# IJPSR (2017), Volume 8, Issue 7



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL



Received on 20 December, 2016; received in revised form, 04 May, 2017; accepted, 21 June, 2017; published 01 July, 2017

# OPTIMIZATION OF TETRABENAZINE TABLET FORMULATION TO MEET THE REQUIRED DISSOLUTION PROFILE AND CONTENT UNIFORMITY

Santanu Roy<sup>\*1</sup>, K. Kannan<sup>2</sup> and Amol Choulwar<sup>3</sup>

Glenmark Pharmaceutical Limited<sup>1</sup>, Andheri East, Mumbai - 400099, Maharashtra, India. Department of Pharmacy<sup>2</sup>, Annamalai University, Chidambaram - 608002, Tamil Nadu, India. Sanofi India Limited<sup>3</sup>, Andheri East, Andheri East, Mumbai - 400072, Maharashtra, India.

Keywords: Tetrabenazine (TBZ), Design of Experiment (DOE), Critical Quality Attributes (CQA), Content Uniformity (CU), Acceptance Value (AV) Correspondence to Author: Santanu Roy Glenmark Pharmaceutical Limited,

Andheri East, Mumbai - 400099, Maharashtra, India.

 $\textbf{E-mail:} santanu_2k1 @rediffmail.com$ 

**ABSTRACT:** An approach to determine the relationship between independent process variables and their two level four factor partial factorial design was adopted, composite of experiment design was applied to optimize a tablet formulation of Tetrabenazine (TBZ) Tablets 25mg containing high percentage of Lactose Anhydrous, Sodium starch Glycolate, Magnesium Stearate and Starch / Lactose Ratio. The particle size distribution of Lactose Anhydrous is used as dependent variable and Sodium starch Glycolate, Magnesium Stearate and Starch / Lactose Ratio were used as independent variables for optimizing some tablets response parameters. Response parameters for final TBZ Tablets were percentage of TBZ dissolve at thirty minutes. Design of Experiments (DOE) is an organized effect on the response variable. 2<sup>4</sup> partial factorial designs were applied in this research work. The models were validated for accurate prediction of response characteristics and use to identify the optimum formulation. The results that an optimum TBZ 25mg tablets having a volume similar to commercial products can be produced by dry granulation process utilizing Lactose Anhydrous.

**INTRODUCTION:** To determine the shelf life of a drug product, long term stability studies are to be carried out. For a stability study, a random sample of tablets is taken from several batches. The tablets are stored under ambient conditions (25 °C / 65% Rh). Being an end product testing Quality Control tool, the dissolution testing has often been used for evaluating challenges encountered during development of formulation and process and Tetrabenazine tablet 25mg stability to establish. During interpretation of long term stability study data of Tetrabenazine Tablet 25mg found that the tablet dissolution shift (slow down) upon stability at different time interval and different lots (batch to batch).

QUICK RESPONSE CODE							
	<b>DOI:</b> 10.13040/IJPSR.0975-8232.8(7).2940-48						
	Article can be accessed online on: www.ijpsr.com						
DOI link: http://dx.doi.org/10.13040/IJPSR.0975-8232.8 (7).2940-48							

The use of experimental design, optimization and multi variate technique to investigate root cause of tablet dissolution shift <sup>2, 5, 7, 11</sup>. Dissolution shift (slow down) upon stability and develop control strategies for a drug product during formulation and process development. An experimental design was carried out to evaluate the interaction and effects of the design factors on critical quality attributes (CQA) of dissolution upon stability.

The design space was studied by design of experiment (DOE) and multivariate analysis to ensure desire dissolution profile and minimal dissolution shift upon stability <sup>2, 7</sup>. Further the level of two or more processing parameters may interact to produce an unanticipated result. This is sometimes referred to as synergism or potentiation, in which the effect of supposedly independent factors is many, folds the sum of effects of the factors taken separately. Thus, some factors may be discovered to be inter-dependent. Utilizing the tool of optimization for redeveloped and marketed a

tablet formulation containing 25mg of TBZ. This made possible the manufacture of a tablet of palatable dimension and acceptable dissolution performance.

# **MATERIALS AND METHODS:**

**Materials:** Anhydrous Lactose / Lactose Anhydrous, Pre-gelatinised Starch, Sodium Starch Glycolate, Iron oxide yellow, Talc, Colloidal silicon dioxide, Magenesium Sterate all selected ingredients are pharmaceopial grade.

Experimentation: Tetrabenazine (TBZ), Lactose anhydrous, corn starch and sodium strach glycolate were sifted through sieve 40 and blended in Octagonal blender (Bectochem, India) for 45 minutes. Iron oxide yellow along with purified talc were sifted through sieve 100 and colloidal silicon dioxide was sifted through sieve 40. These sifted excipient were added to the previously blend and blending was continued for 15 minutes in octagonal blender. Magnesium stearate was sifted through sieve 60 and transferred to blender and Lubricated for 5 minutes. The slug was prepared from the blend by using roll compactor (Alexanderwerk AG, Germany) to get the granules. Slugs was milled and passed through 10.0 mm S.S Screen, slow speed, knives forward using comminuting mill (M/s Ganson Ltd., India).

Talc was sifted through sieve 60 and mixed with the above granules in octagonal blender for 10 minutes. Magnesium stearate was sifted through sieve 60 and lubricated in the same blender for 5 minutes. Finally lubricated blend was compressed in single rotatory compression machine (Cadmac, India).

# **Evaluation of Tablets:**

**Content Uniformity:** Uniformity of Dosage the content uniformity test was carried out by using analytical grade reagent, by HPLC (Water make), C18 column, flow rate 2.0 min, and gradient method at 275nm used UV detector.

**Dissolution Studies:** The release rate of TBZ 25mg was determined according to USFDA web site, dissolution data base (ref) using the Dissolution testing Apparatus II (model TDT-60T, Electro lab, India) fitted with paddles. The dissolution test was performed by using 900ml of 0.1N HCL kept at  $37 \pm 0.5$  °C and 50 rpm.

A 5ml sample was withdrawn from the dissolution apparatus at predetermine time interval (30 minutes). The samples were filtered through a 0.45µm membrane filter and dilute to a suitable concentration with 0.1N HCl. Absorbance of these soultion was measured at 275nm using UV spectrophotometer (JascoV350, Japan). Drug release was calculated using the equation of Beer Lamber's calibration curve.

**Experimental Design:** The selected independent variables are:

- 1. Lactose Anhydrous.
- 2. Sodium Starch Glycolate (Type A, pH 5.5-7.5).
- 3. Magnesium Stearate.
- 4. Strach/Lactose Ratio.

All other processing and formulation variables were kept constant throughout the study. Eight experiments represent a design for four factors at two levels; these are represented by +1 and -1, analogous to the any two level partial factorial designs <sup>2, 7, 6, 12</sup>. Summarizes the value of response parameters obtained from the studies. These parameters are percentage of drug dissolved at thirty minutes sampling point, content uniformity, weight variation, disintegration time and hardness. The experimental plan and responses observed in a screening phase were carried out in randomized order according to eight run matrix provided for by the Factorial design strategy.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:** All the statistical and regression analysis procedure on the response parameters were performed using the DOE methodology <sup>2, 9, 12</sup>. The sets of data obtaining from the statistical analysis were then subjected to computerized regression models including an intercept and main effect terms of each independent variable. Two way interaction terms and a stepwise regression procedure was used to assess all main effects, some two way interactions and quadratic terms for usefulness in the model to obtain a more adequate regression model for each response parameter. The p-value for all the formulation variables is greater than 0.05 indicates there is no significant impact in content uniformity. The tablet content uniformity Acceptance value (AV) is less than 10.0 at studied range of variables observed.

Hence, the range selected will not have any impact on critical quality attribute of drug product. The pvalue for all the formulation variables is greater than 0.05 indicates insignificant for tablet % Dissolution at 30 minutes. The % Dissolution at 30 minutes greater than 95.0 at studied range of variables observed. Hence, the range selected will not have any impact on critical quality attribute of drug product. The optimum values obtained from the contour plots for the independent variables in order to obtain the best values for each of the four response variables are given in **Table 8**.

*In vitro* dissolution data may provide an indication of *in-vivo* bioavailability, therefore the percentage of drug dissolve at 30 minutes was identified as the response parameter. The optimumized formulation satisfied all constraints simultaneously. The absolute effect of selected variables within studied range are less than the standardized effect and the Tablet Content Uniformity Acceptance value (AV) is less than 10.0 and % Dissolution at 30 minutes is more than 95.0%. Hence, it can be concluded that there is no significant impact of selected variables within the studied range on Tablet Content Uniformity and % Dissolution at 30 minutes.

The data of Design of Experiment studies revealed that experimental run within selected range of all the independent variables did not show any impact on Critical Quality Attributes (CQA) and other in process test results. Hence, the selected range can be considered as a design space within which any change will not have any impact on CQA of drug product. The formulation composition was finalized based on formulation optimization. In the formulation optimization studies, impact of Lactose anhydrous PSD, level of sodium starch glycolate ranges for these excipients selected did not have any impact on the *in vitro* dissolution.

#### TABLE 1: SELECTED LEVELS OF EXCIPIENTS

Excipient Low level High level												
Lactose Anhydrous Coarse Fine												
Sodium Starch Glycolate	2.60%	4.60%										
(Type A, pH 5.5-7.5)												
Magnesium Stearate	1.15%	1.65%										
Strach / Lactose Ratio	2.83:97.17	10.83:89.17										
The ranges selected for	dry granulati	on process are										
summarized.												

#### **TABLE 2: PARTICLE SIZE DISTRIBUTION OF LACTOSE ANHYDROUS**

Particles size	Specification	Level 1(+1) (Fine grade)	Level 2(-1) (coarse grade)									
% Below 45 micron	0 to 20	18	2									
% Below 150 micron	40 to 65	64	42									
% Below 250 micron	80 to 100	96	82									

The weight of tablets was kept constant at 125mg, by adjusting the quantity of Lactose Anhydrous.

Require particle size distribution of Lactose Anhydrous were generated by sieving.

|--|

Batch No.	PSD of Lactose Anhydrous	Sodium trach Glucolate	Magnesim Stearate	Starch / Lactose ratio
SR-T-001	Coarse	2.6	1.150	2.83:97.17
(Batch Size: 1000 tablets)				
SR-T-002	Fine	2.6	1.150	10.83:89.17
(Batch Size: 1000 tablets)				
SR-T-003	Coarse	4.6	1.150	10.83:89.17
(Batch Size: 1000 tablets)				
SR-T-004	Fine	4.6	1.650	10.83:89.17
(Batch Size: 1000 tablets)				
SR-T-005	Coarse	2.6	1.650	10.83:89.17
(Batch Size: 1000 tablets)				
SR-T-006	Fine	2.6	1.650	2.83:97.17
(Batch Size: 1000 tablets)				
SR-T-007	Coarse	4.6	1.650	2.83:97.17
(Batch Size: 1000 tablets)				
SR-T-008	Fine	4.6	1.150	2.83:97.17
(Batch Size: 5000 tablets)				

All other processing and formulation variables were kept constant throughout the study. As shown in **Table 3**, the eight experiments represent a

design for four factors at two levels, these are represented by +1 and -1, analogous to the any two level partial factorial design.

Physical Batch No.Maximum AppearanceMaximum Individual % Weight Variation from Target (125.00 mg)Maximum Difference of Thickness (mm) from TargetMaximum Difference of Hardness (kP) from Target TargetDisintegratio n Time (min)% Friability Drug Dissolution% Weight Valu Dissolution% Wait Valu ValuSR-T-0012.8000.0600.7003 min 45 sec0.31003.0SR-T-0023.1000.1200.9004 min 15 sec0.38999.0SR-T-0031.2000.0801.3003 min 30 sec0.381049.7SR-T-004Free of any1.8000.0501.0004 min 10 sec0.351005.9SR-T-005defect3.0000.0800.9003 min 50 sec0.2984.6SR-T-005defect3.0000.01200.9005 min 45 sec0.2984.6					Response stu	idies			
Batch No.AppearanceIndividual % Weight VariationDifference of Thickness (mm) from Target (125.00 mg)Difference of Thickness (mm) from Target (125.00 mg)Difference of n Time (min)n Time (min)Friability DissolutionDrug Dissolution(A' Value Value ValueSR-T-0012.8000.0600.7003 min 45 sec0.31003.0SR-T-0023.1000.1200.9004 min 15 sec0.38999.0SR-T-0031.2000.0801.3003 min 30 sec0.381049.7SR-T-004Free of any1.8000.0501.0004 min 10 sec0.351005.9SR-T-005defect3.0000.0800.9003 min 50 sec0.2984.6		Physical	Maximum	Maximum	Maximum	Disintegratio	%	%	CU
Weight Variation from Target (125.00 mg)         of Thickness (mm) from Target         Hardness (kP) from Target         Dissolution         Value           SR-T-001         2.800         0.060         0.700         3 min 45 sec         0.3         100         3.0           SR-T-002         3.100         0.120         0.900         4 min 15 sec         0.38         99         9.0           SR-T-003         1.200         0.080         1.300         3 min 30 sec         0.38         104         9.7           SR-T-004         Free of any         1.800         0.050         1.000         4 min 10 sec         0.35         100         5.9           SR-T-005         defect         3.000         0.080         0.900         5 min 45 sec         0.2         98         4.6	Batch No.	Appearance	Individual %	Difference	Difference of	n Time (min)	Friability	Drug	(AV
Variation from Target (125.00 mg)         (mm) from Target         (kP) from Target			Weight	of Thickness	Hardness			Dissolution	Value)
from Target (125.00 mg)         Target         Target           SR-T-001         2.800         0.060         0.700         3 min 45 sec         0.3         100         3.0           SR-T-002         3.100         0.120         0.900         4 min 15 sec         0.38         99         9.0           SR-T-003         1.200         0.080         1.300         3 min 30 sec         0.38         104         9.7           SR-T-004         Free of any         1.800         0.050         1.000         4 min 10 sec         0.35         100         5.9           SR-T-005         defect         3.000         0.080         0.900         5 min 45 sec         0.4         100         4.4			Variation	(mm) from	(kP) from				
(125.00 mg)         SR-T-001       2.800       0.060       0.700       3 min 45 sec       0.3       100       3.0         SR-T-002       3.100       0.120       0.900       4 min 15 sec       0.38       99       9.0         SR-T-003       1.200       0.080       1.300       3 min 30 sec       0.38       104       9.7         SR-T-004       Free of any       1.800       0.050       1.000       4 min 10 sec       0.35       100       5.9         SR-T-005       defect       3.000       0.080       0.900       3 min 50 sec       0.2       98       4.6         SR-T-006       2.500       0.120       0.700       5 min 45 sec       0.4       100       4.4			from Target	Target	Target				
SR-T-001       2.800       0.060       0.700       3 min 45 sec       0.3       100       3.0         SR-T-002       3.100       0.120       0.900       4 min 15 sec       0.38       99       9.0         SR-T-003       1.200       0.080       1.300       3 min 30 sec       0.38       104       9.7         SR-T-004       Free of any       1.800       0.050       1.000       4 min 10 sec       0.35       100       5.9         SR-T-005       defect       3.000       0.080       0.900       3 min 50 sec       0.2       98       4.6			(125.00 mg)		-				
SR-T-002       3.100       0.120       0.900       4 min 15 sec       0.38       99       9.0         SR-T-003       1.200       0.080       1.300       3 min 30 sec       0.38       104       9.7         SR-T-004       Free of any       1.800       0.050       1.000       4 min 10 sec       0.35       100       5.9         SR-T-005       defect       3.000       0.080       0.900       3 min 50 sec       0.2       98       4.6         SR-T-005       0.000       0.120       0.700       5 min 45 sec       0.4       100       4.6	SR-T-001		2.800	0.060	0.700	3 min 45 sec	0.3	100	3.05
SR-T-003       1.200       0.080       1.300       3 min 30 sec       0.38       104       9.7         SR-T-004       Free of any       1.800       0.050       1.000       4 min 10 sec       0.35       100       5.9         SR-T-005       defect       3.000       0.080       0.900       3 min 50 sec       0.2       98       4.6         SR-T-006       2500       0.120       0.700       5 min 45 sec       0.4       100       4.6	SR-T-002		3.100	0.120	0.900	4 min 15 sec	0.38	99	9.05
SR-T-004         Free of any         1.800         0.050         1.000         4 min 10 sec         0.35         100         5.9           SR-T-005         defect         3.000         0.080         0.900         3 min 50 sec         0.2         98         4.6           SR-T-006         2.500         0.120         0.700         5 min 45 sec         0.4         100         4.6	SR-T-003		1.200	0.080	1.300	3 min 30 sec	0.38	104	9.75
SR-T-005         defect         3.000         0.080         0.900         3 min 50 sec         0.2         98         4.6           SR-T-006         2.500         0.120         0.700         5 min 45 sec         0.4         100         4.6	SR-T-004	Free of any	1.800	0.050	1.000	4 min 10 sec	0.35	100	5.98
SP T 006 $2500$ 0 120 0 700 5 min 45 cos 0.4 100 44	SR-T-005	defect	3.000	0.080	0.900	3 min 50 sec	0.2	98	4.65
5K-1-000 2.300 0.120 0.700 5 min 45 sec 0.4 100 4.	SR-T-006		2.500	0.120	0.700	5 min 45 sec	0.4	100	4.5
SR-T-007 3.100 0.110 0.900 4 min 45 sec 0.28 97 8.4	SR-T-007		3.100	0.110	0.900	4 min 45 sec	0.28	97	8.46
SR-T-008 1.600 0.110 0.900 3 min 20 sec 0.31 93 5.9	SR-T-008		1.600	0.110	0.900	3 min 20 sec	0.31	93	5.96
Acceptance Acceptable 125.00±5% 2.5±0.3 4.5±2.5 NMT 15 NMT 1%: No In 30 min NM	Acceptance	Acceptable	125.00±5%	2.5±0.3	$4.5 \pm 2.5$	NMT 15	NMT 1%: No	In 30 min	NMT
Criteria free of any minutes Breakage of NLT 15	Criteria	free of any				minutes	Breakage of	NLT	15
defect Tablets 80% (Q)		defect					Tablets	80% (Q)	

#### TABLE 4: SUMMARY OF RESPONSE STUDIES

Summarizes the value of response parameters obtained from the studies. These parameters are percentage of drug dissolved at thirty minutes sampling point, content uniformity, weight variation, disintegration time and hardness.

#### **TABLE 5: GRANULES CHARACTERISTIC**

	<b>Bulk Density</b>	Tap Density	y Retension Retension		Retension	<b>Retension on</b>	<b>Retension on</b>	Pass through
Batch No.	(g/cc)	(g/cc)	on # 20(%)	on # 40 (%)	on # 60(%)	# <b>80%</b> (%)	# 100 (%)	# 100 (%)
SR-T-001	0.661	0.957	1.152	13.461	9.834	8.844	8.342	52.851
SR-T-002	0.634	0.962	0.381	5.362	11.153	12.180	9.161	52.323
SR-T-003	0.658	0.967	0.360	7.254	8.732	6.527	7.842	60.325
SR-T-004	0.606	0.963	0.422	8.743	12.127	10.612	8.246	48.501
SR-T-005	0.656	0.961	0.380	12.241	10.242	9.513	10.614	62.012
SR-T-006	0.643	0.973	0.252	1.243	11.876	11.435	9.400	43.003
SR-T-007	0.632	0.972	0.663	11.801	11.212	8.137	11.313	51.802
SR-T-008	0.658	0.982	0.001	11.207	11.344	7.501	8.934	55.764

Surface Plot of Formulation variables on Tablets Content Uniformity and % Dissolution at 30 minutes. The experimental plan and responses observed in a screening phase were carried out in randomized order according to eight run matrix provided for by the Factorial design strategy. Our full study addressed all response namely granules characteristics are illustrated.

TABLE 6: LONG TERM STABILITY	OF TETRABENAZINE	TABLETS 25mg A	AT AMBIENT	CONDITION (	(25 °C /
65% Rh)					

Batch #	Stability	0 month	3	6	9 months	12 months	18 months	24months
	Frequency	(Initial)	months	months				
JKK	ГТ001	90%	87%	85%	82%	80%	78%	75%
JKK	ГТ002	95%	85%	83%	82%	79%	75%	72%
JKK	ГТ003	89%	86%	85%	80%	75%	73%	70%
JKK	ГТ004	93%	90%	89%	82%	74%	70%	68%
JKK	ГТ005	95%	93%	91%	86%	80%	73%	69%
JKK	ГТ006	92%	89%	83%	82%	80%	73%	70%
JKK	ГТ007	90%	87%	85%	83%	81%	73%	75%

International Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Research

JKKTT008	85%	85%	80%	78%	75%	72%	68%
JKKTT009	90%	87%	85%	80%	78%	75%	69%
JKKTT010	91%	85%	83%	79%	74%	68%	65%

Trend data of ten commercial batches (dissolution shift upon stability)

#### **TABLE 7: MODEL EVALUATION**

Response	Response Terms included in reduced Co- efficient P-Value R-square model											
	Constant	6.643	0.013									
	Conc of Sodium Starch Glycolate	1.391	0.074									
	Conc of Lubricant -0.931 0.111											
	Ratio of Starch to Lactose	0.738	0.144		acceptable							
	PSD of Lactose	0.280	0.338									
Tablet Content	Tablet ContentConc of Sodium Starch Glycolate-0.8320.126											
Uniformity		P-value for all the										
(AV Value)	98.41%	term is greater										
	than 0.05											
Predication Equation:												
Tablet Content Uniformity (AV value) = $6.643+1.391$ (A)- $0.931$ (B)+ $0.738$ (C)+ $0.280$ (D)												
	- 0.832 (AC	C) -1.103 (AD)										

All the statistical and regression analysis procedure on the response parameters were performed using the DOE methodology <sup>2, 9, 12</sup>. The sets of data obtaining from the statistical analysis were then subjected to computerized regression models including an intercept and main effect terms of each independent variable. Two way interaction terms and a stepwise regression procedure was used to assess all main effects, some two way interactions and quadratic terms for usefulness in the model to obtain a more adequate regression model for each response parameter. A full model is a model that is having all possible terms.

The p-value for all the formulation variables is greater than 0.05 indicates there is no significant impact in content uniformity. The tablet content uniformity Acceptance value (AV) is less than 10.0 at studied range of variables observed. Hence, the range selected will not have any impact on critical quality attribute of drug product.

T.	A	B	LE	8:	Μ	0	DI	EL	E١	/A	L	U	A	T	0]	N	I
----	---	---	----	----	---	---	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	----	---	---

Response	Terms included in reduced	Co- efficient	<b>P-Value</b>	<b>R-square</b>	Justification for		
	model				inclusion		
	Constant	97.631	0.0001				
	Conc. of Sodium Starch	0.5012	0.283		R-square value is		
	Glycolate				acceptable		
	Conc of Lubricant	-1.0000	0.535				
Tablet %	Ratio of Starch to Lactose	0.23000	0.102				
Dissolution	PSD of Lactose	-5.23000	0.068		P-value for all the		
at 30	Conc. of Lubricant*PSD of	3.00000	0.157	97.72%	term is greater		
minutes	Lactose				than 0.05		
Predication Equation:							
Tablet % Dissolution at 30 minutes = $97.631+0.50012(A)-1.0000(B)+0.23000(C)-5.23000(D)$							
+3.0000 (BD)							

The p-value for all the formulation variables is greater than 0.05 indicates insignificant for tablet % Dissolution at 30 minutes. The % Dissolution at 30 minutes greater than 95.0 at studied range of variables observed. Hence, the range selected will not have any impact on critical quality attribute of drug product. The optimum values obtained from the contour plots for the independent variables in order to obtain the best values for each of the four response variables are given in **Table 8**. *In vitro* dissolution data may provide an indication of *invivo* bioavailability, therefore the percentage of drug dissolve at 30 minutes was identified as the response parameter. The optimumized formulation satisfied all constraints simultaneously.

	Effects		
Formulation Variable	Content Uniformity (%)	% Dissolution at 30 minutes	
Main Effect			
Conc. of Sodium Starch Glycolate	2.773	1.000	
Conc. of Lubricant	-1.881	-0.500	
Ratio of Starch to Lactose	1.461	2.500	
PSD of Lactose	0.572	-2.500	
Concentration of SSG* Ratio of Starchto Lactose	-1.613		
Concentration of SSG* PSD of Lactose	-2.211		
Concentration of Lubricant*PSD of Lactose		1.000	
Standardized Effect	12.71	4.303	

#### **TABLE 9: EFFECTS OF FORMULATION VARIABLES**

Summarizes the response tablets properties obtained from the eight formulations in experimental design. The concentration of excipient information and the impact of the variable on response are either positive or negative.

The data of Design of Experiment studies revealed that experimental run within selected range of all the independent variables did not show any impact on Critical Quality Attributes (CQA) and other in process test results. Hence, the selected range can be considered as a design space within which any change will not have any impact on CQA of drug product. The formulation composition was finalized based on formulation optimization. In the formulation optimization studies, impact of Lactose anhydrous PSD, level of sodium starch glycolate ranges for these excipients selected did not have any impact on the *in vitro* dissolution.

# TABLE 10: COMPOSITION OF TETRABENAZINETABLETS

Sr. No.	Ingredient	Mg/tablet
	Stage A Dry mixing	
1	Tetrabenzine	25.000
2	Anhydrous Lactose/Lactose	85.300
	Anhydrous	
3	Pre-gelatinised Starch	6.250
4	Sodium Starch Glycolate	4.500
	Stage B Blending-I	
1	Iron oxide yellow	0.200
2	Talc	0.750
3	Colloidal silicon dioxide	0.500
	Stage C Lubrication-I	
1	Magnesium Stearate	1.000
	Stage D Blending-II	
1	Talc	0.750
	Stage E Lubrication-II	
1	Magnesium Sterate	0.750
	Net weight of Core Tablet (mg)	125.000

Product Name: Tetrabenazine Tablet Strength: 25 mg Batch No.: SR-T-008 Batch Size: 5000 Tablets		Mfg Date: 30/10/15					
		Stability initiation date: 05/11/14 Pack: 112 tablets in 60 cc White HDPE Bottle with 33mm CRC cap with seal, one 2gm silica gel canister					
					Condition	Station (Months)	Dissolution at 30 min
					Initial	0	97%
40 °C / 75% RH	1	94%					
	2	96%					
	3	95%					
	6	97%					
30 °C / 65% RH	1	94%					
	2	95%					
	3	97%					
	6	98%					
25 °C / 60% RH	3	96%					
	6	95%					
	9	96%					
	12	96%					

# TABLE 11: STABILITY DATA OF SCALE UP BATCH (IN VITRO DISSOLUTION)

Stability Data of scale up batch and *in vitro* dissolution data.



FIG. 1 AND 2: GRAPHICAL REPRESENTATION OF DISSOLUTION SHIFT UPON STABILITY



FIG. 3: EFFECT OF VARIABLES

The main effect plot showing impact of formulation variables with in studied range on Tablets Content uniformity and % Dissolution at 30 minutes. Main effect of Formulation process variables on Tables CU and (%) Dissolution at 30 minutes. The absolute effect of selected variables within studied range are less than the standardized effect and the Tablet Content Uniformity Acceptance value (AV) is less than 10.0 and % Dissolution at 30 minutes is more than 95.0%. Hence, it can be concluded that there is no significant impact of selected variables within the studied range on Tablet Content Uniformity and % Dissolution at 30 minutes.



FIG. 4: MAIN EFFECT

International Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Research



FIG. 5: SURFACE PLOT: SURFACE PLOT OF FORMULATION VARIABLES ON TABLETS CONTENT UNIFORMITY AND % DISSOLUTION AT 30 MINUTES

The white area shown overlaid contour plot is the formulation design space. Any of the combination of variables within the formulation design space will show acceptable CU and % Dissolution of the

drug product. The intersecting straight line indicates that the optimized formula is within the formulation design space.



FIG. 6: DESIGN SPACE: DESIGN SPACE FOR FORMULATION VARIABLES ON TABLET CU AND % DISSOLUTION

The data of Design of Experiment studies revealed that experimental run within selected range of all the independent variables did not show any impact on Critical Quality Attributes (CQA) and other in process test results. Hence, the selected range can be considered as a design space within which any change will not have any impact on CQA of drug product.

**CONCLUSION:** In this TBZ tablet formulation development, computer assisted regression analysis and mathematics model can be utilized to produce accurate representation of the relationship between the independent variables and tablets response properties and optimize a suitable tablet formulation. The optimization technique can help us to further define and control the whole system.

The dry granulation process selection as well as proportion of excipient could be optimized successfully. By implementation of eight experiments the effect of two level four factors and their interactions were determined. Not significant factors were identified and eliminated early. A Design space which guaranties a product having specified quality attributes has been found. Factorial design applications are used to optimizing the formulation as well as to overcome the dissolution shift.

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST:** All authors have none to declare.

#### **REFERENCES:**

- 1. Patil AS, Pethe AM: (Quality by Design (QbD): A new concept for development of quality pharmaceuticals). International journal of pharmaceutical quality assurance 2013; 4(2): 13-19.
- 2. Rathore AS: (Road map for implementation of Quality by Design (QbD) for biotechnology products). Trends in Biotechnology 2014; 27: 546-553.
- 3. Woodcock J: (The concept of pharmaceutical quality). American Pharmaceutical Review, 2014; 7(60): 10-15.
- 4. Brewer PC: (Six sigma helps a company create a culture of accountability). Journal of organizational excellence 2015; 23(3): 45-59.
- 5. Gabor C and Munteanu D: (A short overview on six sigma). Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov 2014; 3(52): 183-188.
- 6. Gupta N: (An overview of six sigma: Quality Improvement program). International Journal of technical research and applications 2014; 1(1): 29-39.
- Cassidy OE and Thomas WI: Characterisation of wet masses using a powder rheometer, Poster Session 1 -Pharmaceutics., Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmacology 2013; 54: 25-46.
- Freeman C and Armstrong B: The characterisation of granulation wet masses using powder rheometry, 5<sup>th</sup> International Granulation Workshop, Lausanne, Switzerland 2015.
- Yu LX, Amidon G and Khan MA: Understanding pharmaceutical quality by design. AAPS J 2014; 16:771– 783.
- Harry MJ: Six sigma: A break through strategy for profitability. 5<sup>th</sup> ed., Quality program 2013.
- 11. Ennis BJ, Witt W, Weinekoter R, Sphar D, Gommeran E, Snow RH, Allen T, Raymus GJ and Litster JD: Solid-Solid Operations and Processing, in: DW. Green and RH Perry, (Eds.), Perry's Chemical Engineers' Handbook, 8 edn, McGraw-Hill Professional, New York 2013.
- 12. Freeman R: Measuring the flow properties of consolidated, conditioned and aerated powders-A comparative study using a powder rheometer and a rotational shear cell, Powder Technology 2014; 174: 25-33.

#### How to cite this article:

Roy S, Kannan K and Choulwar A: Optimization of Tetrabenazine tablet formulation to meet the required dissolution profile and content uniformity. Int J Pharm Sci Res 2017; 8(7): 2940-48.doi: 10.13040/IJPSR.0975-8232.8(7).2940-48.

All © 2013 are reserved by International Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Research. This Journal licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License.

This article can be downloaded to **ANDROID OS** based mobile. Scan QR Code using Code/Bar Scanner from your mobile. (Scanners are available on Google Playstore)