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ABSTRACT

The present study deals with formulation and evaluation of floating matrix tablets of Chitosan and HPMC using furosemide as model drug. Floating matrix tablets using Chitosan and HPMC in various concentrations were formulated and investigated in vitro dissolution, floating capability, drug release kinetics and mechanism, similarity factor analysis were performed along with Differential Scanning Calorimetry to determine the physicochemical properties of the prepared tablets and the excipients. Effect of Chitosan and HPMC concentration on drug release kinetics and buoyancy was also determined. Formulations showed 78.53, 63.72, 50.19, 46.67, 74.95 and 76.52% of drug released in 8 hrs respectively. The values of **t50%** and **t80%** were found to be between 293.78 to 513.13 minutes for 50% of drug release and 488.72 to 826.69 minutes for 80% of drug release. In vitro drug release of furosemide in all the formulations was best explained by zero order equation and followed mechanism typical of non-Fickian diffusion. Most of the formulations showed floatation lag time of less <1 min and floated throughout the dissolution process. By combining HPMC with Chitosan in various blends we obtained formulations following zero order kinetics with floatation period of more than 8hrs and suitable for oral control release of furosemide.
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INTRODUCTION

Furosemide (4-chloro-N-furfuryl-5-sulphamoylanthranilic acid) is a diuretic and has a highly variable bioavailability (<60%) when administered as commercially available tablets¹. The bioavailability studies carried out on animals have pointed out that there may be regions in the stomach and/or upper part of the small intestine in which furosemide is specifically absorbed and it has been thought that the short stay of controlled release preparations in this specific region of absorption leads to bioavailability problems². Passive diffusion is the major mechanism of transport of the drug across the gastrointestinal tract. Furosemide has a pKa of 4.6 and since the stomach environment is acidic, there is an increase in the unionized moiety of the drug with subsequent increase in the absorption³. A high peak diuresis is observed after the administration of a conventional tablet of furosemide. Due to this, it is only administered experimentally in the therapy for ascites, and edema due to liver cirrhosis.

To eliminate such an effect, various efforts have been made to formulate furosemide in prolonged release forms. A previous study has shown that the bioavailability of furosemide was excessively increased compared to conventional forms and that absorption of furosemide taken place vastly in stomach and upper parts of small intestine when administered as a floating tablet formulation⁴. Buoyant preparations offer a simple and practical approach to not only achieve increased gastric residence time for the dosage form but also modify the drug release profile. The present study involved the design of furosemide floating matrix tablets and the investigation of in vitro dissolution; buoyancy studies and drug release modeling were performed along with Differential Scanning Calorimetry to determine the physicochemical properties of the prepared tablets and the excipients.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Furosemide and Chitosan were obtained as a generous gift by ModiMundi Pharma Pvt. Ltd. (UP, India) and Central Institute of Fisheries Technology, Kochi (Chennai, India) respectively. HPMC K4 M, K15M and K100M (hydroxypropylmethylcellulose [HPMC] 4000, 15000, 100000 cps respectively) were procured from Colorcon Company, (Mumbai, India). Spray dried lactose from Vardhman Healthcare, Haryana, India, and sodium bicarbonate from Ranbaxy Laboratories Ltd., India. All other materials/solvents used were of analytical grade.

METHODS

Matrix preparation

The blend of polymers HPMC K4M, K15M, K100M, and chitosan were employed in the formulations to control the delivery of active material and for the matrix formation. To aid floatation, an effervescent agent i.e. sodium bicarbonate was added in the formulation. All the ingredients were passed through sieve #80 before processing. For each formulation, preweighed quantity of furosemide, blend of HPMC, chitosan, lactose, sodium bicarbonate, and magnesium stearate were manually blended homogenously using a pestle mortar. The homogenous blend was then directly compressed into tablet on a single punch R&D tablet compressing machine equipped with concave punches of 8mm diameter to produce tablets. The tablet weight was adjusted to 200mg. The tablet hardness was kept in the range of 5-6 kg/cm² and was measured on Monsanto tablet hardness tester.

**Table 1: Composition of matrix tablets of Furosemide**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ingredients (%)</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furosemide</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPMC** K4 M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPMC K15 M</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPMC K100M</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitosan</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaHCO₃</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lactose</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mag. Stearate</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The weight of each matrix tablet is 200 mg; **HPMC indicates hydroxypropylmethylcellulose.
Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC)

Differential Scanning Calorimetry (DSC) was used to characterize the thermal properties and possibility of any interaction between the excipients and with the drug in physical mixtures. DSC analysis was conducted using a Universal V4.1D TA Instruments (Q10) (Waters Asia Ltd, USA). Ultra-high purity nitrogen was used as the purge gas at a flow rate of 150 ml/min. 10 mg samples were accurately weighed into aluminum pans and then hermetically sealed with aluminum lids. The thermographs of the samples (figure 3) were obtained at a scanning rate of 10°C/min conducted over a temperature range of 40 to 400 °C. Differential Scanning Calorimetry (DSC) studies of the prepared matrix tablet, the drug and the excipients showed that no polymorphic changes occurred during manufacturing of tablets as all the peaks were present in the DSC graph (figure 3) of tablet sample.

Dissolution methodology

The release of furosemide from different floating matrix tablets was carried out in triplicate using USP type II apparatus (Scientific Instruments, USP-II, Grover Enterprises, New Delhi) under sink condition. The dissolution medium was 900ml, 0.1 N HCl (pH 1.2, enzyme free) at 35±0.5°C with a stirring speed of 50 rpm for 8hrs. The samples were withdrawn at 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8hrs. 10ml of samples were withdrawn at intervals and replaced by an equivalent volume of fresh solvent. The dissolution data were corrected for this dilution effect. The samples were filtered through a 0.45µ membrane filter. The filtered samples were measured for furosemide concentration using UV Spectrophotometer at λ=273 nm (UV-Vis/NIR Spectrophotometer, Cary 5000, Varian, Australia Pty Ltd.).

Floating capability

Floating time was determined by using the USP type II dissolution apparatus with 900 ml of 0.1N HCl solution at 37°C±0.5°C used as a test medium. Both the time needed to go upward and float on the surface of the fluid and the floating durations were determined.

Kinetic modeling

The release profile obtained from each batch was fitted to Zero order (equation 1), First order (equation 2), Higuchi (equation 3), Korsmeyer & Peppas (equation 4) and Hixon-Crowell (equation 5) models to ascertain the kinetic modeling of drug release. In all mathematical expressions, M0 is the amount of the drug dissolved in time t; M∞ is the initial amount of drug in the solution; Mt is the fractional release of the drug; k0 is the zero-order release constant; kH is the Higuchi rate constant; kK is the release constant; kP is a constant incorporating the surface-volume relation; and n is the release exponent, which characterizes the mechanism of drug release.5,4.7

\[ M_t = M_0 + k_0 t \]  
(1)

\[ \log M_t = \log M_0 + \frac{k_0}{2.303} t \]  
(2)

\[ M_t = M_0 + k_P t^n \]  
(3)

\[ M_t = k_H \frac{t^n}{n} \]  
(4)

\[ M_t^{1/2} = M_0^{1/2} \times k_{H} t \]  
(5)

The applicability of the Higuchi model is diminished due to some of the factors like it does not consider the edge effect and assumes the release to be one dimensional diffusion and fails to allow for the influence of swelling of the matrix (upon hydration) and gradual erosion of the matrix. The power law gives only a limited insight into the release mechanism of the drug however it is more comprehensive than Higuchi. Hixon Crowel equation assumes that the release rate is limited by the drug particle dissolution and not by the diffusion occurring through the polymeric matrix.5 This model was used by Neibergall et al.8 and Prista et al.9 to describe the release profile keeping in mind the diminishing surface of the drug particles during the dissolution.

Similarity factor (f1) analysis

The similarity factor between the formulations was determined using the data obtained from their drug release studies. The data were analyzed by the formula shown in equations 8 and 9.

\[ f_1 = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n} (R_j - T_j)^2}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} R_j^2} \times 100 \]  
(6)

\[ f_2 = 50 \log \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (R_j - T_j)^2 \right]^{1/2} \times 100 \]  
(7)

Where n = number of time points, Rj and Tj = dissolution of reference and test products at each time point j.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In vitro release drug release

Figure 1 shows the mean in vitro release profiles of the six different batches. The various dissolution parameters for the different matrix types are given in table 2. Also listed in the table are the respective values of f100 and f100M that is the time for release of 50 % and 90% of the dose. The data are average of three individual measurements of random tablets. There is a distinct difference in the furosemide release pattern between the formulations. As soon as the tablet came in contact with the dissolution medium, acid in the test medium reacted with sodium bicarbonate in the matrix resulting in CO₂ formation. The gas generated got entrapped in the sticky gel formed by the hydration of HPMC and prevents the air bubble from rupture. This decreases the density of the tablet below 1.0 and keeps the whole tablet buoyant on the surface of the test medium for as long as 8 hrs. The drug release from these matrices is controlled by the rate of formation of a partially hydrated gel layer formed on the tablet surface.
content was kept constant in order to study the viscosity effect of HPMC on release profile. Batches A, B, C, D, E and F showed 78.53, 63.72, 50.19, 46.67, 74.95 and 76.52% of drug released in 8 hrs respectively (table 2). The values of t50% and t80% were found to be between 293.78 to 513.13 minutes for 50% of drug release and 488.72 to 826.69 minutes for 80% of drug release for the floating tablets at varying polymer viscosities. This finding indicates the considerable release-retarding potential of the polymer blend for furosemide. An increase in polymer blend viscosity decreases the rate of swelling of polymer and increases the gel strength of swelled polymer. The time required traversing the thick viscous gel increases; thus, slower release from matrices prepared from high viscosity polymers occurs. All of these formulations showed sustained release. The percentage immediate release part for sustained release furosemide was calculated using equation 8 and was found to be 2.7 to 7.5%.

Percentage immediate release part = \( \frac{C_{ss} \times V_d / F \times 100}{(8)} \)

Where, C\(_{ss}\) is steady state plasma concentration, V\(_d\) is volume of distribution, and F is fraction bioavailability.

**Drug release kinetics and mechanism**

Dissolution data from the batches was fitted to zero order, first order, Higuchi, Korsmeyer and Peppas and Hixon-Crowel models and the results are shown in table 2. The value of the release exponent (n) was found to be a function of polymer used and the physico-chemical property of the drug molecule itself. It was found that in vitro drug release of furosemide in all the formulations was best explained by zero order equation, as the plots showed the highest regression coefficient followed by Korsmeyer-Peppas and Hixon Crowel models.

A good compliance with zero order equation (average=0.99±0.013) indicates that the drug release was nearly independent of drug concentration in the matrix. The next best fit was Korsmeyer-Peppas model (average=0.95±0.0420) and Hixon Crowel (average=0.94±0.218). The calculated diffusion exponents (n) were found between 0.5 and 1 (average=0.72±0.056), which indicates a combination of diffusion and swelling controlled release mechanism, and drug release was highly influenced by swelling and gradual erosion of the matrix. It was concluded in a study that chitosan forms swellable and erodible gel which resulted in release mechanism typical of non-Fickian diffusion.

In order to determine the contributions of the diffusional and relaxation mechanisms during the non-Fickian release process, a model proposed by Hopfenberg and developed by Peppas and Sahlin was used (equation 10):

\[
\frac{M_t}{M_{\infty}} = k_1 t^m + k_2 t^n
\]

Where, k\(_1\), k\(_2\), and m are constants, the first term on the right hand side represents the Fickian diffusional contribution, F, whereas the second term the case-II relaxation contribution, R. The ratio of the two contributions is calculated by the following equation:

\[
\frac{R}{F} = \frac{k_2 t^n}{k_1}
\]

The release data of formulations were analyzed according to this equation and the graph of ratio of R/F Vs fraction released is presented in figure 2. As shown in this figure, the contribution of the two mechanisms for the drug release seems to be almost equal for formulations A, C, D and E. For these formulations, the Fickian diffusion mechanism seems to be more effective on drug release as evident from their values of “n” (table 2). The higher R/F values for formulation F may be due to its biphasic release pattern in which the factor controlling the drug release is relaxation of the polymer network and erosion of the matrix. Diffusion seems to be more pronounced on drug release from rest of the formulations. The R/F contribution in formulation A seems to be balanced with respect to other formulations and also justifies its higher rate and extent of drug release.

**Similarity factor (f\(_2\)) analysis**

Formulation A was considered as reference formulation for the comparison of difference (f\(_1\)) and similarity (f\(_2\)) factors due to its higher rate and extent of drug release with highest zero order release kinetics compliance. The data is tabulated in table 3 which reveals that formulations B and E (f\(_1\)= 7.98 and f\(_2\)= 66.58) showed the similarity of release profiles. Release profiles of other formulations were significantly different.

**Table 2:** Kinetic values obtained from different plots of formulations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zero Order</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>0.940</td>
<td>0.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First order</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>0.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higuchi</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.930</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>0.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korsmeyer Peppas</td>
<td>0.996</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>0.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>0.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>0.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hixon Crowel</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>0.961</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t50% (min)</td>
<td>293.78</td>
<td>383.11</td>
<td>477.05</td>
<td>513.13</td>
<td>308.79</td>
<td>322.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t80% (min)</td>
<td>488.72</td>
<td>611.09</td>
<td>768.24</td>
<td>826.69</td>
<td>493.45</td>
<td>499.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Release</td>
<td>78.53</td>
<td>63.72</td>
<td>50.19</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>74.95</td>
<td>76.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All values represent mean (n = 3). t50 and t80 indicates time required for 50% and 80% drug dissolution, respectively.
In vitro buoyancy

On contact with the dissolution medium, hydrochloride in the test medium reacted with sodium in the matrix inducing drug formation in the floating section, thereby decreasing the density of the matrix system and aid in flotation. The swelling properties of HPMC and chitosan supported the system reaching a lower density as long as the volume expansion was faster than the weight gain. Blends of various grades of HPMC and chitosan were found good candidates for the floating delivery system. It sufficiently expanded in contact with dissolution media and was flexible enough to encapsulate the CO₂ formed and did not release it rapidly, which made the formulation to float almost throughout the dissolution process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Peppas-Sahlin model</th>
<th>Difference factor (f₁)</th>
<th>Similarity factor (f₂)</th>
<th>Buoyancy lag Time (min)</th>
<th>Duration of Buoyancy (hr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.008181 0.0000272 0.000332 0.6999 0.9977</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.003352 0.000113 0.00338 0.6689 0.9992</td>
<td>26.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.002759 0.0000974 0.00353 0.7849 0.9992</td>
<td>39.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.002411 0.00000614 0.00255 0.8049 0.9989</td>
<td>43.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.004954 0.00000622 0.0126 0.7080 0.9944</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.000913 0.000165 0.1811 0.6820 0.9901</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In immediate flotation within 1 min., T=Throughout the dissolution studies. Formulation A has been taken as reference in determining f₁ and f₂.

Effect of polymer concentration

Instead of using only a single viscosity grade of HPMC polymer, blends of different viscosity grade of HPMC were used to prepare the matrix tablets. A broad range of drug release behavior was observed from matrix tablets prepared with blends of HPMC K4M, K15M, and K100M. Streubel et al. had also used blends of HPMC and reported similar results. The viscosity of the blends of HPMC grades could be obtained by empirical equation presented as follows:

\[ V_{1/8} = V_1^{1/8} + V_2^{1/8} \]

(9)

Where, \( V_1 \) = viscosity of polymeric blend, \( F_1 \) and \( F_2 \) = fraction of polymers, and \( V_1 \) and \( V_2 \) = viscosity of two polymers respectively.

The batches A & B were prepared using blend of HPMC K4M/K15M, C & D using blend of HPMC K4M/K100M and E & F using blend of HPMC K15M/K100M respectively. The content of chitosan in all the formulations was kept constant (table 1).

The effect of varying the blend ratio on drug release is illustrated in figure 1. By the calculation of apparent viscosity of the HPMC blends, it was revealed that the viscosity of the mixture increased while the percent content of polymer blend in the tablets was kept constant. So, the effect on the drug release mainly depends on the viscosity of the HPMC blend21. The rate of drug release from the matrices was in the order A>F=E>B>C>D respectively.

Formulation A showed highest % drug release because when the viscosity of the blend is low the tablets show a fast controlled release phase, and as the viscosity of the HPMC blend increases, the drug release occurs in a slow controlled manner throughout. Similar results were reported by Menon et al. in which they demonstrated that HPMC with higher viscosity resulted in thicker gel layer formulation. The presence of lactose also contributes its part in faster drug release due to its higher water solubility and osmotic activity, resulting in a faster uptake of the medium into the core by diffusion22. It may also be attributed that matrices containing chitosan become more porous as dissolution proceeds and release drug by diffusion23. The rate at which a drug is released from the hydrophilic matrix depends on the amount of polymer involved and on the nature of the drug. Increasing the amount of hydrophilic polymer in tablets decreases the release rate24. On the other hand drugs with low solubilities in water and/or high molecular weights are released very slowly25. Formulation C gave release nearer to that of D. A possible explanation is the existence of a limiting HPMC viscosity above which further drug release is seen26, 27, and higher viscosity HPMC resulted in thicker gel formation and corresponding decrease in the drug release28. Matrix E and F (more distinct in F) showed a biphasic release pattern, that is, an initial polymer controlled slower release followed by rapid drug release in the second phase. These biphasic release patterns were caused by an apparent change in the matrix structure i.e. formation of a stable gel layer29. Over the first phase, hydrated HPMC remained at the surface of the matrix and the matrix swelled and disentangled, the density and strength of gel layer weakened, resulting in rapid erosion. The results comply with the findings of Krogl and Bodmeier. They stated that the decreased drug release is probably because of the formation of a denser gel and slower erosion at the higher HPMC content.

CONCLUSION

The current studies are aimed at successful development and optimization of floating matrix tablets of furosemide with high regulation of the release rate. Differential Scanning Calorimetry (DSC) studies of the prepared matrix tablets and the drug and the excipients showed that no polymorphic changes occurred during manufacturing of tablets as all the peaks were present in the DSC graph of tablet sample. All the batches showed immediate floatation and floatation period of more than 8hrs. Furosemide release through the matrices includes the combination of diffusion and swelling controlled drug release. Release from these matrix tablets mostly complied with zero order kinetics and extended over longer period of time and depends on the composition of polymer blend. Incorporation of chitosan in the formulation included an initial burst effect followed by a controlled release phase. By increasing the viscosity of the polymer blend, the rate and extent of drug release form the tablets decreases. Regulated drug release in zero-order manner attained in the current study indicates that the floating matrix tablets of furosemide, prepared using blend of HPMC-Chitosan are thus suitable for oral control release of furosemide.
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