IJPSR (2020), Volume 11, Issue 8



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES AND RESEARCH



Received on 25 August 2019; received in revised form, 24 December 2019; accepted, 19 April 2020; published 01 August 2020

FORMULATION CHARACTERIZATION AND OPTIMIZATION OF CEFIXIME TRI-HYDRATE HYDROGEL TABLET BY USING DESIGN EXPERT

Lalita Devi^{*}, Punam Gaba and Neelam Sharma

Department of Pharmaceutics, Amar Shaheed Baba Ajit Singh Jujhar Singh Memorial College of Pharmacy, Bela - 140111, Punjab, India.

Keywords:

Cefixime trihydrate hydrogel tablet, ANOVA, Drug release, Microbial assay

Correspondence to Author: Lalita Devi

Research Scholar, Department of Pharmaceutics, Amar Shaheed Baba Ajit Singh Jujhar Singh Memorial College of Pharmacy, Bela - 140111, Punjab, India.

E-mail: pharmacist.lalita@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: The purpose of current research work has been made to formulate a gastro-retentive drug delivery system (GRDDS) of those drugs having a narrow absorption window or having good absorption at the proximal part of the gastrointestinal tract (GIT) to deliver at stomach site and to improve the bioavailability of a drug. Gastro-retentive hydrogel tablet of Cefixime trihydrate was prepared by the direct compression method via using carbopol 940 and chitosan with different concentrations. Cefixime is a very poorly water-soluble drug after its oral administration so that it is slowly and incompletely absorbed from the gastrointestinal tract, which results within poor bioavailability i.e., 40-50%. Hydrogel was characterized concerning diverse parameters with mechanical strength, swelling ratio, invitro drug release, etc. The drug release from a combination of carbopol 940 and chitosan-based hydrogel showed for a prolonged period. A 3^2 full factorial design was utilized to optimize the tablet of cefixime trihydrate by selecting an amount of carbopol 940 and chitosan as independent variables and effects were observed on drug release and swelling index. Comparison study of antimicrobial activity of optimized batch and the marketed formulation was evaluated against gram-positive (Staphylococcus aureus) and gram-negative bacteria (Escherichia coli) by the zone of inhibition. The optimized batch gave desired results at 16 h as a time for 84.99% drug release and % swelling index, as 93% achieved. Stability studies demonstrated no change in physical appearance and an insignificant difference in drug release and swelling index.

INTRODUCTION: There are many administration routes for introducing the drug into the systemic circulation. Oral administration is one of that, it is a common and convenient strategy due to the ease of administration, and minimal effort treatment leads to higher levels of patient compliance 1,2 .

| | DOI: 10.13040/IJPSR.0975-8232.11(8).3824-33 | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | This article can be accessed online on www.ijpsr.com | | | | | | |
| DOI link: http://dx.doi.org/10.13040/IJPSR.0975-8232.11(8).3824-33 | | | | | | | |

Some drugs like Cefditoren pivoxil, Cefixime trihydrate having a narrow therapeutic absorption window in the upper gastrointestinal tract, which methodology is not suitable for it because of the short transit time of selected dosage form in the part of GIT leads to lesser bioavailability.

Gastroretentive dosage form such as oral hydrogel is a recent advancement of novel drug delivery system which is utilized to prolonging the drug release and to improve the absorption ³. The advancement of oral hydrogel was developed with a target to hold the dosage form in the gastric condition ⁴. These medication conveyance frameworks keep up its consistency all through the

stomach and swell with time in the stomach condition for a controlled medication discharge⁵. Hydrogels are 3D (three dimensional), crossconnected systems of water solvent polymers (hvdrophilic polymers). Thev have the characteristics to absorb a considerable amount of water and swell without dissolving. It is biocompatible, transport great property, biodegradable. Hydrogels have some novel advantages for the delivery and controlled discharge of bioactive molecules, medications, and cell ⁶. Cefixime trihydrate is a third-generation Cephalosporin antibiotic^{7, 8}. It belongs to a BCS Class 2 category; it has a Low Solubility, High Permeability. It is utilized in the treatment of various diseases such as gonorrhea, bacterial infection UTI, tonsillitis, bronchitis, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and pneumonia. A natural polymer involves polysaccharides such as alginate, chitosan, and proteins, such as gelatin and collagen are utilized to form a hydrogel ^{9,10}.

Cefixime trihydrate is very stable in the existence of *beta-lactamase* enzymes. Therefore, numerous organisms resistant to penicillins and few cephalosporins because of the nearness of betalactamases, might be vulnerable to cefixime¹¹. Dose dumping is avoided in the case of a controlled drug delivery system, and the outcome is that most therapeutic administration of a specific drug to a definite person with a specific disease ¹². The current research work was mainly targeted to prepare the optimized swellable hydrogel matrix preparations for controlled drug delivery and to examine the drug release rate of cefixime trihydrate.

MATERIALS AND METHODS: Cefixime trihydrate received as a gift sample from Theon pharmaceutical Ltd. Nalagarh, India. Chitosan, Carbopol 940, Magnesium Stearate, Talc, Lactose were obtained from Loba Chemie laboratory reagents and fine chemicals Pvt. Ltd; Starch was obtained from HIMEDIA.

Experimental:

Formulation Development of Hydrogel Tablet:

Preliminary Trial: Preliminary batches (P1-P12) were formulated for the screening of polymer. The hydrogel tablet ingredients were weighed in **Table 1** accurately. A combination of carbopol 940 and chitosan showed the drug was released in **Table 2** in a controlled manner and more swelling property **Table 3**.

TABLE 1: PRELIMINARY STUDY OF CEFIXIMETRIHYDRATE (P1-P12)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Ingredient (mg) | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | P6 | P7 | P8 | P9 | P10 | P11 | P12 |
| Cefixime Trihydrate | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Carbopol 940 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | - | - | - | - | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 |
| Chitosan | - | - | - | - | 5 | 10 | 15 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 5 |
| Lactose | 45 | 35 | 25 | 15 | 50 | 45 | 40 | 35 | 25 | 25 | 10 | 10 |
| Magnesium stearate | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Talc | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Starch | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 |

TABLE 2: IN-VITRO DRUG RELEASE vs. TIME (P1-P12)

| Time (h) | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | P6 | P7 | P8 | P9 | P10 | P11 | P12 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 9.25 | 5.16 | 6.59 | 6.35 | 57.13 | 55.95 | 51.12 | 62.12 | 4.42 | 4.58 | 10.31 | 5.10 |
| 2 | 18.99 | 13.32 | 13.91 | 14.65 | 77.47 | 89.23 | 81.12 | 87.12 | 7.41 | 6.73 | 15.65 | 10.93 |
| 3 | 13.50 | 40.37 | 50.10 | 21.74 | | | | | 8.40 | 9.70 | 18.00 | 15.93 |
| 4 | 72.00 | 71.02 | 78.81 | 43.05 | | | | | 12.45 | 22.88 | 26.23 | 21.21 |
| 5 | 91.70 | 87.00 | 82.34 | 59.35 | | | | | 13.62 | 30.16 | 27.32 | 22.32 |
| 6 | 97.50 | 99.97 | 97.05 | 72.35 | | | | | 21.89 | 30.34 | 28.43 | 27.98 |
| 7 | | | | 94.64 | | | | | 36.21 | 37.65 | 32.54 | 30.23 |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | 43.54 | 48.89 | 48.97 | 41.21 |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | 51.08 | 61.78 | 53.27 | 50.35 |
| 10 | | | | | | | | | 60.56 | 65.18 | 61.23 | 63.78 |
| 12 | | | | | | | | | 69.89 | 77.83 | 71.12 | 72.73 |
| 14 | | | | | | | | | 75.89 | 89.75 | 86.23 | 80.12 |
| 16 | | | | | | | | | 89.76 | 92.43 | 93.42 | 87.32 |

TABLE 3: SWELLING INDEX (P1-P12)

| | | (| -/ | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|----|----|-----------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Formulations | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | P6 | P7 | P8 | P9 | P10 | P11 | P12 |
| % Swelling Index | 66.66% | 74.76% | 76.76% | 79.98% | - | - | - | - | 90.90% | 88.88% | 92.85% | 93.33% |

Formulation Development of Hydrogel Tablet: In the preliminary study, the selection of chitosan and carbopol polymers for the formulation of hydrogel tablets. The hydrogel tablet ingredients were weighed accurately. The ingredients were then passed through at 20 mesh sieve and properly mixed. Finally, the blends were mixed for 5 min, after the addition of magnesium stearate and talc ¹³. The blends were compressed using a single punch tablet machine. Then the combination of carbopol 940 and chitosan **Table 4** further batches (F1-F9) was prepared. The Batch size of each formulation was 200mg.

| TARLE 4. TARLE ODTIMIZED | CONCENTRATION OF | DOI VMED FOD DDEDAI | A TION OF HVDDOCEL | TABLET |
|--------------------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------|
| TADLE 4: TADLE OPTIMIZED | CUNCENTRATION OF | PUL I MEK FUK PKEPAI | SATION OF HIDROGEL | IADLEI |

| Formulation Ingredients (mg) | F1 | F2 | F3 | F4 | F5 | F6 | F7 | F8 | F9 |
|------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Cefixime Trihydrate | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Carbopol 940 | -1 | -1 | -1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +1 | +1 | +1 |
| | 20 | 20 | 20 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| Chitosan | -1 | 0 | +1 | -1 | 0 | +1 | -1 | 0 | +1 |
| | 5 | 10 | 15 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 5 | 10 | 15 |
| Lactose | 30 | 25 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Magnesium stearate | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| Talc | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 |
| Starch | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 |

Preparation of Cefixime Trihydrate Hydrogel Tablet by Utilizing Experimental Design: To optimize the formulation variables, factors selected for the study were a concentration of carbopol 940 and chitosan. The factors were selected based on preliminary studies carried out before the experimental design was being accomplished. Various batches were prepared as per the 3D surface design, and a total of 9 runs were introduced by the Design Expert® software ¹⁴. The response or dependent variables studied were drug release and swelling index. Experimental findings were analyzed using ANOVA by fitting the response **Table 5** in the run design **Fig. 1(A-D)**.



FIG. 1: IMAGES OF CONTOUR PLOTS (A–B) AND THREE DIMENSIONAL SURFACE RESPONSE PLOTS (C–D) SHOWING THE EFFECT OF *IN-VITRO* DRUG RELEASE, SWELLING INDEX

International Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Research

| Batches | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Response 1 | Response 2 |
|---------|-------------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|
| | X1 (carbopol 940) | X2 (chitosan) | (% drug release) | (swelling index) |
| F1 | -1 | -1 | 72.48 | 87.5 |
| F2 | -1 | 0 | 71.23 | 89.23 |
| F3 | -1 | 1 | 75.23 | 88.23 |
| F4 | 0 | -1 | 78.12 | 89.12 |
| F5 | 0 | 0 | 80.27 | 90.9 |
| F6 | 0 | 1 | 82.31 | 91.22 |
| F7 | 1 | -1 | 80.87 | 88.12 |
| F8 | 1 | 0 | 83.24 | 92.52 |
| F9 | 1 | 1 | 85.67 | 93.33 |

TABLE 5: EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN DEPICTING FORMULATION VARIABLES AND THE OBTAINEDRESPONSES FOR THE STUDIED BATCHES

Characterization of Cefixime Trihydrate Hydrogel Tablet:

Examination of Drug Excipients Interaction: Analysis of possible incompatibilities between an active pharmaceutical ingredient and distinct excipients forms is a chief part of the preformulation phase during the formulation of the stable dosage form FTIR Spectroscopy was utilized to the characterization of drug excipients interaction study. The results were shown in **Fig. 2**



FIG. 2: (A) FTIR SPECTRUM OF CEFIXIME TRIHYDRATE, (B) FTIR SPECTRA OF CEFIXIME TRIHYDRATE AND EXCIPIENTS

Evaluation of Hydrogel Tablet Characteristics: Cefixime Trihydrate Hydrogel Tablets (F1-F9) of pre-compression parameters angle of repose, bulk density, tapped density, Hausner's ratio and carr's index **Table 6** and post-compression parameters for drug content uniformity, weight variation, friability, thickness, and hardness **Table 7** was evaluated. Drug content was analyzed using Shimadzu UV-visible spectrophotometer at 287 nm, and the % drug content was estimated ^{16, 17}.

| Formulations | Angle of Repose | Bulk Density | Tapped | Hausner's | Carr's |
|--------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| | (0) | (g/cc) | Density(g/cc) | Ratio | Index |
| F1 | 26.37±0.323 | 0.55 ± 0.009 | 0.80±0.015 | 1.43±0.01 | 30.47±0.402 |
| F2 | 25.54 ± 0.594 | 0.56 ± 0.004 | 0.79 ± 0.012 | 1.39 ± 0.03 | 28.14 ± 0.780 |
| F3 | 28.34±0.235 | 0.53 ± 0.005 | 0.74 ± 0.006 | 1.39 ± 0.01 | 28.41±0.938 |
| F4 | 28.66±0.259 | 0.58 ± 0.004 | 0.85 ± 0.008 | 1.45 ± 0.005 | 31.52±0.219 |
| F5 | 28.06±0.382 | 0.57 ± 0.003 | 0.78 ± 0.006 | 1.37 ± 0.005 | 27.38±0.196 |
| F6 | 27.20±0.369 | 0.50 ± 0.003 | 0.69 ± 0.008 | 1.35 ± 0.005 | 26.69±0.230 |
| F7 | 25.83±0.147 | 0.52 ± 0.003 | 0.72 ± 0.006 | 1.39 ± 000 | 28.25±0.150 |
| F8 | 29.15±0.063 | 0.57 ± 0.004 | 0.79 ± 0.007 | 1.37 ± 0.005 | 27.71±0.173 |
| F9 | 29.80±0.232 | 0.56 ± 0.004 | 0.78 ± 0.0005 | 1.37 ± 0.011 | 27.57±0.505 |



| Formulations | Average Weight | Content | Diameter | Thickness | Hardness | Friability |
|--------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------|
| | (mg) | uniformity % | (mm) | (mm) | (Kg/cm ²) | (%) |
| F1 | 195.25±0.05 | 99.23 | 8.2±0.01 | 3.4 | 6.5 ± 0.05 | 0.510 |
| F2 | 194.60±0.04 | 100 | 8.3±0.05 | 3.5 ± 0.05 | 6.3±0.05 | 0.506 |
| F3 | 196.60±0.05 | 98.45 | 8.3±0.00 | 3.5 ± 0.05 | 6.5 ± 0.05 | 0.503 |
| F4 | 197.20±0.01 | 98.99 | 8.3±0.05 | 3.7 ± 0.05 | 6.5 ± 0.1 | 0.588 |
| F5 | 196.75±0.01 | 99.67 | 8.5 ± 0.05 | 3.4 ± 0.05 | 6.5 ± 0.05 | 0.506 |
| F6 | 195.40±0.05 | 98.12 | 8.3±0.05 | 3.8±0.05 | 6.4 ± 0.04 | 0.512 |
| F7 | 196.95±0.02 | 99.89 | 8.3±0.05 | 3.6±0.05 | 6.5 ± 0.05 | 0.502 |
| F8 | 194.2±0.05 | 100.2 | 8.5 ± 0.05 | 3.5 ± 0.05 | 6.6±0.05 | 0.503 |
| F9 | 197.3±0.01 | 100 | 8.4 ± 0.05 | 3.3 ± 0.05 | 6.7 ± 0.05 | 0.502 |

Water Uptake Studies: The swelling index for the formulations Fig. 3 was estimated by placing the weighed tablets in the medium (900ml pH 7.2) at 37 ± 0.5 °C. Frequently the tablets were separate from the medium and were reweighed and calculate the water uptake according to given formula (swelling index)¹⁸.

Water uptake % = Weighed of the swollen tablet - Initial weight of tablet \times 100 / Initial weight of the tablet



In-vitro **Drug Release Studies and Release Kinetic Study:** The *in-vitro* drug release study of hydrogel tablet was accomplished for entire experimental batches (F1-F9) **Table 8** utilizing standard USP dissolution test apparatus at 37 ± 0.5 °C with constant stirring rate 50 rpm **Fig. 4**. The dissolution medium is already validated according to IP, and the sink condition is also maintained by adding fresh phosphate buffer. A 200 mg hydrogel tablet was tested for drug release firstly in 0.1 N HCl (900 ml) for 2 h as the average gastric emptying time is about 2 h.

The dissolution medium was then replaced with pH 7.2 phosphate buffer (900 ml), and the drug release study was carried out for further 16 h. A sample volume of 5ml was withdrawn from each dissolution vessel at regular intervals and replaced with equal volumes of fresh dissolution medium. The sample was filtered and analyzed spectrophotometrically. The cumulative % drug release Fig. 5 of optimized batch vs. time shown in Table 9. The kinetic release study of optimized batch Table 10 was evaluated using following these models: first-order, zero-order. Higuchi, Korsmeyer - Peppas models¹⁹.

TABLE 8: IN-VITRO DRUG RELEASE DATA COMPARISON F1-F9

| Time (h) | F1 | F2 | F3 | F4 | F5 | F6 | F7 | F8 | F9 |
|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 6.49 | 7.62 | 10.82 | 5.43 | 7.00 | 6.35 | 5.12 | 6.12 | 5.85 |
| 4 | 14.40 | 16.27 | 19.12 | 12.23 | 14.76 | 9.24 | 7.89 | 26.12 | 19.48 |
| 6 | 25.54 | 28.44 | 31.41 | 28.02 | 29.18 | 22.03 | 22.34 | 39.18 | 34.12 |
| 8 | 33.32 | 35.61 | 42.22 | 43.12 | 37.21 | 32.83 | 37.12 | 53.23 | 52.89 |
| 10 | 44.51 | 45.12 | 54.11 | 55.12 | 53.02 | 46.94 | 57.85 | 65.23 | 65.12 |
| 12 | 53.23 | 59.25 | 62.54 | 64.45 | 65.18 | 59.32 | 68.32 | 77.12 | 76.34 |
| 14 | 69.05 | 68.23 | 68.43 | 74.67 | 74.18 | 75.34 | 73.00 | 80.23 | 82.45 |
| 16 | 72.48 | 70.21 | 73.43 | 76.98 | 80.27 | 81.23 | 80.87 | 83.24 | 85.67 |



FIG. 4: % DRUG RELEASE vs. TIME (F1-F9) FORMULATIONS

FIG. 5: OPTIMIZED BATCH (O) OF CUMULATIVE % DRUG RELEASE vs. TIME

| FABLE 9: OPTIMIZED BATCH | (0) |) CUMULATIVE % | 6 DRUG RELEASE vs. | TIME |
|---------------------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------------|------|
| | (U | | O DRCG RELEIGE /S. | |

| Time | pН | Square root | Cumulative % drug | Log cumulative | Cumulative % | Log Cumulative % |
|--------------|--------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|
| (h) | | of time | released | % drug released | drug retained | drug retained |
| 0 | 0.1 N | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 2 |
| 1 | HC1 | 1 | 5.58±0.18 | 0.746 | 94.42 | 1.975 |
| 2 | | 1.41 | 11.07±0.27 | 1.044 | 88.93 | 1.949 |
| 3 | pH 7.2 | 1.73 | 17.05±0.66 | 1.231 | 82.95 | 1.918 |
| 4 | | 2 | 31.35±1.53 | 1.496 | 68.65 | 1.836 |
| 5 | | 2.23 | 50.55±1.78 | 1.703 | 49.45 | 1.694 |
| 6 | | 2.44 | 65.84±0.42 | 1.818 | 34.16 | 1.533 |
| 7 | | 2.64 | 70.02±0.46 | 1.845 | 29.98 | 1.476 |
| 8 | | 2.82 | 71.27±1.00 | 1.852 | 28.73 | 1.458 |
| 9 | | 3 | 73.04±0.96 | 1.863 | 26.96 | 1.43 |
| 10 | | 3.16 | 76.2±1.77 | 1.881 | 23.8 | 1.376 |
| 11 | | 3.31 | 78.23±1.53 | 1.893 | 21.77 | 1.337 |
| 12 | | 3.46 | 80.27±0.46 | 1.904 | 19.73 | 1.295 |
| 13 | | 3.6 | 81.69±0.26 | 1.912 | 18.31 | 1.262 |
| 14 | | 3.74 | 83.03±0.13 | 1.919 | 16.97 | 1.229 |
| 15 | | 3.87 | 83.83±0.41 | 1.923 | 16.17 | 1.208 |
| 16 | | 4 | 84.99±0.55 | 1.929 | 15.01 | 1.176 |

Each value represents mean ±S.D. (n=3)

TABLE 10: KINETIC STUDY OF OPTIMIZED BATCH (O)

| Kinetic Model | Zero Order | First Order | Higuchi | Korsmeyer Peppas |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------------------|---------|------------------|
| K0 | 5.593 (mg/sec.) | $0.056 (\text{sec.}^{-1})$ | 26.42 | 1.289 |
| \mathbb{R}^2 | 0.843 | 0.943 | 0.906 | 0.861 |

Microbial Assay: The Agar diffusion method was appropriating to examine the antimicrobial activity of the cefixime trihydrate hydrogel tablet. Nutrient agar was prepared and autoclaved then poured into sterile Petri plates in aseptic conditions. After cooling 100 µL of a bacterial log broth culture of *Escherichia coli, Staphylococcus aureus* was spread plated on different nutrient agar plates. The different concentration 10 mg/ml, 20 mg/ml, 30 mg/ml, 40 mg/ml and 50 mg/ml of hydrogel tablet

International Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Research

and marketed formulation are prepared. Wells in agar plates were produced by punching, and the tablet was added to the wells.

The plates were incubated for 18-24 h at 37 ± 0.5 °C, and the zone of inhibition **Fig. 6** of the hydrogel tablet and the marketed formulation was calculated in **Table 11** on the next day ²⁰.

| TABLE | 11: | ZONE | OF | INHIBITION | OF | MI | CRO- |
|--------|-------|--------|----|------------|-----|----|------|
| BIOLOG | ICAL | ASSAY | OF | OPTIMIZED | BAT | СН | AND |
| MARKE | ГЕД І | PRODUC | Т | | | | |

| | - | | | | |
|---------|---------|------------|----------------------|-----------|--|
| Conc. | Optim | ized batch | Marketed formulation | | |
| (mg/ml) | E. coli | S. aureus | E. coli | S. aureus | |
| 10 | 15 mm | 9 mm | 14 mm | 8 mm | |
| 20 | 17 mm | 10 mm | 16 mm | 11 mm | |
| 30 | 17 mm | 15 mm | 17 mm | 13 mm | |
| 40 | 19 mm | 17 mm | 18 mm | 15 mm | |
| 50 | 22 mm | 21 mm | 19 mm | 17 mm | |



FIG. 6: ZONE OF INHIBITION CEFIXIME TRIHYDRATE HYDROGEL TABLET AND MARKETED PRODUCT CEFIXIME TRIHYDRATE

Data Analysis and Validation of the Optimization Model: The responses (% drug release and swelling index) were investigated by a two way ANOVA – based factorial analysis **Table 12.1, 12.2.** A response surface methodology computation for the current optimization was performed utilizing Design expert trial version 11. The data were fitted to the second-order polynomial equation, and the acceptability of a fitting response was studied by analysis of variance (ANOVA). The statistical significance was set to p<0.05, and the creating response surfaces, residual plots, contour plots were studied ²¹.

| Source | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F-value | p-value | |
|----------------|----------------|----|-------------|----------------|---------|-------------|
| Model | 192.97 | 5 | 38.59 | 36.74 | 0.0068 | |
| A-C:carbopol | 158.52 | 1 | 158.52 | 150.89 | 0.0012 | |
| B-C:chitoson | 22.97 | 1 | 22.97 | 21.87 | 0.0185 | |
| AB | 1.05 | 1 | 1.05 | 1.00 | 0.3910 | Significant |
| A ² | 8.93 | 1 | 8.93 | 8.50 | 0.0617 | - |
| B ² | 1.50 | 1 | 1.50 | 1.43 | 0.3177 | |
| Residual | 3.15 | 3 | 1.05 | | | |
| Cor Total | 196 13 | 8 | | | | |

| TABLE 12.1: ANOVA FOR RESPONSE DRUG RELEASE OUADRATIC MODEL |
|---|
|---|

TABLE 12.2: ANOVA FOR RESPONSE SWELLING INDEX QUADRATIC MODEL

| Source | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F-value | p-value | |
|----------------|----------------|----|-------------|----------------|---------|-------------|
| Model | 33.38 | 5 | 6.68 | 31.54 | 0.0085 | |
| A-C: carbopol | 13.53 | 1 | 13.53 | 63.92 | 0.0041 | |
| B-C: chitoson | 10.77 | 1 | 10.77 | 50.90 | 0.0057 | |
| AB | 5.02 | 1 | 5.02 | 23.70 | 0.0166 | Significant |
| A ² | 0.7001 | 1 | 0.7001 | 3.31 | 0.1665 | |
| B ² | 3.36 | 1 | 3.36 | 15.89 | 0.0283 | |
| Residual | 0.6350 | 3 | 0.2117 | | | |
| Cor Total | 34.02 | 8 | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Stability Study: Stability testing of an optimized formulation hydrogel tablet was performing at 40 ± 2 °C and $75 \pm 5\%$ RH for time interval as per ICH

guidelines. The characterization parameters for stability study included drug content, swelling index and % drug release are determined ²².

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

Screening of Constituents and Preformulation **Examination:** In the preliminary stage, recognition was given to choose the real concentration of carbopol 940 and chitosan for good swelling characteristics and release rate. Carbopol 940 and chitosan is utilizing as a gelling agent. The combination of carbopol 940 and chitosan formulation shows the results is the drug is released in a controlled manner and good swelling index. The extent of other excipients like magnesium stearate, talc, starch, lactose was selected according to formulations. The pre-compression parameters of batches, for example, Hausner's ratio, bulk density, tapped density, and carrs index results, are established by recommended limits indicated as Indian Pharmacopoeia.

The drug content was assessed, and it is showing the drug has been uniformly loaded in the tablet. The selected levels of both factors were optimized utilizing design expert software. 3^2 Response surface design enabled the prediction of interaction among independent variables and its effect on the dependent variables. It was utilized to examine how the responses change when two factors are changed at the same time. Consequently, 3^2 surface designs were utilized to optimize the batches of hydrogel tablets containing cefixime trihydrate. To produce optimized batch, different equations and regression behaviors were examined and fitted into the software. A statistical model polynomial term was utilized to assess the responses.

The data clearly demonstrates that the drug release and swelling index were strongly dependent on the selected independent variables. The optimized batch microbial assay zone of inhibition was counted by using *Escherichia coli, Staphylococcus aureus*. Therefore, the stability study was performed according to ICH guidelines; there is no significant change in the optimized batch.

Characterization of Drug-Excipients Interaction Study: Standard cefixime trihydrate spectra shows that 2989.97 cm⁻¹ (C-H Stretch), 3405.97 cm⁻¹ (N-H Stretch), 1767.02 cm⁻¹ (C=O Stretch), 3135.56 cm⁻¹ (Ar-C-H Stretch), 1662.59 cm⁻¹ (C=N Stretch), 1585.04 cm⁻¹ (C=C stretch). The FTIR spectra shows drug - excipients shows in figure 2989.97 cm⁻¹ (C-H Stretch), 3405.97 cm⁻¹ (N-H Stretch), 1767.02 cm⁻¹ (C=O Stretch), 3135.56 cm⁻¹ (Ar-C-H Stretch), 1662.59 cm⁻¹ (C=N Stretch), 1585.04 cm⁻¹ (C=C stretch), there is no change in peaks of cefixime trihydrate compound.

Optimization of Independent Variables: Results from preliminary examination recommended that a combination of carbopol 940 (5-20%) and chitosan (1-10%) effects on the % drug release and swelling index. The medication is released in a controlled way.

Optimization of Dependent Variables: Response 1 (% Drug Release):

 $Y1 = 79.66 + 5.4X1 + 1.96X2 + 0.512X1X2 - 2.11X1^2 + 0.86X2^2$

 R^2 value = 0.9839, quadratic model

ANOVA was applied to assess the significance (p< 0.05) of the model and individual response parameters **Table 12.1**. The model F-Value of 36.74 implies the model was significant. There is just a 0.68% possibility that an F-value this large could happen due to noise. Estimation of probability <0.0500 shows model terms are significant.

For this case A, B is a significant model term. Those model terms are not significant, which are the values greater than 0.1000. The contour plot and 3-D surface response plot in **Fig. 1** demonstrated the effect of various independent variables on the % drug release.

Response 2 (Swelling Index):

 $Y2 = 91.28 + 1.50X1 + 1.34X2 + 1.12X1X2 - 0.59X1^{2} - 1.30X2^{2}$ R² value = 0.9813, quadratic model

After ANOVA estimation the quadratic model F-value of 31.54 implies the model is significant in **Table 12.2**. There is only a 0.85% chance that an F-value this large could occur due to noise. The value of Probability (P) <0.0500 shows model terms are significant. In this case, A, B, AB, B² are significant model terms. The 3-D surface response plot and contour plot in **Fig. 1** demonstrates the effect of different independent variables on the % swelling index.

Stability Study: The Optimized batch (O) were selected, according to ICH guidelines, the hydrogel

tablets were again analyzed for drug content, Swelling index, and *in-vitro* drug release study. The stability studies of the optimized batch showed insignificant changes in the stability parameters.

CONCLUSION: The purpose of the current research work was to formulate the hydrogel gastro-retentive hydrogel tablet by utilizing 3^2 surface design and assess various formulations parameters.

FT-IR studies revealed that there was no interaction between cefixime and the polymers used. The drug release from the combination of carbopol 940 and chitosan-based hydrogel showed for a prolonged period of time. The optimized batch gave desired results at 16 h as the time for 85% drug release and % swelling index as 93% accomplished.

Comparison study of antimicrobial activity of optimized batch and the marketed formulation was assessed against gram-positive (Staphylococcus aureus) and gram-negative bacteria (Escherichia coli) by a zone of inhibition. The optimized formulation was found to have better activity in both Escherichia coli and Staphylococcus aureus than the marketed formulation of the drug. Stability studies demonstrated no change in physical uniformity, appearance, content and an insignificant difference in hardness, drug release, and swelling index.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: The authors are thankful to Amar Shaheed Baba Ajit Singh Jujhar Singh Memorial, College of Pharmacy, for providing necessary facilities for research work.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST: Authors declare no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES:

- 1. Parthiban KG, Muthuswamy R and Deepan D: Formulation and evaluation of superporous hydrogel tablets of rabeprazole sodium as a gastroretentive system. European Journal of Pharmaceutical and Medical Research 2018; 5: 271-78.
- 2. Kaur R, Gupta VK and Pandey SC: Preparation and evaluation of hydrogel nanoparticles as drug delivery system. Journal of Nanomedicine & Nanotechnology 2019; 10: 1-7.
- 3. Juthi AZ and Wang B: Super porous hydrogel: a promising gastroretentive drug delivery system. World Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences 2017; 6: 129-59.
- 4. Larush L, Kaner I, Fluksman A, Tamsut A, Ashok PA, Lesnovski P, Benny O and Magdassi S: 3D printing of

responsive hydrogels for drug-delivery systems. Journal of 3D Printing in Medicine 2017; 1: 219-29.

- Lindsey AS, Adam MD, Sarena DH and Peppas NA: Therapeutic applications of hydrogels in oral drug delivery. J Exp Opin on Drug Delivery 2014; 11: 901-15.
- Han Y, Yang W, Cu W, Yang Ke, Wang X, Chen Y, Deng L, Zhao Y and Jin W: Development of functional hydrogels for heart failure. Journal of Material Chemistry 2019; 7: 1563-80.
- Nagam SP, Naga AJ, Poojitha J, Aruna S and Nadendla RR: A Comprehensive review on hydrogels. International J of Current Pharmaceutical Research 2016; 8: 19-23.
- 8. Tulshi C, Saini V and Rubi: Formulation and evaluation of controlled release floating tablets of cefixime using hydrophilic polymers. Int Res J of Phar 2019; 10: 171-75.
- 9. Singh VJ, Singh H and Kumar SS: Recent trends on hydrogel in human body. International Journal Research Pharmaceutical Biomedical Science 2011; 2: 442-47.
- Younis MK, Tareq AZ and Kamal IM: Optimization of swelling, drug loading and release from natural polymer hydrogels. International Conference on Materials Engineering and Science 2018; 454: 1-14.
- 11. Mogal P and Derle D: Cefixime, in general class 4 drugs but individually class 2 drugs. Journal Medical Physiology Therapy 2017; 2: 1-10.
- 12. Akelesh T, Johnson S, Samantha S and Chander SJU: Formulation and evaluation of floating tablets of cefixime trihydrate using chitosan. Research Journal of Pharmacy and Technology 2015; 8: 1502-08.
- Venugopalarao G, Sreenivas GM and Sarada NC: Formulation evaluation and stability studies of hydrogel tablets containing cefditoren pivoxil. Journal of Pharmacy Research 2013; 7: 230-34.
- 14. Jagdish M, Kumbhar DD, Ravindra B, Swati B and Rahul M: Response surface based co-optimization of release kinetics and mucoadhesive strength for an oral mucoadhesive tablet of cefixime trihydrate. Bulletin Faculty of Pharmacy Cario University 2016; 54: 227-35.
- 15. Reddy BV: Formulation development and *in-vitro* evaluation of floating tablets of cefixime. Pharma Tutor 2015; 11: 48-57.
- Sirisolla JD and Ramanamurthy KV: Formulation and evaluation of cefixime trihydrate of matrix tablets using HPMC, Sodium CMC, Ethyl Cellulose. Indian Journal of Pharmaceutical Science 2015; 77: 321-27.
- 17. Patel S and Shah Y: Formulation and evaluation of an antimicrobial drug loaded hydrogel matrix tablets for controlled drug delivery. European Journal of Pharmaceutical and Medical Research 2018; 5: 594-08.
- Younis MK, Tareq AZ and Kamal IM: Optimization of swelling, drug loading and release from natural polymer hydrogels. International Conference on Materials Engineering and Science 2018; 454: 1-14.
- Suvakanta D, Padala MN, Lilakanta N and Chowdhury P: Kinetic modelling on drug release from controlled drug delivery systems. Acta Poloniae Pharmaceutica-drug Research 2010; 67: 217-23.
- Kumar M, Bala R, Singh GV, Kumar PS, Chhibber SJ, Sharma RK and Wangoo N: Combating food pathogens using sodium benzoate functionalized silver nanoparticles: synthesis, characterization and antimicrobial evaluation. Journal Material Science 2017; 52: 8568-75.
- 21. Bose A, Wong TW and Singh N: Formulation development and optimization of sustained release matrix tablet of itopride HCl By response surface methodology and its evaluation of release kinetics. Saudi Pharmaceutical Journal 2013; 21: 201-13.

International Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Research

22. Rencber S, Senyigit Z and Ozyazici M: Stability studies of compression coated ornidazole tablets for colon specific

drug delivery. Journal of Research in Pharmacy 2019; 23: 34-43.

How to cite this article:

Devi L, Gaba P and Sharma N: Formulation characterization and optimization of cefixime trihydrate hydrogel tablet by using design expert. Int J Pharm Sci & Res 2020; 11(8): 3824-33. doi: 10.13040/IJPSR.0975-8232.11(8).3824-33.

All © 2013 are reserved by the 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)