and the change in stroke direction is a smooth transition, rather than an abrupt reversal of motion. The basket-rack assembly moves vertically along its axis. There is no appreciable horizontal motion or movement of the axis from the vertical.

**Basket-rack assembly**

The basket-rack assembly consists of six open-ended transparent tubes, each 77.5 ± 2.5 mm long and having an inside diameter of 20.7 to 23 mm and a wall 1.0 to 2.8 mm thick; the tubes are held in a vertical position by two plates, each 88 to 92 mm in diameter and 5 to 8.5 mm in thickness, with six holes, each 22 to 26 mm in diameter, equidistant from the center of the plate and equally spaced.
Beaker specifications
and distance of the bottom wire mesh of Apparatus A in the USP, European Pharmacopeia and Japanese Pharmacopeia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apparatus A</th>
<th>USP 23 (701)</th>
<th>USP 26 (701/2040)</th>
<th>USP 30 (701/2040)</th>
<th>European Pharm. 2007 (5.8)</th>
<th>Japanese Ph. (14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume of beaker (mL)</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of beaker (mm)</td>
<td>142-148 (USP 23, suppl.9)</td>
<td>138-155</td>
<td>138-160</td>
<td>149+/-11</td>
<td>about 155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diameter (inside, mm)</td>
<td>103-10 (USP 23, suppl. 9)</td>
<td>97-110</td>
<td>97-115</td>
<td>106+/-9</td>
<td>about 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward stroke: distance wire mesh/ surface (mm)</td>
<td>≥25</td>
<td>≥25</td>
<td>≥15</td>
<td>≥15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downward stroke: distance wire mesh/ bottom (mm)</td>
<td>≥25</td>
<td>≥25</td>
<td>≥25</td>
<td>≥25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disintegration test
Study Design

Two Beakers (diameter)
1) narrow USP specification
2) 1.5 L larger than new USP specification
3) With and without disk
4) Immersion medium
5) App A and B
1.5 L Beaker vs. Small Beaker

- **1.5 L Beaker**
  - Observation: sediment

- **Small Beaker**
  - Observation: No sediment
Result (Tables)
Result (Capsules)

Interval Plot of Chasteberry capsules
95% CI for the Mean

Disintegration time (min)

Medium
- pH 4.5
- SGF
- Water

Disk
- With disk
- Without disk

Beaker
- LB
- SB

Apparatus
- A
- B

30
The aim of this study was to investigate how beaker size, basket assembly, use of disk, and immersion medium impact the disintegration time of dietary supplements. The disintegration times were determined for five tablet and two capsule products. A two-station disintegration tester was used with Apparatus A or Apparatus B as described in the United States Pharmacopeia (USP) chapters, <701> and <2040>. Two beakers complying with the harmonized specifications were used, one with a volume of 1,000 mL and one with a 1,500-mL volume. The disintegration data were analyzed using ANOVA for the following factors: beaker size, equipment (App A and B) and condition (with/without disk). Two tablet products were not sensitive to any changes in the test conditions or equipment configurations. One product was only partially sensitive to the test conditions. The other products showed impact on the disintegration time for all test conditions. The results revealed that these tablet products might pass or fail current USP disintegration requirements depending on the equipment configuration. Similar results were obtained for the two investigated capsule formulations. One product might fail current USP disintegration requirements if the large beaker was used, but might pass the disintegration requirements when the small beaker was used. Hydroxy propyl methyl cellulose capsules were mostly influenced if sodium instead of a potassium buffer was used as the immersion medium. The results demonstrate that the current harmonized ICH specifications for the disintegration test are insufficient to make the disintegration test into reliable test for dietary supplements.
Investigation of the Performance of the Disintegration Test for Dietary Supplements

The aim of this study was to investigate how beaker size, basket assembly, use of disk, and immersion medium impact the disintegration time of dietary supplements. The disintegration times were determined for five tablet and two capsule products. A two-station disintegration tester was used with two beakers complying with the harmonized ICH specifications for the disintegration test. Sodium instead of a potassium buffer was used as the immersion medium. The results demonstrate that the current harmonized ICH specifications for the disintegration test are insufficient to make the disintegration test into a reliable test for dietary supplements.
Beaker—Low form, 1000 mL; the difference between the diameter of the plastic plates, which hold the tubes in a vertical position, and the inside diameter of the beaker should not be more than 6 mm.² 2S (USP33)
Soft Gelatine Capsules

http://www.sixthseal.com/archive/June2006/normison_capsules_gel.jpg

http://www.jsppharma.com/Liquid-capsule-softgel.html
Method

5 different products, in form of soft gelatine capsules, were Received:

1. Amantadine HCL \(\rightarrow\) Suspension
2. Pseudoephedrine HCl \(\rightarrow\) Solution
3. Flaxseed Oil
4. Ginseng 100mg \(\rightarrow\) Oil base
5. Soybean Oil
Each Product

12 Capsules (Disintegration test)
- 6 Capsules (Coated)
- 6 Capsules (intact)

12 Capsules (Rupture test)
- 6 Capsules (Coated)
- 6 Capsules (intact)
Interval Plot of Time (minutes): test, condition and storage for Amadantine capsule
95% CI for the Mean

Result
Result

Interval plot for Time (minutes): test; condition and storage for Flaxseed oil capsule
95% CI for the Mean

- Time (minutes)
- Storage: RT, T40 2 weeks, RT 2 weeks, RT 2 weeks coated, RT 2 weeks uncoated, RT 2 weeks coated, RT 2 weeks uncoated, RT, T40 2 weeks, RT 2 weeks coated, RT 2 weeks uncoated
- Condition: coated, uncoated
- Test: Disintegration, Rupture

95% Confidence Interval for the Mean: 9.5%
Result

Interval Plot for Time (minutes): test; condition; storage for Pseudoephedrine capsule

95% CI for the Mean
Comparison of the Rupture and Disintegration Tests for Soft-Shell Capsules
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ABSTRACT
The USP General Chapter <2040> Disintegration and Dissolution of Dietary Supplements introduced a rupture test as a performance test of soft-shell capsules. Traditionally, the disintegration test was used for determining the disintegration time of all solid oral dosage forms. The aim of this investigation was to investigate differences between the rupture test and the disintegration test using soft-shell capsules.

Five different soft-shell capsule products were chosen based on their filling contents and treated to simulate a production deficiency. The study design compared capsules as received with capsules that were treated by coating them with the liquid contents of another capsule. The capsules were incubated at room temperature and at 40 °C. The tests were repeated after two weeks, and at each time point, twelve capsules of each product were tested using the rupture and the disintegration tests. Six capsules were tested untreated, while the other six capsules were treated. Rupture and disintegration times were recorded as dependent variables in each experiment. The data were analyzed using ANOVA.

According to the USP definition for disintegration, the rupture of a soft-shell capsule can be seen as fulfilling the disintegration criterion if the capsule contents is a semisolid or liquid. Statistical analysis showed no advantage of the rupture test over the disintegration test. On a product-by-product basis, both tests were sensitive to certain investigated parameters. A noticeable difference between both tests was that in most cases, the rupture test reached the defined endpoint faster than the disintegration test.

Soft-shell capsules that are subject to a Quality by Design approach should be tested with both methods to determine which performance test is the most appropriate test for a specific product.
On a product-by-product basis, both tests were sensitive to certain investigated parameters. A noticeable difference between both tests was that in most cases, the rupture test reached the defined endpoint faster than the disintegration test. Soft-shell capsules that are subject to a Quality by Design approach should be tested with both methods to determine which performance test is the most appropriate test for a specific product.
Dissolution or Disintegration?
When to use which test?

The FDA draft guidance on “Dissolution Testing and Specification Criteria for Immediate-Release Solid Oral Dosage Forms Containing Biopharmaceutics Classification System Class 1 and 3 Drugs” U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2015 allows the use of disintegration testing as a surrogate for routine release and stability dissolution testing for certain BCS class 1 & 3 drug products. The acceptance criteria is a 5 min disintegration time for drug products which passed a dissolution Q=80% within 15 min.
Dissolution Controlled Dosage Forms

• **immediate release** oral drug products, such as tablets and capsules, are formulated to **release** the active drug immediately after oral administration.

• In the formulation **no deliberate effort is made** to modify the drug **release** rate.

Direct compression
Granulation:
- Wet
- Dry
- Sinter
Immediate release a mechanistic view

Two cases:

1) API driven Dissolution (drug particle properties)
   - Example: direct compression

2) Formulation impacted or controlled dissolution (excipient API interaction — drug particles properties can not be liked to dissolution behavior)
   - Example: wet granulation
Flushing a Toilet vs. opening a Faucet

- The rate depends only on the hydrostatic pressure and diameter of the pipe.
- Opening a faucet you can control the amount and rate of water.
Two manufacturing methods

Direct compression

Drug
MCC
CaPO₄ X 2H₂O
Croscarmellose Na
Mg Stearate

Granulation

Drug
MCC
CaPO₄ X 2H₂O
Water

Croscarmellose Na
Mg Stearate

FDT

SET
Research Article
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When a new oral dosage form is developed, its dissolution behavior must be quantitatively analyzed. Dissolution analysis involves a comparison of the dissolution profiles and the application of mathematical models to describe the drug release pattern. This report aims to assess the application of the DDSolver, an Excel add-in software package, which is designed to analyze data obtained from dissolution experiments. The data used in this report were chosen from two dissolution studies. The results of the DDSolver analysis were compared with those obtained using an Excel worksheet. The comparisons among three different products obtained similarity factors (f2) of 23.21, 46.66, and 17.91 using both DDSolver and the Excel worksheet. The results differed when DDSolver and Excel were used to calculate the release exponent “n” in the Korsmeyer-Peppas model. Performing routine quantitative analysis proved to be much easier using the DDSolver program than an Excel spreadsheet. The use of the DDSolver program reduced the calculation time and has the potential to omit calculation errors, thus making this software package a convenient tool for dissolution comparison.
Model Fitting using Excel-Add-In
Common release Models for IR and ER dosage forms

- Zero Order \( F = k_0 \cdot t \)
- First Order \( F = 100 \cdot (1 - e^{-k_1 \cdot t}) \)
- Gompertz \( F = 100 \cdot e^{-\alpha \cdot e^{-\beta \cdot \log(t)}} \)
- Hixson Cromwel
  \[ F = 100 \cdot \left[ 1 - (1 - k_{HC} \cdot t)^3 \right] \]
- Hopfenberg \( F = 100 \cdot [1 - (1 - k_{HB} \cdot t)^n] \)
- Weibull \( F = 100 \cdot \left[ 1 - e^{-\frac{(t-Ti)^\beta}{\alpha}} \right] \)
Drug release mechanism

Korsmeyer-Peppas equation:

\[ F = k_{KP} t^n \]

Exponent \( n \) of the power law and drug release mechanism from polymeric controlled delivery systems of different geometry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geometry</th>
<th>n values</th>
<th>Drug release mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thin Film</td>
<td>0.5, 0.45, 0.89</td>
<td>Fickian Diffusion, Anomalous Transport, Case-II Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cylinder</td>
<td>0.45 &lt;n&lt;0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphere</td>
<td>0.43 &lt;n&lt;0.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fast Disintegrating Slow Eroding Tablet

Korsmeyer-Peppas n values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RPM</th>
<th>n Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fickian Diffusion

Sphere
- <0.43
- 0.43 < n < 0.85
- >0.85

Korsmeyer-Peppas n values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RPM</th>
<th>n Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Controlled Release
How to show that disintegration is the most important step?

ICH Guideline Q6A “Specifications: Test procedures and acceptance criteria for new drug substances and new drug products” outlines acceptance criteria for different dosage forms and routes of administration. The guidance document contains decision tree #7.1, which allows disintegration testing to be used as a performance/quality control test if a relationship between dissolution and disintegration has been established.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1999
Disintegration of Highly Soluble Immediate Release Tablets: A Surrogate for Dissolution

Abhay Gupta,¹ Robert L. Hunt,¹ Rakhi B. Shah,¹ Vilayat A. Sayeed,² and Mansoor A. Khan¹,³
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Abstract. The purpose of the work was to investigate correlation between disintegration and dissolution for immediate release tablets containing a high solubility drug and to identify formulations where disintegration test, instead of the dissolution test, may be used as the acceptance criteria based on International Conference on Harmonization Q6A guidelines. A statistical design of experiments was used to study the effect of filler, binder, disintegrating agent, and tablet hardness on the disintegration and dissolution of verapamil hydrochloride tablets. All formulation variables, i.e., filler, binder, and disintegrating agent, were found to influence tablet dissolution and disintegration, with the filler and disintegrating agent exerting the most significant influence. Slower dissolution was observed with increasing disintegration time when either the filler or the disintegrating agent was kept constant. However, no direct corelationship was observed between the disintegration and dissolution across all formulations due to the interactions between different formulation components. Although all tablets containing sodium carboxymethyl cellulose as the disintegrating agent, disintegrated in less than 3 min, half of them failed to meet the US Pharmacopeia 30 dissolution criteria for the verapamil hydrochloride tablets highlighting the dependence of dissolution process on the formulation components other than the disintegrating agent. The results identified only one formulation as suitable for using the disintegration test, instead of the dissolution test, as drug product acceptance criteria and highlight the need for systematic studies before using the disintegration test, instead of the dissolution test as the drug acceptance criteria.
Disintegration of Highly Soluble Immediate Release Tablets: A Surrogate for Dissolution
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Abstract. The purpose of the work was to investigate correlation between disintegration and dissolution for immediate release tablets containing a high solubility drug and to identify formulations where disintegration test, instead of the dissolution test, may be used as the acceptance criteria based on

However, no direct correlation was observed between the disintegration and the dissolution
New method: Impact of immersion media on disintegration

Effect of dissolution medium on disintegration
Test formulation #1 (direct compression)

- conventional media
- disintegration impacting media

Disintegration Time [s]

- SGF
- Buffer 4.5
- Syrup 10%
- Syrup 20%
- Syrup 30%
Dissolution test: media impact with formulation

Test formulation #1 (direct compression)

amount dissolved [mg]

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

Time [min]

0 10 20 30 40 50 60

Dissolution test: media impact with formulation

f2-test comparison to SGF-profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>f2-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USP pH 4.5</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrup 10%</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrup 20%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrup 30%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Test formulation #1 (direct compression): SGF, Buffer 4.5, Sugar 10%, Sugar 20%, Sugar 30%
For certain Formulations Disintegration and Dissolution are Sequential Processes

No correlation other than the Sequence should be found if API controls Dissolution
Justification of disintegration testing beyond current FDA criteria using in vitro and in silico models
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Abstract: Drug product performance testing is an important part of quality-by-design approaches, but this process often lacks the underlying mechanistic understanding of the complex interactions between the disintegration and dissolution processes involved. Whereas a recent draft guideline by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has allowed the replacement of dissolution testing with disintegration testing, the mentioned criteria are not globally accepted. This study provides scientific justification for using disintegration testing rather than dissolution testing as a quality control method for certain immediate release (IR) formulations. A mechanistic approach, which is beyond the current FDA criteria, is presented. Dissolution testing via United States Pharmacopeial Convention Apparatus II at various paddle speeds was performed for immediate and extended release formulations of metronidazole. Dissolution profile fitting via DDSolver and dissolution profile predictions via DDDPlus™ were performed. The results showed that Fickian diffusion and drug particle properties (DPP) were responsible for the dissolution of the IR tablets, and that formulation factors (eg, coning) impacted dissolution only at lower rotation speeds. Dissolution was completely formulation controlled if extended release tablets were tested and DPP were not important. To demonstrate that disintegration is the most important dosage form attribute when selecting the appropriate in vitro dissolution method, disintegration testing was performed. Further work is needed to establish a comprehensive mechanistic understanding of the disintegration process in different dosage forms.
It was found that disintegration and dissolution can be sequential or parallel processes, or both. If disintegration occurs first, API dependent dissolution can happen and disintegration can be used as performance test of rapidly disintegrating tablets beyond the current FDA criteria.

The scientific data needed for this justification being, that dissolution is API dependent and formulation factors have to be negligible for the dissolution process.

This approach will enable globally operating pharmaceutical companies to scientifically justify their product specifications for disintegration independent from national – sometimes contradicting – regulatory guidance documents.
PHASE 1/2 R&D DEVELOPMENT

Dosage form

Manufacturing process

R&D Development

Proposed New Formulation

Classification: **API vs. Formulation**

Controlled Dissolution

QC Method

---

**Capsule Tablet or ODT/FDT**

Direct compression
Dry granulation
Powder blend

Fluid bed granulation
Sinter granulation
Melt extrusion

Wet granulation

Dissolution Test

API controls dissolution excipients have no significant impact

Release mechanism Modeling

Formulation significantly controls dissolution

Disintegration Test

Dissolution Test
In Vitro vs. In Vivo Dissolution Mechanistic considerations
At this time point, there is no universal medium available which can be used to predict every drug substance’s solubility or a drug product’s in vivo dissolution behavior.
anatomy & in vitro model

Gastric secretions

Pancreatic secretions

Organic Sink

Stomach

Duodenum

Jejunum
Solubility vs. pH Profile for Acids and Bases and their potential Solubility Gap
R&D Consideration for Dissolution Test Development

BCS Sub-Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BCS 1/3</th>
<th>Acids</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Acids</strong></td>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS 2/4</td>
<td>Acids</td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Acids</strong></td>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low dose / Fast Abs</th>
<th>Low dose / Slow Abs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Dose / Fast Abs</td>
<td>High dose / Slow Abs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High dose / Fast Abs</td>
<td>BCS 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High dose / Fast Abs</th>
<th>BCS 2</th>
<th>Acids</th>
<th>transfer model</th>
<th>Biphasic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>transfer model</td>
<td>Biphasic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Single vessel dissolution</td>
<td>Biphasic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High dose / Slow Abs</th>
<th>BCS 3</th>
<th>Acids</th>
<th>Single vessel dissolution</th>
<th>Biphasic?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>transfer model</td>
<td>Biphasic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Single vessel dissolution</td>
<td>Biphasic?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High dose / Slow Abs</th>
<th>BCS 4</th>
<th>Acids</th>
<th>transfer model</th>
<th>Biphasic?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
<td>transfer model</td>
<td>Biphasic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Single vessel dissolution</td>
<td>Biphasic?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BIPHASIC – Dissolution Ibuprofen

Octanol

buffer
Ibuprofen

Direct compression

Ibuprofen
MCC
CaPO$_4$ X 2H$_2$O
Croscarmellose Na
Mg Stearate

Granulation

Ibuprofen
MCC
CaPO$_4$ X 2H$_2$O
Water
Croscarmellose Na
Mg Stearate
# Excipients characteristics

(Handbook of Pharmaceutical Excipients)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MCC (Avicel PH102)</th>
<th>Dextrose Monohydrate</th>
<th>CaHPO4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solubility</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>5.0 - 7.0</td>
<td>3.5 – 5.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses</td>
<td>Adsorbent; suspending agent; tablet and capsule diluent (20-90%); tablet Disintegrant</td>
<td>Tablet and capsule diluent; therapeutic agent; tonicity agent; sweetening agent. <strong>Binder as well</strong></td>
<td>Tablet and capsule diluent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BIPHASIC DISSOLUTION
Phosphate buffer 5mM + Octanol

Phosphate buffer 5mM

Phosphate buffer USP strength
Microcrystalline Cellulose formulations

**Direct Compression**
- **D formulation**
  - Ibuprofen – 400mg
  - Avicel PH102 – 800mg
  - Croscarmellose Na – 3%
  - Mg Stearate – 1%

**Wet Granulation**
- **G formulation**
  - Ibuprofen – 400mg
  - Avicel PH102 – 800mg
  - Croscarmellose Na – 5%
  - Starch 1500* – 210mg
  - Mg Stearate – 1%

Granulation liquid: EtOH 70%

*Added as powder
Overview G and D tablets in 900mL

Neutral excipient
USP buffer: No difference
Low buffer capacity: Process differentiation

Graph showing dissolution over time for different MCC samples in various buffers.
MCC G tablets – 900ml vs 200ml

% Diss. vs Time (min)

900mL - Zero order
Additional sink assisted on medium pH maintenance
CaHPO4 FORMULATIONS

Direct Compression

Ibuprofen – 400mg
Avicel PH102 – 400mg
CaHPO4 - 400mg
Croscarmellose Na – 3%
Mg Stearate – 1%

Wet Granulation

Ibuprofen – 400mg
Avicel PH102 – 400mg
CaHPO4 – 400mg
Croscarmellose Na – 5%
Starch 1500* – 210mg

Mg Stearate – 1%

* Granulation liquid: EtOH 70%
  • Extragranular
  • Intragranular
Overview G and D tablets in 900mL

USP buffer: No difference

Low buffer capacity: Process differentiation
Dextrose monohydrate formulations

Direct Compression

- Ibuprofen – 400mg
- Avicel PH102 – 400mg
- Dextrose - 400mg
- Croscarmellose Na – 3%
- Mg Stearate – 1%

Wet Granulation

- Ibuprofen – 400mg
- Avicel PH102 – 400mg
- Dextrose – 400mg
- Croscarmellose Na – 5%
- Starch 1500* – 210mg
- Mg Stearate – 1%

Granulation liquid: EtOH 70%

*Added as powder

- Intragranular
- Extragranular
900mL

USP buffer:
No difference

Low buffer capacity:
Process differentiation

200mL

Octanol layer – 200mL
set up
Process differentiation and excipient effect

USP buffer:
No difference

Low buffer capacity:
Process differentiation
Study summary

• USP buffer (50mM) did not differentiate between excipients nor manufacturing process.
• Low buffer capacity (monophasic) differentiated between processes in 900mL but not in 200mL due to medium saturation. (Also seen in the aqueous phase of biphasic dissolution – 900ml)
• For minor excipient changes within the same dosage form, biphasic dissolution (200mL) was much more discriminative in the octanol phase.
• More pronounced excipient effect on the G formulations was captured in the aqueous phase of the biphasic dissolution 900mL, whereas in the 200mL set up it was captured in the octanol phase.
• The additional sink helped maintaining the medium pH. In the 200mL set up the medium pH recovery was much faster.
Conclusions

• Pharmacopeial tests have their limitations
• More basic mechanistic questions need to be asked in drug development
• A BCS sub-classification helps to decide on the in vitro performance testing set-up
• Disintegration might be used for API driven dissolution
• Immediate release needs to be better defined.
• Biphasic dissolution needs to be more studied to find suitable conditions to differentiate between excipient and process variables.
Any Questions

Thanks