

# **Starch-free grewia gum matrices: Compaction, swelling, erosion and drug release behaviour**

**E.I. Nep<sup>1,2</sup>, K. Asare-Addo<sup>1</sup>, M.U. Ghor<sup>1</sup>, B.R. Conway<sup>1</sup> and A.M. Smith<sup>1\*</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Pharmacy, University of Huddersfield, Queensgate, Huddersfield, UK, HD1, 3DH

<sup>2</sup>Department of Pharmaceutics and Pharmaceutical Technology, Faculty of Pharmaceutical Science, University of Jos, PMB 2084, Jos, Nigeria, 930001

## **\*Correspondence:**

Dr. Alan M. Smith

Tel: +44-1484-472-305

Fax: +44-1484-472-350

[a.m.smith@hud.ac.uk](mailto:a.m.smith@hud.ac.uk)

International Journal of Pharmaceutics

## Abstract


Polysaccharides are suitable for application as hydrophilic matrices because of their ability to hydrate and swell upon contact with fluids, forming a gel layer which controls drug release.

5 When extracted from plants, polysaccharides often contain significant quantities of starch that impacts upon their functional properties. This study aimed to evaluate differences in swelling, erosion and drug release from matrix tablets prepared from grewia gum (GG) and starch-free grewia gum (GDS) extracted from the stems of *Grewia mollis*. HPMC was used as a control polymer with theophylline as a model drug. Swelling, erosion, and *in-vitro* release were  
10 performed in deionized water, pH1.2 and pH6.8 media. The Vergnaud and Krosmeier-Peppas model were used for swelling and drug release kinetics, respectively. However, linear regression technique was used to determine the erosion rate. GDS compacts were significantly harder than the native GG and HPMC compacts. GDS matrices exhibited the fastest erosion and drug release in deionised water and phosphate buffer compared with the  
15 GG and HPMC. At pH1.2, GDS exhibited greater swelling than erosion, and drug release was similar to GG and HPMC. This highlights the potential of GDS as a matrix for controlled release similar to HPMC and GG at pH1.2 but with a more rapid release at pH6.8. GDS may have wider application in reinforcing compacts with relatively low mechanical strength.

**Keywords:** HPMC K4M, grewia gum, starch-free grewia gum, matrix tablets, theophylline

20 **Abbreviations:** HPMC, Hydroxypropyl methylcellulose; GG, native grewia gum; GDS, starch-free grewia gum; GGp, native grewia gum polymer; GDSp, de-starched grewia gum polymer; HPM Cp, hydroxypropyl methylcellulose polymer; HPM Cf, hydroxypropyl methylcellulose formulation; GGf, native grewia gum formulation; GDSf, de-starched grewia gum formulation; HCl, hydrochloric acid; MDT, mean dissolution time; MDR, mean  
25 dissolution rate; DE, dissolution efficiency; DSC, differential scanning calorimetry; USP, United States Pharmacopeia

# Graphical Abstract



Erosion, swelling and drug release from native and starch-free *Grewia mollis* matrices

30

35

## 1. Introduction

40 In the developing world, the pharmaceutical sector depends heavily on petrochemicals due to majority of excipients being imported. Consequently, this accounts for high prices that are beyond the reach of the majority of the local populations, despite the fact that the countries of the developing world are often rich in renewable sources of raw materials suitable for use in the industry. Such materials which are abundant in nature and, can also be cultivated, remain  
45 largely undeveloped. Plant polysaccharides are one particular resource that could be used as alternative excipients and have come under increasing research focus in the design of dosage forms for oral controlled release administration (Naggar et al., 1992; Bonferoni et al., 1993; Kristmundsdóttir et al., 1995; Sujja-areevath et al., 1996; Talukdar et al., 1996; Khullar et al., 1998; Vervoort et al., 1998; Munday and Cox, 2000; Mughal et al., 2011; Nep 2015).  
50 These materials are hydrophilic in nature and when in contact with water they hydrate and swell. This property has been utilized in the formulation of dosage forms (Nakano and Ogata, 1984) where the powdered drug is embedded within the matrix of hydrophilic polymeric materials and compressed to produce matrix tablets. The release of drug from such hydrophilic matrices is described as a complex interaction between swelling, diffusion and  
55 erosion (Harland et al., 1988; Peppas and Sahlin, 1989; Colombo et al., 1990; Lee and Kim, 1991; Colombo et al., 1992; Colombo et al., 1995; Reynolds et al., 1998; Munday and Cox, 2000; Ghori et al., 2014a).

Swelling is the result of the gradual imbibing of water to form an increasingly hydrated gel layer which is the diffusional path length across which the pharmaceutical active is  
60 transported *via* mechanisms of diffusion and gel layer dissolution (Wan et al., 1991; Panomsuket al., 1996). For polysaccharide matrices, this process has been shown to follow square root of time kinetics (Munday and Cox, 2000; Kavanagh and Corrigan, 2004). However, at the interface between the gel layer and the surrounding medium, other

mechanisms, in addition to diffusion, also come into play during drug release from matrices.  
65 The polymer chains gradually disentangle from the interface by erosion, thus enhancing drug  
release. Erosion of the polymer has also been shown to follow cube root of time kinetics  
(Munday and Cox, 2000; Kavanagh and Corrigan, 2004).

Hydroxypropyl methylcellulose (HPMC) is the most widely used of the cellulosic  
controlled release agents, providing outstanding controlled release performance. It is a  
70 hydrophilic cellulose derivative that is non-ionic, with versatile matrix forming ability and is  
used to control the release of soluble and insoluble drugs. The different viscosity grades  
available afford the choice of material forming more or less viscous gels. Furthermore, the  
non-ionic nature of the material enables pH –independent release of drug from tablet matrices  
(Merchant et al., 2006; Sahoo et al., 2008; Mughal et al., 2011).

75 *Grewia mollis* is a shrub which grows wild or cultivated in the middle belt region of  
Nigeria (and other parts of sub-saharan Africa) where the inner bark from the stems of the  
shrub is pulverised and used as a thickener in various food formulations. The native gum  
extract has previously been identified to contain polysaccharides (Okafor, Chukwu & Udeala,  
2001; Nep and Conway, 2011a) and has been evaluated as a pharmaceutical excipient in oral  
80 formulations, as a binder or sustained release matrix (Nep & Conway 2011b), as bioadhesive  
(Nep & Okafor 2006; Nep & Conway 2011c) or as a suspending agent (Nep & Conway  
2011d).

Various extraction methods have been explored and shown to impact the functional  
properties of grewia gum extracts (Ogaji, 2011; Akdowa et al 2014). Furthermore, it has been  
85 reported that the native grewia gum (GG) contains a significant quantity of starch and the  
enzymatic removal results in a starch free material which differs from the native  
polysaccharide in the relative proportion of monosaccharides and physicochemical properties  
(Nep et al., 2015). Consequently, it is anticipated that the starch-free grewia polysaccharide

(GDS) may exhibit different functional properties as compared with the native  
90 polysaccharide, thus providing the potential to diversify the applications using extracts  
produced using different methods.

In the present study, matrix tablets of the starch-free grewia gum were compared with  
similar formulations of the native grewia gum to show the effect of starch digestion on the  
functional application in matrix tablet formulations.

95

## **2. Materials and Methods**

### **2.1 Materials**

Methocel (HPMC K4M) was a kind gift from Colorcon (UK) and was used as  
supplied from manufacturer. Lactose monohydrate (FlowLac<sup>®</sup> 100) was a kind gift from  
100 Meggle (Germany). Magnesium stearate was used as procured from Merck (Germany).  
Anhydrous theophylline (TCI Chemicals, Europe) was used as the model drug. Dissolution  
media were prepared according to the USP 2003 method using the following materials:  
potassium chloride (Acros Organics, UK) and hydrochloric acid (Fisher Scientific, UK) for  
pH 1.2, and potassium phosphate monobasic-white crystals (Fisher BioReagents, UK) and  
105 sodium hydroxide (Fisher Scientific, UK) for pH 6.8 media. Native grewia polysaccharide  
and starch-free grewia polysaccharide were extracted in our laboratory as previously reported  
(Nep et al., 2015).

### **2.2 Extraction of native grewia polysaccharide (GG) and starch free grewia 110 polysaccharide (GDS)**

The method of Nep et al., (2015) was adopted without modification. Briefly, the inner  
stem bark of *Grewia mollis* was dried and shredded. The material was then macerated in  
0.1% sodium metabisulphite for 24 hours. The swollen gum was separated from the residue

by filtration through a muslin bag and the filtrate was precipitated from solution using  
115 absolute ethanol. Further purification was achieved by re-dispersion in water and final  
precipitation in absolute ethanol to give the gum fraction code named GGp which was then  
oven dried at 50 °C for 24 hours. The dried GGp was milled to a particle size of 200 µm  
undersize using a centrifugal mill (ZM 100, Retsch Germany) set at a rotation speed of  
10,000 rpm equipped with a 200 µm mesh filter. The milled powders were then collected and  
120 stored in sealed plastic containers before use in tablet formulation. To obtain the starch-free  
grewia polysaccharide (GDSp), GGp was digested using 1 %w/v dispersion of GGp with  
Termamyl 120 L (1 %v/v) with stirring at 70 °C for 4 hours. Sample pH was adjusted to 4.5  
with 2 M HCl to precipitate the enzyme and the sample was then centrifuged at 4400 rpm for  
20 min. The supernatant was dialysed against deionized water for 72 hours using a cellulose  
125 membrane with molecular weight cut-off at 12500 Da. The material was then precipitated  
using 2 volumes of 95% ethanol followed by a solvent exchange using 1 volume of 95%  
propan-2-ol. The precipitate was oven dried overnight at 50 °C and subsequently, tested for  
starch using 1% v/v iodine in KI solution as described by Nep et al (2015). The starch-free  
grewia polysaccharide (GDSp) was size reduced to a particle size of 200 µm undersize and  
130 stored under the same conditions as the GGp.

Particle size was determined using the Sympatec laser diffraction particle size  
analyser (Clausthal-Zellerfeld, Germany) according to the methodology detailed in Asare-  
Addo et al., (2015). Chemical and physical characterisation of both GGp and GDSp batches  
used in this study are reported in Nep et al., (2015).

### 135 **2.3 Tablet formulation, compression, hardness and dimensions**

The pure polymers (GGp, GDSp and HPMC K4M) were compacted using a single  
punch tableting machine (Model MTCM-1, Globe Pharma US) at 6 different pressures (44.6,  
70.0, 97.4, 125.7, 150.8, and 176.0 MPa) to determine the effect of compression force on the

hardness of the pure polymer compacts and the tablet matrices. HPMC was used as a control  
140 due to its popular use in extended release matrices as a result of its robustness, stability,  
regulatory acceptance and cost effectiveness (Tiwari and Rajabi-Siahboomi, 2008;  
Nokhodchi and Asare-Addo, 2014). In the present study HPMC K4M was chosen as it is a  
mid-range viscosity grade (~4000 cp) and is commonly used in matrix tablets (Ghori et al.,  
2014a). Tablets matrices, containing theophylline as a model drug, were formulated  
145 according to the unit formula in Table 1. Round convex tablets with a diameter of 10.0 mm  
and a target weight of 250 mg were prepared by blending the appropriate amounts of  
ingredients as shown in Table 1 for 10 min in a Turbula<sup>®</sup> (Type T2C, Switzerland) blender  
and tablets formed by compression at 125.7 MPa. The compressed tablets were allowed to  
recover for 24 h, the hardness of the tablets was determined on a hardness tester  
150 (PharmaTest, Germany) while the thickness and diameter of the matrix tablets was measured  
using a digital calliper (Toolzone, UK) .

#### 2.4 Bulk, tapped density and porosity of polymers and formulation blends

The bulk and tapped densities of the pure polymers and formulation blends were  
155 determined by weighing 10 g of the material into a 100 mL measuring cylinder and, without  
disturbing the cylinder the volume was read to give the bulk volume of the powder. The  
measuring cylinder was then tapped until the volume of powder was constant. This represents  
the tapped volume of the polysaccharide gum powder. The bulk or tapped density was  
calculated as the ratio of the weight of powder to the bulk or tapped volume respectively.  
160 Porosity was determined according to equation 1.

$$Tablet\ porosity = \left[ 1 - \left[ \frac{tablet\ weight / tablet\ volume}{true\ density\ of\ powder} \right] \right] \times 100 \quad (1)$$

#### 2.5 True density of the polymers and formulation blends



The true density of the polymers and formulation blends was determined using  
165 Micromeritics Accupyc II pycnometer 100 (Micromeritics, USA). The test was carried out  
using a multi-run system (10 runs) with a standard deviation of 0.005%. The results are the  
mean and standard deviation of three determinations.

## 2.6 *In-vitro* release studies

An automated USP dissolution apparatus II (paddle method) was used to monitor the  
170 dissolution profiles of theophylline from the tablet matrices. The dissolution medium was 900  
mL of deionized water, 0.1 N HCl (pH 1.2) or phosphate buffer (pH 6.8) equilibrated to  $37 \pm$   
0.5 °C with a paddle stirring speed of 100 rpm. Samples were withdrawn at selected time  
intervals from 5 min up to 720 min using a peristaltic pump and the absorbance measured  
using a UV spectrophotometer. The concentrations of theophylline in the samples was  
175 determined using the linear regression equation obtained from the respective UV standard  
calibration curve at 272 nm.

## 2.7 Dissolution parameters (dissolution efficiency (DE) and mean dissolution time (MDT))

The mean dissolution time (MDT), the mean time for the drug to dissolve under *in-*  
180 *vitro* dissolution conditions, is a model-independent method and is suitable for dosage forms  
having different mechanisms of drug release (Al-Hamidi et al., 2013; 2014; Mu et al., 2003;  
Khan, 1975). Also calculated was the dissolution efficiency (DE), which is the area under the  
dissolution curve up to a certain time  $t$ , expressed as a percentage of the area of a rectangle  
described by 100% dissolution in the same time  $t$  (Khan, 1975).

$$185 \quad MDT = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n t_j \Delta M_j}{\sum_{j=1}^n \Delta M_j} \quad (2)$$

Where  $j$  is the sample number,  $n$  is the number of dissolution sample times,  $t_j$  is the  
time at midpoint between  $t_j$  and  $t_{j-1}$  and  $\Delta M_j$  is the additional amount of drug dissolved  
between  $t_j$  and  $t_{j-1}$ .

$$DE = \frac{\int_0^t y \times dt}{y_{100} \times t} \times 100 \quad (3)$$

190 Where  $y$  is the drug percent dissolved at time  $t$

## 2.8 Similarity factor

Similarity between the drug release profiles was determined using similarity factor  $f_2$  (Moore and Flanner, 1996; Polli et al., 2004; Asare-Addo et al. 2010).

$$f_2 = 50 \log \left\{ \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n w_t (R_t - T_t)^2 \right]^{-0.5} \times 100 \right\} \quad (4)$$

195 where  $n$  is the number of pull points for tested samples;  $w_t$  is the optional weight factor;  $R_t$  is the reference assay at time point  $t$ ;  $T_t$  is the test assay at time point  $t$ .

Similarity factor was calculated using the drug release profile of HPMC K4M matrices as the reference.  $f_2$  values ranging from 50-100 indicate similarity between the two profiles. The closer the  $f_2$  value is to 100, the more similar or identical the release profiles.

200 Values of  $f_2$  less than 50 indicate dissimilarity between two dissolution profiles (Polli et al., 1997; Pillay and Fassihi, 1998).

## 2.9 Kinetics of drug release

The kinetics of drug release were analysed using the Korsmeyer-Peppas model Eq (5) as detailed in Siepmann & Peppas, (2001a) where,  $M_t/M^\infty$  is the fraction of drug released at time  $t$  while  $K$  is a drug release constant incorporating the geometrical characteristics of matrix tablet, and  $n$  is diffusional exponent of drug release. For cylinders, i.e., the tablet matrices made in the present study,  $n$  values of up to 0.45 suggest Fickian diffusion, and values of above 0.89 suggest Case-II transport. A value between these two suggests anomalous transport occurring as reported in numerous studies (Siepmann and Peppas 2001b; 210 Asare-Addo et al., 2013; Siah-Shadbad et al., 2011; Ritger and Peppas 1987).

$$\frac{M_t}{M^\infty} = Kt^n \quad (5)$$

## 2.10 Swelling and erosion studies

215 Swelling and erosion were determined according to a method described by Tahara et al.  
(1995). A USP II dissolution apparatus (PharmaTest, Germany) was used and set to 100 rpm  
and equilibrated at 37 °C. The deionized water, pH 6.8, or pH 1.2 buffer were used as  
swelling/erosion media. The matrix tablets were supported on pins at the bottom of the  
dissolution vessel. Swelling/erosion media (900 mL) was measured into each of the six  
220 vessels of the bath and allowed to equilibrate for 30 min before starting the experiment. The  
experiment consisted of allowing the tablets to swell and/or erode in the medium at 100 rpm  
for 30, 60, 120, 180 or 240 min before they were removed into a pre-weighed weighing boat.  
The excess dissolution medium was drained and blotted from around the tablet without  
disrupting the tablet. The tablet and weighing boat were then weighed to establish the wet  
225 weight of the tablet. The mean weight was determined for each formulation and degree of  
swelling (S) was calculated using Eq. (6): (Ghori et al., 2014b)

$$S = \frac{W_s - W_i}{W_i} \times 100 \quad (6)$$

Where  $W_i$  and  $W_s$  are initial dry and swollen weight of matrix tablet, respectively, at  
immersion time (t) in the swelling media. The degree of swelling was determined from the  
230 mean of three replicates and presented as degree of swelling (S, %) against time (t). Finally,  
the tablets were dried to a constant weight in an oven at 50 °C. The tablets were cooled to  
ambient temperature and then weighed until a constant weight had been achieved and this  
was termed as dried weight of matrix tablets. The degree of erosion (E) was calculated using  
Eq. (7) (Ghori et al., 2014a)

$$235 \quad E = \frac{W_i - W_f}{W_i} \times 100 \quad (7)$$

Where,  $W_i$  is the initial weight of the matrix tablets and  $W_f$  is the weight of the dried  
matrices at specific sampling times.

The swelling kinetics of all the matrix tablets was determined by fitting the swelling data to a mathematical swelling model described by Vergnaud (1993). This model has been used by several authors to explain the mechanism of swelling (Ghori et al., 2014c, Chaibva et al., 2010, Roy and Rohera, 2002, Ebube et al. 1997) and the generalised form of Vergnaud model is shown in Eq. (8)

$$M = Kt^n \quad (8)$$

Where,

M = the amount of liquid transferred

t = time

K = the swelling constant.

n = exponent indicating the mechanism of water uptake.

Ebube et al. (1997) reported that a value of  $n < 0.5$  is indicative of a diffusion-controlled mechanism in which the rate of diffusion is much slower than the rate of polymer hydration in a matrix tablet. However, when  $n = 1$ , water diffuses through the matrix at a constant velocity, with an advancing liquid front marking the limit of liquid penetration into the matrix. A value of  $0.45 < n < 1$  indicates an anomalous behaviour in which diffusion of liquid and polymer hydration are of similar magnitude. Moreover, the authors showed that when a simple linear regression was applied to a plot of percentage matrix erosion vs time the slope represented erosion rate ( $k, \% \text{ min}^{-1}$ ) (Ghori et al., 2014a).

## 2.12 Differential Scanning Calorimetry (DSC)

Free and bound water of the tablets using endothermic scanning of the melted free water was performed as reported previously (Asare-Addo et al., 2011; Kaialy et al., 2013). Briefly, flat faced 4 mm disks with target weights of 20 mg were produced from all pure polymers and formulation blends and compressed using a single punch tableting machine (as

before) at 2500 psi (150.8 MPa). The discs were placed in standard aluminium pans (40  $\mu$ L) containing 25 mg of purified water, 0.1N HCl (pH 1.2), or phosphate buffer (pH 6.8) and sealed with a lid. The pure polymers were then allowed to hydrate for up to 30 min to determine the influence of time on bound and free water states. The tablet formulations were hydrated for 5 min before DSC analysis. This was to determine if the state of water in the matrices could relate to the dissolution profiles of the tablets formulations. DSC analysis was performed in three stages. First, the samples were cooled from ambient temperatures ( $\sim 25$   $^{\circ}$ C) to  $-30$   $^{\circ}$ C at a rate of  $55$   $^{\circ}$ C/min to freeze any unbound (free) water; secondly, sample was held at  $-30$   $^{\circ}$ C for 5 minutes for equilibration and thirdly, sample was heated from  $-30$   $^{\circ}$ C to  $50$   $^{\circ}$ C at  $10$   $^{\circ}$ C/min. The experiment was run under nitrogen atmosphere and at a flow rate of  $50$   $\text{cm}^3$ . These experiments were carried out in triplicate.

### 3. Results and Discussion

#### 3.1 Physical properties of formulation blends

Properties of the pure polymers and formulation blends or compacts are presented in Table 2. The results show that the bulk density of the pure polymers (GGp, GDSp and HPM Cp) increased upon blending with other formulation ingredients. The GDSp and the formulation blend (GDSf) exhibited the highest porosity of all the formulation blends and formed the hardest compacts or tablets at any given compression pressure (Figure 1). Thus GDSp is a highly compactible polymer, forming matrices with greater hardness compared with GGp or HPM Cp matrices. What is interesting also is that the de-starching process did not affect the true density of the GDS polymer as its true density remained the same as the GG (Table 1).

Particle size analysis showed the HPMC K4M to have a  $d_{10}$  value of  $26.79$   $\mu\text{m}$ ,  $d_{50}$  of  $78.67$   $\mu\text{m}$  and  $d_{90}$  of  $141.63$   $\mu\text{m}$ . The results also showed  $d_{99}$  to have a value of  $171.10$   $\mu\text{m}$

### 290 3.2 Swelling and erosion of matrices

Upon its initial contact with liquid media the liquid starts to imbibe into the dry matrix tablet and the change in overall weight of matrix tablet is reflected as swelling. The extent of swelling was determined by using Eq. 6 and plotted with respect to time and shown in Figure 2 (a-c). The matrix erosion, however, which is a fundamental property of matrix tablets  
295 which occurs when the polymer chains present on the surface disentangle and begin to dissolve. Eventually this leads to bulk surface dissolution of polymer chains which is widely considered as matrix erosion. In this study the degree of matrix erosion was calculated by using Eq. 7 and % erosion vs time was plotted (Figure 4 a-c).

300 The results show that GGf matrices exhibited the highest extent of swelling in all media. GDSf matrices swell within the first 30 min in deionized water but are rapidly eroded thereafter (Figure 2A). In pH 6.8 media, GDSf matrices were observed to swell rapidly in the first 30 min and thereafter plateau until 180 min when erosion of the tablets occurred (Figure 2B). However, the least extent of swelling was exhibited by HPMC (K4M) matrices in pH  
305 1.2. Moreover, to study the mechanism of swelling Vergnaud model was used, Eq. 8 (Vergnaud 1993) and swelling parameters were enlisted in Table 3. The model, however, was not applicable to GDSf as these particular matrices start to erode quickly. In general the  $R^2$  values were in the range of 0.953-0.991, which indicate that the data can be well described by this model. According to the swelling kinetics findings, GGF has the highest swelling rate  
310 ( $K_w$ ) 64.16 %  $\text{min}^{-1}$  in water but HPMCF has highest  $K_w$  25.59 and 32.00 %  $\text{min}^{-1}$  in pH 6.8 and pH 1.2 media, respectively. All the grewia gum matrices, however, showed a no significant difference in pH 1.2 media which might be attributed to its anionic nature. The polymer swelling kinetics can also be inferred from the value of swelling exponent ( $n$ )

According to the criteria laid out by Ebube et al., (1997) all the matrix tablets apart from GGf  
315 in pH 6.8 showed diffusion controlled swelling, where the rate of polymer relaxation is  
greater than the rate of liquid penetration in to the polymer matrix network. However, GGf  
specifically in pH 6.8 swelling media showed an anomalous polymer swelling behaviour in  
which the rate of water diffusion and polymer relaxation is of same magnitude. Eventually  
after the swelling phase the hydrophilic polymer based matrices underwent erosion. The rate  
320 of polymer erosion was determined by using the data in Figure 4 and the erosion kinetics  
parameters were enlisted in Table 3. The  $R^2$  of erosion kinetics findings were in the range of  
0.954-0.998, and therefore attributed to a good fit indicating that the findings can explain the  
erosion phenomena. In water HPMCF showed highest erosion rate ( $K_E = 0.354 \% \text{ min}^{-1}$ )  
while in pH 6.8 GDSf showed highest erosion ( $K_E = 0.297 \% \text{ min}^{-1}$ ). However, in pH 1.2  
325 media the matrices have not showed any substantial difference in the erosion rates. Hydration  
of polysaccharides matrices occurs when hydrogen-bonding forces maintain the integrity of  
the hydrophilic polysaccharide matrix during the course of the experiment (Munday and Cox,  
2000). Therefore, for any given material, when the hydrogen bonding forces are weak in any  
given media, matrix erosion may prevail. This probably explains the relatively higher  
330 erosion rate of GDSf matrices in water and pH 6.8 in contrast to pH 1.2 (Figure 4). The GDSf  
matrices rapidly hydrate upon contact with water or pH 6.8 media but the gel layer formed  
was not durable or resistant to erosion at 100 rpm.

Furthermore, the hydration rate of polysaccharides depends on the nature of the substituent  
groups and the degree of substitution (Roy and Rohera, 2002). HPMC K4M is a non-ionic  
335 polymer and has been reported (Streubel et al., 2000; Tatavarti and Hoag, 2006; Tatavarti et  
al., 2004; Gabr, 1992) to exhibit pH independent drug release as a result of pH independent  
swelling and erosion of the matrices when drug solubility is pH independent.

Both GGp and GDSp have both been reported to be anionic polysaccharides (Nep et al.,  
340 2015). Consequently, a pH dependent swelling and erosion of the matrices may be expected.  
However, the percentage content of uronic acids in GDSp (64 %w/w) is higher than GGp (58  
%w/w), and likewise GDSp has a greater degree of acetyl esterification (GDSp 49% and  
GGp 34%) (Nep et al., 2015). Sungthongjeen et al., (2004) has shown that the degree of  
esterification of pectins can modify drug release from pectin based matrices

345 The decrease in erosion rate of GDSf matrices in pH 1.2 media may be attributable to a  
decrease in the ability of GDSp to hydrate as the pH falls below the pKa of the uronic acids  
present in the polymer chains.

Images of matrices after 3 hours of swelling and erosion in the different media are shown in  
Figure 3, which clearly shows the relatively rapid erosion and dissolution of GDSf matrices  
350 in deionised water and pH 6.8 media as compared with GGf and HPMCF.

### 3.4 Drug release from matrices

The release profiles are presented in Figure 6. The dissolution parameters  $T_{50}$  and  $T_{100}$   
355 are shown in Table 4. The profiles show that none of the matrices exhibited any initial burst  
release of theophylline despite the propensity for initial burst release of soluble drugs from  
HPMC (Tiwari et al., 2003; Gohel et al., 2009; Huand and Brazel, 2001). Initial burst release  
is attributable to the rapid dissolution of the drug from the surface and near the surface of the  
matrix which occurs while the polymer is undergoing hydration to form a protective gel  
360 layer.

The release of theophylline in deionized water was fastest from the GDSf matrices  
which released 100% of the drug within 120 min (Figure. 5A). This may be explained to be  
as a consequence of the excessive erosion and dissolution of the GDSf matrices in deionized  
water. Conversely, GGf matrices showed the slowest release of theophylline in deionized



365 water. Similarly, in pH 6.8 media, GDS matrices showed the fastest release of theophylline  
with 100% of drug released after 240 min (Figure. 5C), also attributable to excessive erosion  
of the matrices.

However, in pH 1.2 media, it was observed that the extent and rate of drug release  
from the different polymer matrices were more or less the same (Figure. 5B) with GDSf  
370 matrices releasing 100% of drug only after 330 min. The present results show that GDSf  
matrices release 100% of the drug faster in pH 6.8 (240 min) than in pH 1.2 media (330 min)  
in contrast with HPMC K4M and GGf matrices.

The release of the drug from the polymer matrices was also compared using  
dissolution efficiency (DE), mean dissolution time (MDT) and similarity factor ( $f_2$ ). The DE  
375 and MDT are presented in table 4. The results show that the DE for the matrices in pH 1.2  
media was 86.91%, 87.27% and 87.58% for GGf, GDSf and HPMC K4M matrices  
respectively, and indicates that the efficiency of release of the drug from the matrices was  
essentially the same in this medium. This is also supported by the similarity factor ( $f_2$ ) for the  
matrices in pH 1.2 media (Table 4). The  $f_2$  was 83.66 and 82.15 for GGf and GDSf matrices  
380 respectively with HPMC K4M as the reference verifying GGf and GDSf's similar drug  
release in pH 1.2 media to HPMC K4M. However, at pH 6.8, and in deionized water, there  
was a larger difference in release. The higher DE of GDSf (95.01% and 89.9% in water and  
pH 6.8 media respectively) concurs with the high erosion of the material in both media.  
Conversely the lower values of DE for GGf may be attributable to the swelling of the  
385 material which persisted over the duration of the release study.

### 3.5 Modelling of drug release

The release kinetics for the polymer matrices are presented in Table 4. The release of  
theophylline from HPMC K4M matrix tablets has been reported (Asare-Addo et al., 2011;

390 Sriamornsak et al., 2007) to fit well with both Higuchi equation and Korsmeyer–Peppas equation. The Higuchi model describes drug release that is largely governed by diffusion through water-filled pores in the matrices, while the Korsmeyer–Peppas model describes the combined effect of diffusion and erosion mechanisms for drug release (Korsmeyer et al., 1983).

395 Theophylline release from GDSf matrices in pH 1.2 and pH 6.8 media were typically non-Fickian with a best fit to Korsmeyer-Peppas model indicating that drug release was by a combination of diffusion and erosion. In deionized water the model could not be determined because there were insufficient data points on the release profiles between 10% and 60% release to provide accurate values. Similarly, the release was anomalous (non-Fickian) and  
400 diffusion controlled release for GGf and HPMC (K4M) matrices in deionized water, pH 1.2 and pH 6.8 media. Interestingly, the release data of GDSf matrices fitted well with zero-order release model with a correlation coefficient ( $r^2$ ) greater than 0.996 (not shown) probably due to the extensive swelling of the tablets in deionized water as shown in Figure 2a.

405

### **3.6 DSC hydration results and theophylline release from matrices**

Jhon and Andrade, 1973 classifies hydration water to three types, namely; Type I (freezing or free, bulk-like water) melts at the normal melting point of pure water (0 °C). Type II (freezing or bound water) weakly interacts with macromolecules and displays a lower  
410 melting point than pure water (<0 °C). Type I and II can be classed as free or freezable water with type III being classed as bound water. Bound water has the ability to interact with the ionic and hydrophilic groups of polymers and shows non-freezing behaviour. Water penetrates into a tablet matrix during the first stages of dissolution and acts as bound water. Aoki et al., (1995) explained that during the next stages of dissolution, the water content of

415 the matrices increases and freezable water is detected at levels that are related to drug release. Figure 6 shows the percentage of bound water with increasing time (1, 5, 10, and 30 min) for the pure polymers in deionized water, calculated from the thermographs in Figure 7. All the thermographs for the pure polymers demonstrated a slight shift to the left with an increase in hydration time. The results showed HPMC K4M to bind more to water as compared with  
420 GGp and GDSp. There was also an increase in the amount of bound water occurring with an increase in time. Due to the first time point of dissolution being at 5 min, hydration values to determine bound and free water states were utilised for the formulation matrices to establish a correlation between free water state and drug dissolution. This however was difficult to establish. The results however showed that GDSf, GGf and HPMC K4M matrices bound to  
425 deionized water more than to the other two media used (Table 5). It can be seen that the amount of available water for hydration increased in pH1.2 or phosphate buffer (pH6.8) for all the matrices. Also, HPMC K4M generally binds more to water in all the tested media as compared with GGf and GDSf formulations. This was similar to the trend for the pure polymers. Interestingly, when comparing the amount of bound water at the same time point  
430 (5 min) for the pure polymer and formulation compact, it is observed that the incorporation of drug and the lactose significantly reduces the bound water percentage.

#### **4. Conclusion**

Starch-free grewia polysaccharide is a highly compressible and compactible polymer with  
435 superior compression and compaction properties to those of GG and HPMC (K4M). The results show that variations in release properties are also apparent, depending on the polymer and the dissolution media used. In pH 1.2 media, drug release from GGS was similar to GG and HPMC (K4M) matrices and exhibited greater swelling than erosion. Rapid release of drug was observed from the GDS matrices in water and at pH6.8, mainly due to erosion. This

440 was despite forming compacts with greater hardness than GGp or HPM Cp. GG matrices on  
the other hand, slowed down drug release when compared with HPMC (K4M) attributable to  
the greater swelling of the material. Overall this study has demonstrated the potential of  
grewia gum as a matrix former that can modify the release of a water soluble drug as a  
potential alternative to HPMC. Furthermore, by using different grades of the raw material it is  
445 possible to achieve different types of drug release. In addition, the superior compaction  
properties of GDSp may provide a wider application as a binder to strengthen weak  
compacts.

#### 450 **Acknowledgement**

This project was funded by the Royal Society through the award of the Newton International  
Fellowship scheme to Elijah I. Nep (grant number NF120704). The authors also thank  
Colorcon and Meggle for the kind gifts of HPMC K4M and FlowLac<sup>®</sup> 100 respectively.

#### 455 **References**

- Akdowa, E. P., Boudjeko, T., Woguia, A. L., Njintang-Yanou, N., Gaiani, C., Scher, J., &  
Mbofung, C. M. F. (2014) Optimization of variables for aqueous extraction of gum from  
*Grewia mollis* powder. *J. Polym*, 2014, 1-10.
- 460 Al-Hamidi, H., Edwards, A.A., Douroumis, D., Asare-Addo, K., Nayebi, A.M., Reyhani-Rad,  
S., Mahmoudi, J., Nokhodchi, A. (2013). Effect of glucosamine HCl on dissolution and solid  
state behaviours of piroxicam upon milling. *Colloids Surf B: Biointerfaces*, 103, 189-199.
- Al-Hamidi, H., Asare-Addo, K., Desai, S., Kitson, M., & Nokhodchi, A. (2014). The  
465 dissolution and solid-state behaviours of coground ibuprofen-glucosamine HCl. *Drug Dev.*  
*Ind. Pharm*, 41, 1682-1692.
- Aoki, S., Ando, H., Ishii, M., Watanabe, S., & Ozawa, H. (1995). Water behavior during drug  
release from a matrix as observed using differential scanning calorimetry. *J. Control.*  
470 *Release*, 33, 365-374.

- Asare-Addo, K., Levina, M., Rajabi-Siahboomi, A.R., Nokhodchi, A. (2010). Study of dissolution hydrodynamic conditions versus drug release from hypromellose matrices: The influence of agitation sequence. *Colloids Surf B: Biointerfaces*, 81(2), 452-460.
- 475
- Asare-Addo, K., Levina, M., Rajabi-Siahboomi, A.R., Nokhodchi, A. (2011). Effect of ionic strength and pH of dissolution media on theophylline release from hypromellose matrix tablets—Apparatus USP III, simulated fasted and fed conditions. *Carbohydr. Polym*, 86(1), 85-93.
- 480
- Asare-Addo, K., Conway, B. R., Hajamohaideen, M. J., Kaialy, W., Nokhodchi, A., & Larhrib, H. (2013). Aqueous and hydro-alcoholic media effects on polyols. *Colloids Surf B: Biointerfaces*, 111, 24-29.
- 485
- Asare-Addo, K., Šupuk, E., Al-Hamidi, H., Owusu-Ware, S., Nokhodchi, A., & Conway, B. R. (2015). Triboelectrification and dissolution property enhancements of solid dispersions. *Int. J. Pharm*, 485(1), 306-316.
- 490
- Bonferoni, M.C., Rossi, S., Tamayo, M., Pedraz, J.L., Dominguez-Gil, A., Caramella, C., (1993). On the employment of l-carrageenan in a matrix system. I. Sensitivity to dissolution medium and comparison with sodium carboxymethylcellulose and xanthan gum. *J. Control. Release*, 26, 119–127.
- 495
- Chaibva, F. A., Khamanga, S. M., Walker, R. B. (2010). Swelling, erosion and drug release characteristics of salbutamol sulfate from hydroxypropyl methylcellulose-based matrix tablets. *Drug. Dev. Ind. Pharm*, 36(12), 1497-1510.
- 500
- Colombo, P., Conte, U., Gazzaniga, A., Maggi, L., Sangalli, M.E., Peppas, N.A., La Manna, A. (1990). Drug release modulation by physical restriction of matrix swelling, *Int. J. Pharm*, 63, 43-48.
- 505
- Colombo, P., Catellani, P.L., Peppas, N.A., Maggi, L. and Conte, U. (1992). Swelling characteristics of hydrophilic matrices for controlled release. New dimensionless number to describe the swelling and release behaviour. *Int. J. Pharm*, 88, 99- 109.
- 510
- Colombo, P., Bettini, R., Massimo, G., Catellani, P.L., Santi, P., Peppas, N.A. (1995). Drug diffusion front movement is important in drug release control from swellable matrix tablets. *J. Pharm. Sci*, 84 (8), 991–997.
- 515
- Gabr K. (1992). Effect of organic acids on the release patterns of weakly basic drugs from inert sustained release matrix tablets. *Eur. J. Pharm. Biopharm*, 38 (6), 199-202.
- Ghori M.U, Ginting, G., Smith, A.M., Conway B.R. (2014a) Simultaneous quantification of tablet erosion and drug release kinetics. *Int. J. Pharm*, 465, 405-412
- Ghori, M. U., Alba, K., Smith, A. M., Conway, B. R., Kontogiorgos, V. (2014b). Okra extracts in pharmaceutical and food applications. *Food Hydrocolloid*, 42, 342-347.
- 520
- Ghori M.U (2014c) Release kinetics, compaction and electrostatic properties of hydrophilic matrices. *PhD Thesis, University of Huddersfield*

- Gohel, M., Parikh, R., Nagori, S., Jena, D. (2009). Fabrication of modified release tablet formulation of metoprolol succinate using hydroxypropyl methylcellulose and xanthan gum. *AAPS PharmSciTech*, 10 (1), 62-68.
- 525
- Harland, R.S., Gazzaniga, A., Sangalli, M.E., Colombo, P., Peppas, N.A. (1988). Drug:polymer matrix swelling and dissolution. *Pharm. Res*, 5 (8), 488–494.
- Huang, X., Brazel, C. (2001). On the importance and mechanisms of burst release in matrix-controlled drug delivery systems. *J Control Release*, 73 (2-3), 121-136.
- 530
- Jhon, M. S., & Andrade, J. D. (1973). Water and hydrogels. *J. Biomed. Mat Res*, 7, 509–522.
- Kaialy, W., Emami, P., Asare-Addo, K., Shojaee, S., Nokhodchi, A. (2013). Psyllium: a promising polymer for sustained release formulations in combination with HPMC polymers. *Pharm. Dev. Technol*, 19(3), 269–277.
- 535
- Kavanagh, N., Corrigan, O.I. (2004). Swelling and erosion properties of hydroxypropylmethylcellulose (Hypromellose) matrices—influence of agitation rate and dissolution medium composition. *Int. J. Pharm*, 279, 141–152.
- 540
- Khan, K.A. (1975). The concept of dissolution efficiency. *J. Pharm. Pharmacol*, 27(1), 48-49.
- 545
- Khullar, P., Khar, R.K., Agarwal, S.P. (1998). Evaluation of guar gum in the preparation of sustained-release matrix tablets. *Drug Dev. Ind. Pharm*, 24 (11), 1095–1099.
- Korsmeyer, R.W., Gurny, R., Docler, E., Buri, P., Peppas, N.A. (1983). Mechanism of solute release from porous hydrophilic polymers. *Int. J. Pharm*, 15, 25–35.
- 550
- Kristmundsdóttir, T., Ingvarsdóttir, K., Sæmundsdóttir, G. (1995). Chitosan matrix tablets: The influence of excipients on drug release. *Drug Dev. Ind. Pharm*, 21 (13), 1591–1598.
- 555
- Lee, P.I., Kim, C-J. (1991). Probing the mechanisms of drug release from hydrogels. *J. Control. Release*, 16, 229–236.
- Merchant, H.A., Shoaib, H.M., Tazeen, J., Yousuf, R.I.(2006). Once-daily tablet formulation and in vitro release evaluation of cefpodoxime using hydroxypropyl methylcellulose: a technical note. *AAPS Pharm. Sci. Tech.* 7(3): Article 78.
- 560
- Moore, J.W., Flanner, H.H. (1996). Mathematical comparison of dissolution profiles. *Pharm. Tech*, 20(6), 64-74.
- 565
- Mu, X., Tobyn, M.J., Staniforth, J.N. (2003). Development and evaluation of bio-dissolution systems capable of detecting the food effect on a polysaccharide-based matrix system. *J Control. Release*, 93(3), 309-318.
- Mughal, M.A., Iqbal, Z., Neau, S.H. (2011). Guar Gum, Xanthan Gum, and HPMC can define release mechanisms and sustain release of propranolol hydrochloride. *AAPS Pharm. Sci. Tech*, 12 (1), DOI: 10.1208/s12249-010-9570-1
- 570

- Munday, D.L. and Cox, P.J. (2000). Compressed xanthan and karaya gum matrices: hydration, erosion and drug release mechanisms. *Int. J. Pharm*, 203, 179–192.
- 575
- Naggar, V.F., El-Khawas, M., Ismail, F.A., Boraie, N.A. (1992). Pectin, a possible matrix for oral sustained-release preparations of water-soluble drugs. *STP Pharma. Sci*, 2 (3), 227–234.
- Nakano, M., Ogata, A., (1984). Examination of natural gums as matrices for sustained release of theophylline. *Chem. Pharm. Bull.* 32, 782-785
- 580
- Nep, E. I. & Conway, B. R. (2011a). Physicochemical characterization of grewia polysaccharide gum: effect of drying methods. *Carbohydr. Polym*, 84, 446–453.
- 585
- Nep, E. I. & Conway, B. R. (2011b). Grewia polysaccharide as a pharmaceutical excipient in matrix tablets. *J. Excip. Food. Chem*, 2, 3-15.
- Nep, E. I. & Conway, B. R. (2011c). Grewia gum 2: Mucoadhesive properties of compacts and gels. *Trop. J. Pharm. Res*, 10, 393-401.
- 590
- Nep, E.I. & Conway, B. R. (2011d). Evaluation of grewia polysaccharide gum as a suspending agent. *Int. J. Pharm. Pharmaceutical Sci*, 3, 168-173.
- Nep, E.I. and Okafor, I.S. (2006). Evaluation of the bioadhesive property of Grewia gum in indomethacin tablet formulation in pig gastric mucus. *J. Pharm Bioresources*, 3(2), 62-69.
- 595
- Nep, E.I., Sims, I.M., Morris, G.A., Kontogiorgos, V., Smith, A.M. (2015). Evaluation of some important physicochemical properties of starch free grewia gum. *Food Hydrocolloid.*, Article in Press, doi: 10.1016/j.foodhyd.2015.02.016.
- 600
- Nokhodchi, A., & Asare-Addo, K. (2014). Drug release from matrix tablets: physiological parameters and the effect of food. *Expert Opin Drug Deliv*, 11(9), 1401-1418.
- Ogaji, I. (2011). Characterization and application of grewia gum as a film coating agent in theophylline hydrochloride tablets. *Pharmaceutics and Pharmaceutical Tech*.308.
- 605
- Okafor I. S, Chukwu A, & Udeala O. K (2001). Some physicochemical properties of grewia gum. *Nig. J. Polym. Sci. Tech*, 2, 161-168.
- 610
- Panomsuk, S.P., Hatanaka, T., Aiba, T., Katayama, K., Koizumi, T. (1996). A study of the hydrophilic cellulose matrix: effect of drugs on swelling properties. *Chem. Pharm. Bull*, 44, 1039–1042.
- Peppas, N.A., Sahlin, J.J., (1989). A simple equation for the description of solute release. III. Coupling of diffusion and relaxation. *Int. J. Pharm*, 57, 169–172.
- 615
- Pillay, V., & Fassihi, R. (1998). Evaluation and comparison of dissolution data derived from different modified release dosage forms. An alternative method. *J. Control. Rel.*, 55, 45–55.

- 620 Polli, J.E., Rekhi, G.S., Augsburger, L.L., Shah, V.P. (1997). Methods to compare dissolution profiles and a rationale for wide dissolution specifications for metoprolol tartrate tablets. *J. Pharm. Sci*, 86(6), 690-700.
- 625 Polli, J. E., Yu, L. X., Cook, J. A., Amidon, G. L., Borchardt, R. T., Burnside, B. A., et al. (2004). Summary workshop report: Biopharmaceutics classification system—Implementation challenges and extension opportunities. *J. Pharm. Sci*, 93, 1375–1381.
- 630 Reynolds, T.D., Gehrke, S.H., Hussain, A.S., Shenouda, L.S. (1998). Polymer erosion and drug release characterisation of hydroxypropylmethylcellulose matrices. *J. Pharm. Sci*, 87 (9), 1115–1123.
- 635 Ritger, P.L. and Peppas, N.A. (1987). "A simple equation for description of solute release I. Fickian and non-fickian release from non-swellable devices in the form of slabs, spheres, cylinders or discs. *J. Control. Release*, 5, 23–36.
- Roy, D.S., Rohera, B.D. (2002). Comparative evaluation of rate of hydration and matrix erosion of HEC and HPC and study of drug release from their matrices. *Eur. J. Pharm. Sci*, 16, 193–199.
- 640 Sahoo, J., Murthy, P.N., Biswal, S., Sahoo, S.K., Mahapatra, A.K. (2008). Comparative study of propranolol hydrochloride release with Kollidon®SR or hydroxypropylmethyl cellulose. *AAPS Pharm. Sci. Tech.* 9(2):577–82.
- 645 Siah-Shadbad, M. R., Asare-Addo, K., Azizian, K., Hassanzadeh, D. & Nokhodchi, A. (2011). Release behaviour of propranolol HCl from hydrophilic matrix tablets containing psyllium powder in combination with hydrophilic polymers. *AAPS Pharm. Sci. Tech.*, 12(4), 1176-1182.
- 650 Siepmann, J., Peppas, N.A. (2001a). Mathematical modeling of controlled drug delivery. *Adv. Drug Deliv. Rev*, 48, 139–157.
- Siepmann, J., Peppas, N.A. (2001b). Modeling of drug release from delivery systems based on hydroxypropyl methylcellulose (HPMC). *Adv. Drug Del. Rev*, 48, 139–157.
- 655 Sriamornsak, P., Thirawong, N., Korkerd, K. (2007). Swelling, erosion and release behavior of alginate-based matrix tablets. *Eur. J. Pharm. Biopharm*, 66, 435–450.
- 660 Streubel A, Siepmann J, Dashevsky A, Bodmeier R. (2000). pH-independent release of a weakly basic drug from water-insoluble and-soluble matrix tablets. *J. Control. Release*, 67(1), 101-110.
- 665 Sujja-areevath, J., Munday, D.L., Cox, P.J., Khan, K.A. (1996). Release characteristics of diclofenac sodium from encapsulated natural gum mini-matrix formulations. *Int. J. Pharm.* 139, 53–62.
- Sungthongjeen, S., Sriamornsak, P., Pitaksuteepong, T., Somsiri, A., Puttipipatkachorn, S., (2004). Effect of degree of esterification of pectin and calcium amount on drug release from pectin-based matrix tablets. *AAPS Pharm. Sci. Tech.* 5, E9.



670

Tahara, K., Yamamoto, K., Nishihata, T. (1995). Overall mechanism behind matrix sustained release (SR) tablets prepared with hydroxypropyl methylcellulose 2910. *J. Control. Release* 35, 59–66.

675

Talukdar, M.M., Michoel, A., Rombaut, P., Kinget, R. (1996). Comparative study on xanthan gum and hydroxypropylmethylcellulose as matrices for controlled-release drug delivery. I. Compaction and in vitro drug release behaviour. *Int. J. Pharm.*, 129, 233–241.

680

Tatavarti A, Hoag S. (2006). Microenvironmental pH modulation based release enhancement of a weakly basic drug from hydrophilic matrices. *J. Pharm. Sci.*, 95(7), 1459-1468.

685

Tatavarti A, Mehta K, Augsburger L, Hoag S. (2004). Influence of methacrylic and acrylic acid polymers on the release performance of weakly basic drugs from sustained release hydrophilic matrices. *J. Pharm. Sci.*, 93(9), 2319-2331.

Tiwari, S.B., Murthy, T.K., Pai, M.R., Mehta, P.R., Chowdary, P.B. (2003). Controlled release formulation of tramadol hydrochloride using hydrophilic and hydrophobic matrix system. *AAPS Pharm. Sci. Tech.* 4(3), E31.

690

Tiwari, S. B., & Rajabi-Siahboomi, A. R. (2008). Extended-release oral drug delivery technologies. Monolithic matrix systems. *Meth. Mol. Biol.*, 217-243.

Vergnaud, J. M. (1993). Liquid transport controlled release processes in polymeric materials: applications to oral dosage forms. *Int. J. Pharm.*, 90(2), 89-94.

695

Vervoort, L., Van den Mooter, G., Augustijns, P., Kinget, R. (1998). Inulin hydrogels. I. Dynamic and equilibrium swelling properties. *Int. J. Pharm.*, 172, 127–135.

700

Wan, L.S.C., Heng, P.W.S. and Wong, L.F. (1991). The effect of hydroxypropylmethylcellulose on water penetration into a matrix system, *Int. J. Pharm.*, 73, 111-116.

705

710

## Tables

**Table 1:** Unit formula for matrix tablets by direct compression

715 **Table 1: Unit formula for matrix tablets by direct compression**

Formulation code	Theophylline (mg)	Native grewia gum (GG) (mg)	De-starched grewia gum (GDS) (mg)	HPMC K4M (mg)	Lactose (mg)	MgSt (mg)
<b>GG</b>	125	75	-	-	47.5	2.5
<b>GDS</b>	125	-	75	-	47.5	2.5
<b>HPMC (K4M)</b>	125	-	-	75	47.5	2.5

720 **Table 2:** Properties of the pure polymer, formulation mixes, polymer compacts and tablet matrices

	True density (g/cm <sup>3</sup> )	Bulk density (g/cm <sup>3</sup> )	Tapped density (g/cm <sup>3</sup> )	Tablet Porosity (%) at 13.79 MPa	Tablet hardness (N) at 13.79 MPa
<b>GGp</b>	1.59±0.00	0.37±0.01	0.81±0.03	52.08±1.92	81.75±5.40
<b>GGf</b>	1.53±0.02	0.43±0.01	0.74±0.00	42.77±0.24	88.94±1.13
<b>GDSp</b>	1.59±0.01	0.20±0.03	0.38±0.02	49.61±1.93	375.07±38.78
<b>GDSf</b>	1.53±0.02	0.35±0.01	0.65±0.01	42.30±0.46	148.79±6.38
<b>HPMCp</b>	1.36±0.03	0.31±0.01	0.46±0.04	40.91±2.47	146.17±5.46
<b>HPMcf</b>	1.45±0.02	0.36±0.01	0.65±0.01	39.98±0.29	97.77±1.50

Note: “p” and “f” next to GG, GDS or HPMC is for pure polymer and formulation blends respectively.

725

730

735

740

745

750

**Table 3:** Parameters for swelling and erosion kinetics

Matrices	Swelling kinetics parameters			Erosion kinetics parameters	
	$n$	$K_w$	$R^2$	$K_E$	$R^2$
GGf-water	0.3461	64.16	0.977	0.1603	0.954
GDSf-Water	-	-	-	0.1548	0.991
HPMCf-Water	0.2111	32.16	0.966	0.3546	0.957
GGf-pH 6.8	0.4781	24.95	0.978	0.1409	0.981
GDSf- pH 6.8	-	-	-	0.2973	0.954
HPMCf- pH 6.8	0.2334	25.59	0.953	0.1449	0.992
GGf-pH 1.2	0.3979	19.51	0.991	0.1611	0.998
GDSf- pH 1.2	0.3573	19.34	0.970	0.1812	0.979
HPMCf- pH 1.2	0.2058	32.00	0.990	0.1704	0.997

$K_w$ = Swelling constant (% min<sup>-1</sup>),  $n$  = Swelling exponent,  $K_E$ = Erosion rate (% min<sup>-1</sup>)

755


**Table 4:** Dissolution parameters from release profiles of GG, GDS and HPMC K4M formulation tablet matrices

Matrix	Media	$T_{50}$ (min)	$T_{100}$ (min)	DE (%)	MDT	Diffusional exponent, $n$	Similarity factor ( $f_2$ )
GG	water	120	540	80.98	136.96	0.43	37.96
	pH 1.2	67	330	86.91	94.22	0.45	83.66
	pH 6.8	97	720	80.52	140.28	0.46	52.86
GDS	water	32	120	95.01	35.91	N/A	N/A
	pH 1.2	75	330	87.27	91.69	0.44	82.15
	pH 6.8	60	240	89.9	72.72	0.54	56.49
HPMC	water	60	270	88.65	81.72	0.47	-
	pH 1.2	60	330	87.58	89.41	0.46	-
	pH 6.8	70	360	86.45	97.57	0.49	-

760


**Table 5:** Bound water (%) of the pure polymer compacts (HPMCp, GDSp, GGp) and the formulated tablet matrices (HPMCf, GDSf, GGf) in all media at 5 min

Compact	Water (%)	pH 1.2 (%)	pH 6.8 (%)
GDSp	21.2±1.56	13.39±2.22	18.23±0.40
GDSf	11.93±0.03	6.03±0.84	7.01±0.06
GGp	24.84±1.59	17.34±0.80	17.87±0.12
GGf	13.39±0.41	5.01±1.85	5.47±0.11
HPMCp	27.43±0.88	18.46±0.18	22.22±0.42
HPMCf	13.02±2.22	9.8±1.87	8.98±0.73




**Figure 1:** Dependence of hardness on compression pressure for the polymer compacts (HPM Cp, GGp and GDSp) and formulation matrices (HPM Cf, GGf and GDSf).

770




**Figure 2:** Swelling of HPM Cf, GGf and GDSf matrices in A) deionized water B) phosphate buffer (pH 6.8) and C) 0.1N HCl (pH 1.2)

775




780 **Figure 3:** Photographs of the swelling and erosion of formulation matrices in (a) phosphate buffer (pH 6.8) (b) 0.1N HCl (pH 1.2), and (c) deionized water at 37°C for 3 hours




785 **Figure 4:** Dissolution medium uptake per unit polymer remaining **A.** for formulation matrices in different media, **B.** for formulation matrices in different media, plotted versus  $t^{0.5}$  in water at 100 rpm. **C.** Dry weights of matrices in different media at 100 rpm fitted to cube root of time equation


790



795 **Figure 5:** Release profiles of theophylline in: A. deionized water B. 0.1N HCl (pH 1.2) and C. phosphate buffer (pH 6.8) equilibrated to 37 °C and agitation speed of 100 rpm



800 **Figure 6:** Representative bound water profiles of Pure Polymer compacts in distilled water



**Figure 7:** DSC Thermograms of the pure polymer compacts after hydration for 1, 5, 10, and 30 min in deionized water for A. GDS B. GG and, C. HPMC K4M