Title: Effect of various surface-active-agents on the adhesive-ability of polycarbophil mucoadhesive discs invitro.

Authors: Mortazavi S.A., Moghimi H.R.

Abstract: Mucoadhesive drug delivery systems could be used for obtaining systemic or local effects of various drugs. The aim of this study was to investigate the effect of the presence of cationic, anionic and nonionic surface-active-agents (surfactants) within or outside discs prepared from polycarbophil, on their strength and duration of mucoadhesion invitro. For this purpose various amounts of the cationic surfactant chlorhexidine, sodium lauryl sulfate (anionic surfactant), Tween 20 and Poloxamer 407 (nonionic surfactants) were used. The effect of the presence of these surfactants within the pH 7.0 phosphate buffer medium, on the strength and duration of mucoadhesion of polycarbophil discs was determined at 37°C, using a model mucosa (rat small intestine). Also effect of the presence of various amounts of surfactants (except Tween 20) within polycarbophil discs, on their strength and duration of mucoadhesion, was assessed. Results showed that the presence of various surfactants outside the polycarbophil discs could reduce the strength and duration of mucoadhesion of discs much more than when they are present within the polymeric discs. This observation depends on the concentration of surfactant, and in the presence of greater amounts of surfactant tends to be greater. Furthermore, it was found that the presence of the cationic surfactant, chlorhexidine, outside polycarbophil discs, produces the greatest reduction in the strength and duration of mucoadhesion of discs. Effect of the other surfactants investigated, on the strength and duration of mucoadhesion of polycarbophil discs was exceedingly less than chlorhexidine. In here, the effect of the anionic surfactant, sodium lauryl sulfate, was somewhat more than the two nonionic surfactants. In addition it was found that the duration of mucoadhesion of polycarbophil discs, especially in the presence of higher amounts of surfactant, is affected more than the strength of mucoadhesion.

In conclusion it seems that the presence of surface-active-agents, and in particular cationic surfactants, could influence the mucoadhesive-ability and hence efficacy of polycarbophil, which is amongst the strongest and most recognised mucoadhesive polymers.

Keywords: Mucoadhesion, Strength of mucoadhesion, Duration of mucoadhesion, Polycarbophil, Surface-active-agents, Surfactants.

¹⁻ Associate Professors School of Pharmacy, Shaheed Beheshti University of Medical Sciences. .

²⁻ Associate Professors, School of Pharmacy, Shaheed Beheshti University of Medical Sciences. .

```
Poloxamer Tween 20
                                                         407
  pH =
  )
                         °C
     )
                                                    (Tween 20
                                       .( )
     .(
         )
```

(.()) (.() .() Lehr

% .()

...

Span 60

```
B.F.
                           Goodrich
Sigma-Aldrich Chemical
                                                      Tobyn
      Tween 20
   Poloxamer 407.
                      Merck
                                         Span 60
    . BASF ChemTrade
                                                               Triton X 705
                               (PC)
                                                     ) %
               (SLS)
Poloxamer
                     (POL407) 407
```

```
)
     (rat)
N.M.R.I.
                                                      pH =
                                               pН
          (
                 C
                                                    Tween 20
                               POL407
                             POL407
                                        POL407
                                            . %
                                            Tween 20
                                   SLS
                                 ( / )
```

.(

PH = pH =)

PC . C

SLS PC P > /) PC (ANOVA SLS (pH =)) PC \pm (Tukey post-test ANOVA P < /) .(n= PC (g) SLS SLS (g) PC / ± / / ± / (ANOVA / \pm // ± / / / ± / (pH =) PC Tween 20 .(n=) POL407 ((P < /)(g) (Tukey post-test ANOVA (g) (%) PC / ± / / ± / / ± / / ± / Tween 20 / ± / (pH = / ± / / ± / / / ± / .(n= SLS (g) Tween 20 Tween () PC (g) 20 (%) / ± / (%) SLS PC / ± / / ± / . (% /) / ± /

```
...
```

OL407 PC Tween 20 POL407 P < /)PC . (Tukey post-test ANOVA POL407 % / PC PC P < /) ANOVA (Tukey post-test ANOVA P < /)(Tukey post-test POL407 (pH =)) PC (pH = (g) POL407 (g) POL407 .(n= / ± / / ± / () (%) / ± / / ± / / ± / / ± / / / ± / / ± / / ± / () SLS PC PC

P < /)

(Tukey post- ANOVA

% test

POL407 % / Tween 20

•

•

Tween 20

(pH =)
PC
.(n= ±)

Tween 20 () (%)

/ ± / /
/ ± / /
/ ± / /
/ ± / / /
/ ± / / /
/ / ± / /

. PC
% SLS
PC
ANOVA P< /)

SLS (pH =)

(Tukey post-test

PC

±) .(n=

PC . SLS

% PC
ANOVA P< /)

(Tukey post-test

(-) P

() Tween 20 . PC () POL407 P< /) PC

(Tukey post-test ANOVA

...

POL407 (pH =) PC PC .(n= PC POL407 POL407 PC .(PC PC PC SLS PC

PC .() PC PC PC PC PC) PC)

PC

...

PC PC SLS PC SLS PC PC (PC PC PC PC Tobyn ()

Span 60

```
Triton X 705
```

%

POL407

PC

Tobyn

Tobyn

References:

- 1- Rossi S., Sandri G., Ferrari F., Bonferoni M.C., Caramella C. Buccal delivery of acyclovir from films based on chitosan and polyacrylic acid. Pharm. Dev. Technol., 2003, 8: 199-208.
- 2- Martin L., Wilson C.G., Koosha F., Uchegbu I.F. Sustained buccal delivery of the hydrophilic drug denbufylline using physically cross-linked palmitoyl glycol chitosan hydrogels. Eur. J. Pharm. Biopharm., 2003, 55: 35-45.
- 3- Miyazaki Y., Ogihara K., Yakou S., Nagai T., Takayama K. Invitro and invivo evaluation of mucoadhesive microspheres consisting of dextran derivatives and cellulose acetate butyrate. Int. J. Pharm., 2003, 258: 21-29.
- 4- Ugwoke M.I., Verbeke N., Kinget R. The biopharmaceutical aspects of nasal mucoadhesive drug delivery. J. Pharm.Pharmacol., 2001, 53: 3-21.
- 5- Hass J., Lehr C.M. Developments in the area of bioadhesive drug delivery systems. Expert Opin. Biol. Ther., 2002, 2 (3): 287-298.
- 6- Takeuchi H., Yamamoto H., Kawashima Y. Mucoadhesive nanoparticulate systems for peptide drug delivery. Adv. Drug Deliv. Rev., 2001, 47: 39-54.
- 7- Langoth N., Kalbe J., Bernkop-Schnurch A. Development of buccal drug

- delivery systems based on a thiolated polymer. Int. J. Pharm., 2003, 252: 141-148.
- 8- Gu J.M., Robinson J.R., Leung S.H.S. Binding of acrylic polymers to the mucin/epithelial surfaces: structure-property relationships. Crit. Rev. Therapeutic Drug Carrier Syst., 1988, 5: 21-67.
- 9- Peppas N.A., Burri P.A. Surface interfacial and molecular aspects of polymer bioadhesion on soft tissues. J. Contrl. Rel., 1985, 2: 257-275.
- 10- Mortazavi S.A., Smart J.D. An investigation into the role of water movement and mucus gel dehydration in mucoadhesion. J. Contrl. Rel., 1993, 25: 197-203.
- 11- Ahuja A., Khar R.K., Ali J. Mucoadhesive drug delivery systems, Drug Dev. Ind. Pharm., 1997, 23: 489-515.
- 12- Smart J.D. The role of water movement and polymer hydration in mucoadhesion. In: Bioadhesive Drug Delivery Systems Mathiowitz E., Chickering III D.E., Lehr C.M. (Eds.), Marcel Dekker Inc.: New York, 1999, pp. 11-23.
- 13- Madsen F., Eberth K., Smart J.D. A rheological assessment of the nature of interactions between mucoadhesive

polymers and a homogenised mucus gel. Biomaterials, 1998, 19: 1083-1092.

14- Mortazavi S.A. Investigation of various parameters influencing the duration of mucoadhesion of some polymer containing discs. DARU, 2002, 10: 98-104.

15- Hosny E.A., Elkheshen S.A., Saleh S.I. Buccoadhesive tablets for insulin delivery: in-vitro and in-vivo studies. Boll. Chim. Farm., 2002, 141: 210-217.

16- Tobyn M.J., Johnson J.R., Dettmar P.W. Factors affecting in-vitro gastric mucoadhesion: influence of tablet excipients, surfactants and salts on the observed mucoadhesion of polymers. Eur. J. Pharm. Biopharm., 1997, 43: 65-71.

nН

18- Sajadi-Tabassi S.A., Martin G.P., Marriott C. The effects of polysorbate surfactants on the structure of mucus glycoproteins. DARU, 2001,

19- Lehr C.M., Bouwstra J.A., Bodde H.E., Junginger H.E. A surface energy analysis of mucoadhesion: contact angle measurements on polycarbophil and pig intestinal mucosa in physiologically relevant fluids. Pharm. Res., 1992, 9: 70-75.

in vitro.

21- Mortazavi S.A., Aboofazeli R. Preparation and invitro assessment of various mucosa-adhesive films for buccal delivery. DARU, 2000, 8: 9-18.

invitro

23- Smart J.D. An invitro assessment of some mucosa-adhesive dosage forms. Int.

J. Pharm., 1991, 73: 69-74.

24- Mortazavi S.A., Smart J.D. An investigation of some factors influencing the invitro assessment of mucoadhesion. Int. J. Pharm., 1995, 116: 223-230.

25- Smart J.D. Drug delivery using buccaladhesive systems. Adv. Drug Deliv. Rev., 1993, 11: 253-270.

26- Mortazavi S.A. A comparative study between the strength and duration of mucosa-adhesion of transbuccal carbomer based aqueous gels. Iran. J. Pharm. Res., 2002, 1: 7-15.

27- Mortazavi S.A., Smart J.D. An in-vitro method for assessing the duration of mucoadhesion. J. Contrl. Rel., 1994, 31: 207-212.

28- Singla A.K., Chawla M., Singh A. Potential applications of carbomer in oral

mucoadhesive controlled drug delivery system: a review. Drug Dev. Ind. Pharm., 2000, 26: 913-924.

29- Carbomer Resins for Pharmaceutical Applications. Informational Publication of B.F. Goodrich Chemical Ltd., Technomic Publishing Agency: Basel, 1996.

