

An exact model for predicting tablet and blend content uniformity based on the theory of fluctuations in mixtures

Sagar S. Rane*, Ehab Hamed, and Sarah Rieschl

Cima Labs Inc.
R&D Formulations
7325 Aspen Lane
Brooklyn Park, MN 55428

Abstract


The content uniformity (CU) of blend and tablet formulations is a critical property that needs to be well controlled in order to produce an acceptable pharmaceutical product. Methods that allow the formulations scientist to predict the CU accurately can greatly help in reducing the development efforts. This article presents a new statistical mechanical framework for predicting CU based on first principles at the molecular level. The tablet is modeled as an open system which can be treated as a grand canonical ensemble to calculate fluctuations in the number of granules and thus the CU. Exact analytical solutions to hard sphere mixture systems available in the literature are applied to derive an expression for the CU and elucidate the different factors that impact CU. It is shown that there is a single ratio, $\lambda \equiv \langle w^2 \cdot f^2 \rangle / \langle w \cdot f \rangle$; that completely characterizes “granule quality” with respect to impact on CU. Here w and f denote the weight of granule and the fractional (w/w) assay of API in it. This ratio should be as small as possible to obtain best CU. We also derive analytical expressions which show how the granule loading impacts the CU through the excluded volume, which has been largely ignored in the literature to date. To test the predictions from the theoretical model with experimental data, tablet formulations were made and analyzed for CU using a model API. The analysis showed that the theoretical model is able to predict the experimental CU with good success.

Keywords: tablet content uniformity, prediction, granule particle size, random mixing, statistical mechanics, hard spheres

Running title: *An exact model for predicting tablet content uniformity*

* Author to whom all correspondence should be addressed. Email: sagar.rane@cimalabs.com. Phone: 763-488-4763. Fax: 763-488-4800

Table of contents graphic



I. Introduction

Granulation is a commonly used route in pharmaceutical product development to increase dissolution rate, flowability, density of API, better distribution of API for low dose formulations, or in the case of multiparticulate systems to provide for a solid core for coating a release modifying polymer. However, when granules are added to a blend formulation, problems of poor content uniformity (CU) may arise due to a combination of factors such as non-ideal granule characteristics (particle size, assay distribution), low tablet dose, particle size differences with excipients, and segregation during manufacturing operations. Therefore there is great interest in the industry to understand the interplay of various granule characteristics such as assay variation with particle size, particle size distribution, dose, and granule loading with tablet CU. Such an understanding can help identify conditions that would yield the best CU in tablets. Here an exact theoretical model for predicting the CU assuming random mixing of granules but allowing for packing effects within granules is presented. The results are general in nature and are applicable to tablet formulations with particles of any size or type such as layered/coated beads,¹ pellets,² microspheres,³ or others. Thus, the current model can have a broad impact on the field.

A number of publications have addressed the issue of predicting tablet content uniformity from particle size distribution of the API. Different theoretical approaches have been implemented. Johnson presented simple and elegant analytical calculations for the expected content uniformity for a given API particle size distribution assuming a Poisson distribution of API particles in the tablets.⁴ The approach was extended by Yalkowsky et al⁵ by assuming normal distribution of tablet assay. Yalkowsky et al. presented another analytical expression for the content uniformity from mean particle size and relative standard deviation. They also calculated an upper limit for mean particle diameter for a given relative standard deviation with log-normal particle size distribution which assured that the USP CU criteria was met with 99% probability. Rohr's et al.⁶ took a step further and incorporated the effect of testing limited sample size using the chi-square distribution. They identified upper limits for the particle mean size in order to pass the USP CU criteria with 99% confidence for a given particle standard deviation and target dose. Recently, Huang et al.⁷ presented a numerical simulation of tablet content uniformity from API particle size using the Monte Carlo simulation strategies. A nomograph was developed that can be used to define cut-off particle size requirements to pass the USP CU criteria with 99% certainty at a target dose. They also showed that the coefficient of variation and skewness are decoupled from the API particle size distribution and that the coefficient of variation varies inversely with the square root of the dose. Thus, a good amount of insight into how API particle size determines the content uniformity is available in the literature. However, there is no information in the literature for predicting CU in multiparticulate formulations that use granules or beads.

In addition, the impact of granule loading (as a proportion of tablet size) on content uniformity has not been systematically evaluated in the literature. Nor is it clear whether the observed relationships for tablets made with pure API particles would hold for tablets made with beads or granules. The impact of granule loading on the content uniformity has been discussed to some extent for e.g. Johnson.⁴ Assuming non-random mixing (i.e. particle packing effects) in a two component system, Johnson had proposed that when the API loading is between 1-10% w/w the coefficient of variation (*CV*) can be predicted roughly by multiplying the *CV* observed under ideal mixing conditions with the weight fraction of the excipient. As commented by Johnson, extending non-random mixing to multicomponent

systems is complicated. Therefore, no systematic or first principle based solutions are available for incorporating the effect of the granule loading which, as we show herein, has a large impact on tablet CU regardless of the dose.

All of the work in the literature⁴⁻⁷ thus far is based on the assumption of ideal mixing, with the exception of some results due to Johnson.⁴ In ideal mixing, no regard is given to excluded volume which plays an important role in determining the radial distribution function and thus the content uniformity. Excluded volume refers to the actual volume occupied by the granules in a tablet, i.e. volume which is excluded for placement of other particles. Taking account of excluded volume ensures that no two particles occupy the same space. Ideal mixing is only truly valid when the excluded volume of API or granules is very small (for example at low doses). It is due to this reason that the current models in the literature cannot account for the effect of granule loading or tablet size on the content uniformity.

Statistical mechanical models⁸⁻¹⁷ or computer simulations¹⁸⁻²¹ can yield deep insight into the structure of condensed matter at the molecular level. We show that the problem of predicting content uniformity in blend or tablet is essentially of the same category and can be solved with the framework of statistical mechanics.

In this article, analytical theory for hard sphere mixtures is implemented to calculate the number fluctuations in granules and hence the *exact CU under the assumption of random mixing while allowing for packing effects within granules*. Analytical solution to the problem of hard spheres became possible after the Percus-Yevick (P-Y) approximation⁸⁻⁹ was used to solve the Ornstein-Zernike equation.¹⁰ Wertheim¹¹ and Thiele¹² independently obtained an exact solution for the radial distribution function of a fluid of single component hard spheres using the P-Y approximation. While Lebowitz¹³⁻¹⁴ obtained an exact solution for the fluid of a mixture of hard spheres. The equation of states obtained for both the single component and mixture of hard spheres have been shown to be in very good agreement with computer simulations for the whole range of fluid densities. Therefore, these exact analytical solutions provide an important foundation for calculating fluid properties and are implemented in the current work. By modeling the granules as hard spheres we can take into account the excluded volume and thus account for the effect of granule loading and packing on the CV. In the current approach, excipients are ignored because the results are obtained under the assumption of random mixing of granules. Random mixing is a commonly used approach in statistical mechanics to understand the behavior of complex systems and is a good approximation in situations where there is weak interaction between particles.

Since the current approach is based on equilibrium thermodynamics, it predicts the structure of the blend under equilibrium conditions only, without regard to the path taken to achieve that state. If one desires to know the path taken to achieve the final CU, other theoretical methods or simulations such as DEM (discrete element method) will be needed which calculate particle trajectories during processing operations.²² Since the goal of every system is to achieve equilibrium conditions, the current approach yields valuable insight into molecular factors that govern the final CU.

Finally, to confirm the theoretical model, an experimental study was conducted using granules manufactured from a model API. Tablets with varying dose and granule loading were manufactured and analyzed for CU. Good agreement was obtained between the

predictions of the theoretical model and the experimental *CV*. This shows that the model is able to capture all the elements that impact the *CV* under the assumptions of random mixing.

II. Materials

Diphenhydramine HCL USP was obtained from Letco Medical, Inc (Decatur, AL) with a reported purity of >99%. The API had d_{10} , d_{50} , and d_{90} of 21, 84, and 195 micron respectively. Mannitol 60 (Pearlitol® 160C) was obtained from Roquette Frères, France. Granular mannitol 2080 (Mannogem™) was obtained from SPI Pharma (Grand Haven, MI). Microcrystalline cellulose (Avicel®) was obtained from FMC Biopolymer (Philadelphia, PA). Crospovidone (Polyplasdone® XL) was obtained from ISP technologies (Calvert city, KY). Magnesium stearate was obtained from Mallinckrodt Inc (St. Louis, MO). Eudragit® E100 was obtained from Evonik Röhm Pharma Polymers, Germany. All of the above excipients complied with USP and Ph. Eur specifications and were used as obtained without any further processing. Ethyl alcohol USP was obtained from Grain Processing corporation (Muscatine, IA). Squalene (purity > 98%) was obtained from Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, MO).

III. Experimental Section

A. Theoretical Model

In this article, a new approach to predicting content uniformity of granules in tablets or blend is presented. The approach is based on modeling the blend as a fluid mixture and applying the theory of fluctuations derived from statistical mechanics. This approach, combined with analytical theory of hard sphere fluid mixtures, allows us to derive a *direct* and *exact* model for the content uniformity based on the assumption of random mixing. A scheme illustrating the approach is depicted in Figure 1.

Consider a volume in a given blend which corresponds to one tablet mass after accounting for the blend density (region \mathfrak{R} above). This blend volume can be considered to be ultimately compressed into a tablet and therefore studying the drug content in this volume allows us to obtain an expression for the content uniformity. Let m denote the total number of granule types (i.e. sizes) in the blend. We assume that each granule is impenetrable and is spherical. Let μ_i denote the chemical potential for granules of diameter R_i .

Region \mathfrak{R} in figure 1 is “open” i.e. it can allow for granules to enter and leave. Note that the volume V (corresponding to one tablet) of the region \mathfrak{R} is fixed. The actual number of granules of each type i , N_i , in region \mathfrak{R} is controlled by the respective chemical potential, μ_i . In statistical mechanics, such a system where the volume, temperature, and chemical potentials are fixed while allowing for the number of granules or particles to fluctuate is referred to as the grand canonical ensemble.²³

Let w_i and f_i denote the weight of each granule of type i and the fractional (w/w) assay of API in it. Then, the weight of the API in each granule of type i is $a_i = w_i f_i$. Each tablet has a variable number of total number of granules (N) and there is a distribution in the weight of the granules. Let \bar{N}_i denote the average number of granules of type i in region \mathfrak{R} . The variance in the number of granules of each type i is given as:

$$\text{Var}(N_i) = \langle (N_i - \bar{N}_i)^2 \rangle = \langle (\Delta N_i)^2 \rangle \quad (3.1)$$

Thus $\text{Var}(N_i)$ is identical to the mean square number fluctuations of granules of type i .

The dose is given as,

$$D = \left\langle \sum_{j=1}^N \hat{a}_j \right\rangle = \langle N \rangle \langle w \cdot f \rangle \quad (3.2)$$

where \hat{a}_j is the weight of the API in granule j . The variance in the dose can be written as,⁵

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(D) &= \text{Var} \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \hat{a}_j \right) \\ &= \langle N \rangle \text{Var}(\hat{a}) + \text{Var}(N) [E(\hat{a})]^2 \\ &= \langle N \rangle (E(w^2 \cdot f^2) - [E(w \cdot f)]^2) + \text{Var}(N) [E(w \cdot f)]^2 \\ &= \langle N \rangle (\langle w^2 \cdot f^2 \rangle - \langle w \cdot f \rangle^2) + \text{Var}(N) \langle w \cdot f \rangle^2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

The percent coefficient of variation is then given as,

$$CV = \frac{100[\text{Var}(D)]^{\frac{1}{2}}}{D} \quad (3.4)$$

Each of the terms in Eq (3.2) and (3.3) can be estimated from knowledge of the dose, particle size, and assay distribution with granule particle size. The only term that is non-trivial is $\text{Var}(N)$. However, $\text{Var}(N)$ can also be evaluated exactly as we show below.

The total number fluctuations in a fixed volume V are given by

$$\langle (\Delta N)^2 \rangle = \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^m (N_i - \bar{N}_i)^2 \right\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^m \langle (\Delta N_i)^2 \rangle + \sum_{i \neq j=1}^m \langle (\Delta N_i)(\Delta N_j) \rangle \quad (3.5)$$

In the rest of the paper, summation over all m species will not be shown explicitly and is understood. In the grand canonical ensemble it can be shown that,²⁴

$$\langle (\Delta N_i)^2 \rangle = \left. \frac{\partial N_i}{\partial \beta \mu_i} \right|_{V, T, \mu_k, k \neq i} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle (\Delta N_i)(\Delta N_j) \rangle = \left. \frac{\partial N_i}{\partial \beta \mu_j} \right|_{V, T, \mu_k, k \neq j} \quad (3.6)$$

where $\beta = 1/kT$; k is the Boltzmann's constant and T is the temperature in Kelvin. Thus, the total number fluctuations can be obtained from the individual species number fluctuations and cross species number fluctuations given by Eq. (3.6). For a two-component system it is known that the matrix of the individual species and cross species number fluctuations is the inverse of the matrix formed with the derivative of the chemical potentials.²⁵⁻²⁷ It is easy to prove that this result is also applicable to multicomponent systems. Therefore, we have,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \left. \frac{\partial N_1}{\partial \beta \mu_1} \right|_{V,T,\mu_k,k \neq 1} & \dots & \left. \frac{\partial N_1}{\partial \beta \mu_n} \right|_{V,T,\mu_k,k \neq n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \left. \frac{\partial N_n}{\partial \beta \mu_1} \right|_{V,T,\mu_k,k \neq 1} & \dots & \left. \frac{\partial N_n}{\partial \beta \mu_n} \right|_{V,T,\mu_k,k \neq n} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \left. \frac{\partial \beta \mu_1}{\partial N_1} \right|_{V,T,N_k,k \neq 1} & \dots & \left. \frac{\partial \beta \mu_1}{\partial N_n} \right|_{V,T,N_k,k \neq n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \left. \frac{\partial \beta \mu_n}{\partial N_1} \right|_{V,T,N_k,k \neq 1} & \dots & \left. \frac{\partial \beta \mu_n}{\partial N_n} \right|_{V,T,N_k,k \neq n} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \quad (3.7)$$

In order to calculate the matrix $\left[\frac{\partial \beta \mu}{\partial N} \right]$ an analytical theory is needed. Fortunately, such a theory is readily available in the literature. For a system of pure component hard spheres, Wertheim¹¹ and Thiele¹² succeeded in obtaining an exact solution of the P-Y integral equation for the radial distribution function $g(r)$. For a system consisting of a mixture of hard spheres, Lebowitz¹³⁻¹⁴ has obtained an exact solution, which we use here in the calculation for the individual and cross species fluctuations. The expression for the chemical potential is obtained as,¹⁴

$$\beta \mu_i = \ln \left[\frac{\rho_i h^3}{(2\pi m_i kT)^{3/2}} \right] + \ln(1 - \xi) + \frac{\pi}{6} \beta P R_i^3 + \frac{R_i^2}{(1 - \xi)^3} \left\{ 3Y - 6\xi Y + \frac{9}{2} X^2 - \frac{9}{2} \xi X^2 + 3\xi^2 Y \right\} + \frac{R_i}{(1 - \xi)^3} \{ 3X - 6\xi X + 3\xi^2 X \} \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$\beta P = \left\{ [\Sigma \rho_i][1 + \xi + \xi^2] - \left(\frac{18}{\pi} \right) \sum_{i < j} \eta_i \eta_j (R_i - R_j)^2 [2R_{ij} + X R_i R_j] \right\} (1 - \xi)^{-3} \quad (3.9)$$

where

R_i is the diameter of a particle of the i^{th} species, m_i is the mass of a particle of the i^{th} species, $\rho_i = N_i/V$ is the number density of the i^{th} species, and h is Planck's constant.

$$R_{ij} \equiv (R_i + R_j)/2, \quad \eta_i = \frac{1}{6} \pi \rho_i, \quad \xi = \sum \eta_i R_i^3, \quad X = \sum \eta_i R_i^2, \quad Y = \sum \eta_i R_i \quad (3.10)$$

Here ξ is the packing fraction i.e. the volume fraction occupied by granules in the tablet. From differentiation of Eq. (3.8), the matrix $\left[\frac{\partial \beta \mu}{\partial N} \right]$ can be easily constructed. Then the individual and cross species fluctuations can be calculated exactly through Eq. (3.7). This allows for the evaluation of CV from Eqs. (3.3-3.4). It is also possible to calculate CV directly from the individual and cross species number fluctuations. An example to show this calculation is included in section IV-B.

B. Tableting study

To evaluate the predictions of the theoretical approach presented herein with experimental data, tablets with varying size and loading of granules were manufactured. The experimental plan of 9 tablet formulations is outlined in Table I. A total of 27 independent

tablet batches were manufactured to ensure that a reasonably large data set is available (three tablet batches were manufactured for each formulation).

Diphenhydramine HCL was chosen as a model API. The API was granulated in a high shear granulator (KG-5L, Key International, Englishtown, NJ) and coated with Eudragit E100 dissolved in ethyl alcohol in a bottom spray fluid bed processor (MP-1, Niro Aeromatic, Columbia, MD). The target potency for the coated granules was ~30% w/w. The granules were screened and particles larger than 30 mesh or smaller than 100 mesh were discarded. The -30/+100 mesh coated granules were blended with mannitol 60, granular mannitol 2080, microcrystalline cellulose, and crospovidone in a V-blender (Patterson-Kelley, East Stroudsburg, PA) for 30 minutes. Following which magnesium stearate was added and the mixture was further blended for an additional 5 minutes. The granules were loaded at 5.0, 12.5, and 25.0% w/w. The loading of the excipients were as follows: microcrystalline cellulose (10.0% w/w), crospovidone (6.0 % w/w), magnesium stearate (1.5 % w/w). Granular mannitol 2080 and mannitol 60 were loaded at 1:1 ratio to add up all ingredients to 100%. The blend was then compressed on a rotary tablet press (Piccola B10-C, Riva S.A. Argentina) using 4 stations at 40 and 25 rpm press and paddle speeds respectively. Batch size was ≥ 3800 tablets for each formulation studied. Tablet samples were collected in ten approximately equally spaced intervals throughout the batch. Three tablets per interval were analyzed for API content using UV/VIS spectrophotometry (Model 8453, Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA) at wavelength of 258 nm. For each tablet formulation three independent batches were manufactured and analyzed for CU. The coated granules were also analyzed for particle size distribution using several screen sizes (30 – 100 US mesh) and assay for each sieve fraction was determined using spectrophotometry. The granule particle size and assay data are shown in Table II. The particle size distribution of the blends are shown in Table III.

IV. Results

A. Theoretical model

Exact solution:

The most direct evaluation of the *CV* without any approximations can be obtained by writing the variance in the drug content as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(D) &= \left\langle \left(\sum_i a_i N_i - \sum_i a_i \bar{N}_i \right)^2 \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_i a_i^2 \langle (\Delta N_i)^2 \rangle + \sum_{i \neq j} a_i a_j \langle (\Delta N_i) (\Delta N_j) \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

The above method of calculating the *CV* is exact; however, it does not give us any insight into the different granule and tablet properties that collectively impact the *CV*. To understand that relationship between the variables involved we have to obtain an approximate expression for $\text{Var}(N)$ in Eq. (3.3).

Approximate solutions:

In this section we show how an approximate expression for $\text{Var}(N)$ can be derived.

i) Single component system

It is well known that for a pure component, the number fluctuations in a control volume V are given exactly as follows:²⁸

$$\frac{\langle(\Delta N)^2\rangle}{N^2} = \frac{\kappa_T}{\beta V} \quad (4.2)$$

where $\kappa_T = \frac{-1}{V} \frac{\partial V}{\partial P} \Big|_{T,N}$ is the isothermal compressibility. For the evaluation of the isothermal compressibility, we use the equation of state (EOS) for pure component hard sphere systems obtained from the integral equation theory by Wertheim¹¹ and Thiele¹²,

$$\frac{\beta P V}{N} = \frac{1 + \xi + \xi^2}{(1 - \xi)^3} \quad (4.3)$$

This EOS results in the following expression for the isothermal compressibility, when terms up to ξ^2 are retained:

$$\frac{\kappa_T}{\beta V} = \frac{1}{N(1 + 8\xi + 21\xi^2)} \quad (4.4)$$

Plugging Eq. 4.4 in 4.2 we find that the $\text{Var}(N)$ for a pure component is given as:

$$\langle(\Delta N)^2\rangle = \frac{N}{(1 + 8\xi + 21\xi^2)} \quad (4.5)$$

Since both w and f are fixed for a pure component species, inserting Eq. 4.5 into Eqs. 3.2-3.4 we find that

$$CV = \frac{100}{\sqrt{D}} \left[\frac{w \cdot f}{1 + 8\xi + 21\xi^2} \right]^{1/2} \quad (4.6)$$

Eq. 4.6 is exact as it is derived from an analytical theory for single component hard spheres that has been shown to reliably describe fluid behavior up to at least a packing fraction of $\xi \lesssim 0.4$.¹⁴

ii) Multicomponent system

For a multicomponent system, the term $\frac{\kappa_T}{\beta V}$ no longer represents the total number fluctuations. For example, for a two component system (1,2), it can be shown with straightforward thermodynamics that:²⁵⁻²⁷

$$\frac{\langle(\Delta N)^2\rangle}{N^2} = \frac{\kappa_{T,N_1,N_2}}{\beta V} - \frac{N_1 N_2 (\bar{v}_2 - \bar{v}_1)^2}{(\partial\beta\mu_1/\partial N_2)_{T,P,N_1}} \quad (4.7)$$

where, \bar{v}_i denotes the partial molar volume of species i . The cross-derivative $(\partial\beta\mu_1/\partial N_2)_{T,P,N_1}$ is non-positive, which makes the second term in Eq. 4.7 positive.²⁹ Thus, in this case, the term $\frac{\kappa_T}{\beta V}$ captures only a portion of the total number fluctuations.

For mixtures with >2 components, the expansion of total number fluctuations into contributions from compressibility and other contributions is non-trivial and is not discussed here. However, the two component mixture serves as a good example to highlight the fact that the total number fluctuations cannot be entirely derived from the isothermal compressibility for multicomponent systems. Therefore, unlike Eq. 4.6, which is exact for a single component system, only an approximate analytical expression for the CV can be obtained for multicomponent mixtures. However, in the following we find that in multicomponent systems for small $\xi \lesssim 0.2$, the term $\frac{\kappa_T}{\beta V}$ serves as a good approximation for the total number fluctuations. This approach to estimating the total number fluctuations allows us to understand the various factors that contribute to the CV in tablets and blends.

From the EOS in Eq. 3.9 the isothermal compressibility for a multicomponent system of hard spheres can be obtained (only terms up to ξ^2 are retained).¹⁴⁻¹⁵ Therefore,

$$\frac{\langle(\Delta N)^2\rangle}{N^2} \cong \frac{\kappa_T}{\beta V} = \frac{1}{N(1 + 8\xi + 21\xi^2 - 6y_1\xi - 27y_1\xi^2 - 9y_2\xi^2)} \quad (4.8)$$

Where,

$$y_1 = \sum_{j>i=1}^m \Delta_{ij}(R_i + R_j)(R_i R_j)^{-1/2}$$

$$y_2 = \sum_{j>i=1}^m \Delta_{ij} \sum_{k=1}^m \left(\frac{\xi_k}{\xi}\right) \frac{(R_i R_j)^{1/2}}{R_k}$$

$$\Delta_{ij} = [(\xi_i \xi_j)^{1/2}/\xi][(R_i - R_j)^2/R_i R_j](x_i x_j)^{1/2}$$

$$\xi_i = \frac{1}{6}\pi\rho_i R_i^3$$

and x_i is the mole fraction of the i^{th} species.

Note that Eq. 4.8 is exact as it is derived from an analytical theory for hard sphere mixtures that has been shown to reliably describe fluid behavior up to at least a packing fraction of $\xi \lesssim 0.51$.¹⁵

Inserting Eq. 4.8 into Eq. 3.3, we find that

$$\text{Var}(D) = N \left[\langle w^2 \cdot f^2 \rangle - \langle w \cdot f \rangle^2 \frac{(8\xi + 21\xi^2 - 6y_1\xi - 27y_1\xi^2 - 9y_2\xi^2)}{(1 + 8\xi + 21\xi^2 - 6y_1\xi - 27y_1\xi^2 - 9y_2\xi^2)} \right] \quad (4.9)$$

This shows that the *CV* is given as

$$CV = \frac{100}{\sqrt{D}} \left[\underbrace{\langle w^2 \cdot f^2 \rangle}_1 - \underbrace{\langle w \cdot f \rangle}_2 \frac{(8\xi + 21\xi^2 - 6y_1\xi - 27y_1\xi^2 - 9y_2\xi^2)}{(1 + 8\xi + 21\xi^2 - 6y_1\xi - 27y_1\xi^2 - 9y_2\xi^2)} \right]^{1/2} \quad (4.10)$$

The different grouped terms in the above equation are discussed in further detail in section V-A

B. Tableting study

To show the predictions from the model and its comparison with the experimental data, at first the true density of the coated granules had to be obtained. This was performed by taking ~25 gm of the -30/+100 mesh granules in a volumetric cylinder. To this, a non-interacting solvent (squalene) was added and mixed to displace all the air bubbles. The final volume of the mixture was noted. Taking into account the final volume of the mixture, density of squalene, and weight of granules, the true density of the granules was calculated to be 1.2 gm/cc. We assume that the true density for the different sieve cuts are very close and therefore use a single value for all based on the composite.

Next, the packing fraction, ξ , in each tablet formulation had to be estimated. This was done by taking into account the blend density ($\cong 0.6$ gm/cc, irrespective of granule loading), tablet weight, w/w percent loading of granules, and true density of granules. The calculated values are shown in Table I.

In Table IV we show the calculations performed in estimating the various terms in Eq. 4.10. For each sieve cut, we use the median diameter of the particles for the calculation. In Table IV, the number fraction of granules of each sieve cut were obtained by dividing the weight fraction with the cube of the median diameter and normalizing the ratios to add up to 1.0. This method is based on the assumption that the true density of each sieve fraction is identical. The weight of each bead was obtained by multiplying the volume of each bead with the true density. We obtain the following properties for the granules: $\langle w^2 \cdot f^2 \rangle = 2.85E-11$ gm² and $\langle w \cdot f \rangle = 2.95E-06$ gm. The number of granules of each sieve cut in a tablet, and the associated number densities, ρ_i , in a tablet for use in Eq. 3.8 and 3.9 can be calculated from the volume of the granules of each sieve cut in a tablet and the volume of each granule of the sieve cut. From Eq. 4.8, y_1 and y_2 were calculated to be 0.1961 and 0.0773 respectively, which are fixed since the same granule composite was used in all tablet formulations.

With the information in Tables I, II and IV, the predicted *CV* from Eqs. 4.1 and 4.10 can be easily calculated. The predicted *CVs* from these equations, along with the experimentally measured tablet weight corrected *CV* (n=3 batches for each formulation) are shown in Table V.

In these calculations, to obtain the individual number fluctuations, the matrix $\left[\frac{\partial \beta \mu}{\partial N} \right]$ was calculated by numerical differentiation of Equation 3.8. The inverse matrix, viz., $\left[\frac{\partial N}{\partial \beta \mu} \right]$ was obtained using the MINVERSE function in MS Excel. Then, the exact *CV* can be easily obtained through Eq. 4.1.

V. Discussion

A. Theoretical model

Eq. (4.10) allows us to clearly understand the contributions from various factors to the final content uniformity. The first ratio shows that the CV varies inversely with the square root of the dose if all other factors are fixed (granule particle size and assay distribution, granule loading). The second ratio shows how the granule characteristics with respect to particle size distribution and assay distribution with particle size impact the CV . The third term shows how the percent loading of granules (on a vol/vol basis) affects the CV , although, this effect is coupled with the assay distribution of the granules through the term $\langle w.f \rangle$ and the particle size distribution through the terms y_1 and y_2 . It can be seen that the CV is a complex function of the granule particle size and assay distribution, tablet volume, and granule loading. Therefore, it is not possible to generate a simplified nomograph e.g. for the limiting granule particle size distribution for passing the USP CU criteria as is available in the ideal mixing approximation from references 5-7. In this case, the limiting granule characteristics have to be obtained for each tablet formulation individually from the theory.

Further insight from Eq. 4.10 can be obtained as follows. If the dose is fixed, but the tablet size is increased such that $\xi \rightarrow 0$ (this will be the situation in low granule loading or low dose tablets), Eq. 4.10 evolves as:

$$CV_{\xi \rightarrow 0} = \frac{100}{\sqrt{D}} \left[\frac{\langle w^2 \cdot f^2 \rangle}{\langle w \cdot f \rangle} \right]^{1/2} \quad (5.1)$$

Eq. 5.1 shows that for a given dose the CV is determined by the ratio $\lambda = \langle w^2 \cdot f^2 \rangle / \langle w \cdot f \rangle$. Thus, clearly, λ characterizes the “granule quality”. If λ is larger the CV is larger and vice versa. To ensure a low CV we must have as small λ as possible. From Table IV, for the experimental system we find that $\lambda=9.661E-06$ gm.

If the particle size and its associated assay fraction are truly independent, one can write λ as:

$$\lambda = \frac{(Var(w) + \langle w \rangle^2)(Var(f) + \langle f \rangle^2)}{\langle w \rangle \cdot \langle f \rangle} \quad (5.2)$$

Where $Var(w) = \langle w^2 \rangle - \langle w \rangle^2$ and $Var(f) = \langle f^2 \rangle - \langle f \rangle^2$ denote the variance in the particle size distribution and assay with particle size distribution. Eq. 5.2 shows that both the particle size distribution and assay with particle size distribution equally influence the granule quality and hence the CV of tablets. Thus it is not merely sufficient to have a narrow particle size distribution; attention should also be paid to the assay distribution. Note: If the particle size and its associated assay fraction are not independent, or, their degree of independence is not known, Eq. 5.2 should not be used for calculation of λ . The exact definition of λ should be used instead.

A special case of Eq. 5.1 is when f is fixed (for granules) or $f=1$ (as in pure API particles). Then, the equation reduces to:

$$CV_{\xi \rightarrow 0, f = \text{fixed}} = \frac{100}{\sqrt{D}} \left[\frac{\langle w^2 \rangle}{\langle w \rangle} \right]^{1/2} \quad (5.3)$$

Eq. 5.3 is identical to one recently derived by Huang and Ku.⁷ This equation was shown to reliably predict the *CV* in low dose formulations with pure API particles.

Another observation from the present study is that it is not always true that removing only larger particles will reduce the *CV*. For example, consider two cases for illustration a) if the particle assay is increasing with size and b) when particle assay is decreasing with size. Representative plots for the product wf of each particle with the number fraction in these two granule systems are shown in Figure 2. Both granule systems have a fixed log-normal particle size distribution. The particle size is increasing on the x-axis from left to right for granules A while it is decreasing in the same direction for granules B. For both granules, it is found that λ can be decreased by removing particles of large values for wf , which for granules B is actually the smaller size particles. In our opinion, for any granule system removing particles of larger values for wf should reduce λ . However, this needs to be evaluated further and could be verified on a case by case basis.

B. Tableting study

In Table V, we find that the *CV* calculated through Eq. 4.10 is very close to the *CV* obtained from the exact expression through Eq. 4.1. This closeness provides further proof that Eq. 4.10 is able to capture most of the number fluctuations in typical blend or tablet formulations with relatively low packing fraction ($\xi \lesssim 0.2$). For example, with the granule system shown in Table II it is found that the percentage of the total number fluctuations captured by the term $\frac{\kappa_T}{\beta V}$ at $\xi = 0.026, 0.065, 0.13$ and 0.2 are 92, 82, 67, and 50% respectively. Therefore, at larger ξ , Eq. 4.10 becomes a less accurate approximation of Eq. 4.1. This is also apparent in Table V where the difference in the *CV* calculated through Eq. 4.1 and Eq. 4.10 increases with increasing granule loading i.e. ξ .

It should also be noted that during regular manufacturing a distribution in the measured *CV* exists due to the finite number of tablets that are analyzed in each batch. The theoretical calculation of the *CV* through Eq. 4.1 gives the exact mean *CV* expected for an infinite number of tablets.

During manufacturing the *CV* may increase due to segregation in blending operations, dispensing, tableting operation, and other sources. Therefore, we have,

$$CV_{obs}^2 = CV_{calc}^2 + CV_{Tableting}^2 + CV_{Blend\ dispensing}^2 + CV_{Error}^2$$

Or

$$CV_{obs}^2 = CV_{calc}^2 + CV_{All\ errors}^2$$

In the last column of Table V we calculate $CV_{All\ errors}^2$ as the difference between the exact *CV* (through Eq. 4.1) and the experimental mean *CV*. We find that $CV_{All\ errors}^2$ is roughly same for all the tablet formulations of a given weight. This is interesting as it suggests that the granule loading does not have a large impact on the degree of segregation. With increasing tablet weight $CV_{All\ errors}^2$ significantly decreases. This suggests that the segregation arising

from tableting operation can be reduced by making a larger tablet for a given dose. The larger values for $CV_{All\ errors}^2$ for the 100 mg tablet are not unexpected considering that filling a smaller tablet die is likely to be more difficult and involve more movement for the blend which can cause more segregation in the placement of granules in tablets. Note that for the 100 mg tablet, it appears that the model is unable to predict the experimental CV for higher granule loading. In fact, this is not the case. Since the CV from random mixing [i.e. Eq. (4.1)] decreases rapidly with increasing granule loading and $CV_{All\ errors}^2$ is large and relatively fixed, the experimental CV is relatively large at high granule loading.

The results from Table V show that one can calculate $CV_{All\ errors}^2$ and that may allow us to predict the experimental CV (in combination with the theoretical model) for other products, or, at least other formulations with similar characteristics.

VI. Conclusions

A generic and exact model for predicting content uniformity of granules in blend and tablet formulations is presented. The model exploits the fundamental theory behind particle number fluctuations in statistical mechanics to allow for the most accurate prediction of the CV under the assumption of random mixing. A distinguishing feature of the present model is that it takes into account the excluded volume of the granules in the formulation, and thus, allows us to study the effect of granule loading on the CV. Earlier models have mostly been based on the assumption of ideal mixing which ignores the excluded volume, and consequently, are incapable of incorporating the effect of granule loading. Our model also applies to formulations made with API particles as a special case. We also manufactured several tablet formulations with granules made from a model API to test the predictions from the theoretical model. It was found that the model is able to predict the CV with good success in all cases. An exact method for calculating the CV was presented along with analytical expressions which are an approximate solution. The approximate solutions give insight into the factors that contribute to the CV. It is shown that the CV varies inversely with the square root of the dose if all other factors are fixed (granule particle size and assay distribution, granule loading). We showed how the percent loading of granules (on a vol/vol basis) affects the CV, and, this effect is coupled with the characteristics of the granules. It was established that the CV is determined by the ratio $\lambda = \langle w^2 \cdot f^2 \rangle / \langle w \cdot f \rangle$ which characterizes the “granule quality”. If λ is larger the CV is larger and vice versa. To ensure a low CV we must have as small λ as possible. This ratio clearly shows the relation between granule properties and observed CV. It was argued that it is not always necessary to remove particles with larger size to reduce CV, but, instead remove particles with larger values for $w \cdot f$ which could be the smaller particles if the assay is decreasing with increasing particle size.

The theoretical method presented could be used to estimate the $CV_{All\ errors}^2$ in the blend processing and tableting operations, and then predict the experimental CV for similar products. In summary, our theoretical model can help in guiding the formulations scientist for designing robust processes to meet the requirements for content uniformity.

Acknowledgement

S.S.R would like to thank Tim Hundertmark, Vikas Agarwal, Jim Netz, Terry Anderson, and Brian Ullmann for providing computer resources and support in execution of the model. S.S.R would also like to thank Nicholas Pick for conducting the API particle size and blend density measurements.

References

1. L. Martinez, P. Tchoreloff, B. Leclerc, M. Besnard, and G. Couarraze, *Pharm. Tech. Eur.* **1** (2001).
2. S. Krenzlin, F. Siepmann, D. Wils, L. Guerin-Deremaux, M. P. Flament, and J. Siepmann, *Drug. Dev. Ind. Pharm.* **37**, 1150 (2011).
3. K. Malik, G. Arora, and I. Singh, *Sci. Pharm.* **79**, 653 (2011).
4. M. C. R. Johnson, *Pharm. Acta. Helv.* **47**, 546 (1972).
5. S. H. Yalkowsky and S. Bolton, *Pharm. Res.* **7**, 962 (1990).
6. B. R. Rohrs, G. E. Amidon, R. H. Meury, P. J. Secreast, H. M. King, and C. J. Skoug, *J. Pharm. Sci.* **95**, 1049 (2006).
7. C. -Y. Huang and M. S. Ku, *Int. J. Pharm.* **383**, 70 (2010).
8. J. K. Percus and G. J. Yevick, *Phys. Rev.* **110**, 1 (1958).
9. J. K. Percus, *Phys. Rev. Letters.* **8**, 462 (1962).
10. L. S. Ornstein and F. Zernike, *Proc. Acad. Sci. Amsterdam.* **17**, 793 (1914).
11. M. Wertheim, *Phys. Rev. Letters* **10**, 321 (1963).
12. E. Thiele, *J. Chem. Phys.* **39**, 474 (1963).
13. J. L. Lebowitz, *Phys. Rev.* **133**, A895 (1964).
14. J. L. Lebowitz and J. S. Rowlinson, *J. Chem. Phys.* **41**, 133 (1964).
15. G. A. Mansoori, N. F. Carnahan, K. E. Starling, and T. W. Jr. Leland, *J. Chem. Phys.* **54**, 1523 (1971).
16. S. Rane and P. D. Gujrati, *Phys. Rev. E.* **64**, 011801 (2001).
17. S. S. Rane and P. D. Gujrati, *Macromolecules* **38**, 8734 (2005).
18. S. S. Rane, W. L. Mattice, and A. Dhinojwala, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **108**, 14830 (2004).
19. W. L. Mattice, C. A. Helfer, S. S. Rane, E. von Meerwall, and B. L. Farmer, *J. Polym. Sci. Part B: Polym. Phys.* **43**, 1271 (2005).
20. S. S. Rane and B. D. Anderson, *Mol. Pharmaceutics* **5**, 1023 (2008).
21. B. D. Anderson, S. S. Rane, and T. -X. Xiang, in *Water properties in Food, Health, Pharmaceutical and Biological Systems*, edited by D. S. Reid, T. Sajjaanantakul, P. J. Lillford, and S. Charoenrein (Wiley-Blackwell, Singapore, 1st ed, 2010), pp 315-334.
22. B. C. Hancock and W. R. Ketterhagen, *Int. J. Pharm.* **418**, 265 (2011).
23. R. K. Pathria, *Statistical Mechanics* (Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 1996) pp 90-95.
24. R. K. Pathria, *Statistical Mechanics* (Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 1996) pp 93.
25. H. Benoit, *Polymer* **32**, 579 (1991).
26. J. -F. Joanny and H. Benoit, *Macromolecules* **30**, 3704 (1997).
27. S. S. Rane and P.D. Gujrati, *Eur. Polym. J.* **41**, 1846 (2005).
28. R. K. Pathria, *Statistical Mechanics* (Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford, 1996) pp 100-101.
29. A simple application of the Gibbs-Duhem equation in a binary mixture shows that the cross-derivative $(\partial\beta\mu_1/\partial N_2)_{T,P,N_1}$ is always non-positive.

List of symbols

w_i	weight of each granule of type i
f_i	fractional (w/w) assay of API in granule of type i
m	total number of granule types (i.e. sizes)
μ_i	chemical potential of granule of type i
R_i	diameter of granule of type i
V	volume corresponding to one tablet in the blend
N_i	number of granules of type i in the tablet
\bar{N}_i	average number of granules of type i in the tablet
N	total number of granules in the tablet
a_i	weight of the API in each granule of type i
\hat{a}_j	weight of the API in granule j
β	$1/kT$
k	Boltzmann's constant
T	temperature in Kelvin
P	pressure
m_i	mass of a granule of type i
ρ_i	number density of granule of type i
h	Planck's constant
ξ	packing fraction, i.e. volume fraction occupied by all granules in the tablet
D	dose
$\langle(\Delta N_i)^2\rangle$	mean square number fluctuations in granule of type i
$\langle(\Delta N_i)(\Delta N_j)\rangle$	mean product of number fluctuations in granule of types i and j
$\langle(\Delta N)^2\rangle$	total number fluctuations in volume V
κ_T	isothermal compressibility
\bar{v}_i	partial molar volume of granule type i
x_i	mole fraction of granule of type i
ξ_i	packing fraction of granule of type i
CV	percent coefficient of variation in the dose
CV_{obs}	percent coefficient of variation in the dose observed from experiments
CV_{calc}	percent coefficient of variation in the dose calculated from theory
$CV_{All\ errors}$	contribution to percent coefficient of variation in the dose from segregation during manufacturing operations
λ	parameter that characterizes "granule quality"

Figure 1. Scheme illustrating the approach of considering each blend volume equivalent to a tablet as an open system within the entire blend. The system is then modeled based on its analogy to thermodynamics of fluid mixtures.




Figure 2. An illustrative result for the possible distribution of the product wf in granules, A) assay increasing with particle size, and, B) assay decreasing with particle size. The particle size distribution is same for both granules. The particle size is increasing on the x-axis from left to right for granules A while it is decreasing in the same direction for granules B. For both granules, λ can be decreased by removing particles of large values for wf




Table I. Experimental plan for tablet manufacture

Formulation number	Particle loading (%w/w)	Dose (mg)	Tablet weight (mg) and tooling size (inch)	ξ
1	5.0	1.49	100 (1/4)	0.026
2	12.5	3.72		0.065
3	25.0	7.44		0.13
4	5.0	3.72	250 (5/16)	0.026
5	12.5	9.30		0.065
6	25.0	18.60		0.13
7	5.0	7.44	500 (1/2)	0.026
8	12.5	18.60		0.065
9	25.0	37.20		0.13

Table II. Particle size distribution and assay for each sieve fraction for the coated granules

Mesh size	Diameter of granules (cm)	Percent retained (w/w)	Assay fraction of each cut
30	0.0595	0.0	NA
35	0.05	11.4	0.3317
40	0.04	9.7	0.3285
45	0.0354	13.1	0.3132
50	0.0297	14.9	0.3081
60	0.025	14.9	0.3014
70	0.021	14.9	0.2959
80	0.0177	12.4	0.2929
100	0.0149	8.7	0.2871
-30/+100 composite	NA	100	0.3077

Table III. Particle size distribution of the blends with various granule loadings

Mesh size	Percent retained (% w/w) on the sieve		
	Granule load 5% w/w	Granule load 12.5% w/w	Granule load 25% w/w
30	0	0.2	0.2
40	8.3	12.1	11.8
50	13.3	14.3	14.8
100	30	29.2	32.3
200	22.4	20.1	18.4
325	14.3	13.1	12.4
Pan	11.7	10.9	10.2
Total	100	99.9	100.1

Table IV. Calculation of granule characteristics

Sieve cut US mesh	Median Diameter (cm)	% w/w retained	Number fraction, p	Assay fraction, f	Volume of each bead, v (cm ³)	Weight of each bead, w (gm)	API in each bead, a (gm)	=p.w.f (gm)	=p.w ² .f ² (gm ²)
-30/+35	0.05475	11.4	0.01066	0.3317	8.59E-05	1.03E-04	3.42E-05	3.64E-07	1.24E-11
-35/+40	0.045	9.7	0.01628	0.3285	4.77E-05	5.72E-05	1.88E-05	3.06E-07	5.75E-12
-40/+45	0.0377	13.1	0.03733	0.3132	2.80E-05	3.36E-05	1.05E-05	3.93E-07	4.13E-12
-45/+50	0.03255	14.9	0.06622	0.3081	1.80E-05	2.16E-05	6.65E-06	4.41E-07	2.93E-12
-50/+60	0.02735	14.9	0.11162	0.3014	1.07E-05	1.28E-05	3.86E-06	4.31E-07	1.66E-12
-60/+70	0.023	14.9	0.18769	0.2959	6.37E-06	7.64E-06	2.26E-06	4.24E-07	9.59E-13
-70/+80	0.01935	12.4	0.26228	0.2929	3.79E-06	4.55E-06	1.33E-06	3.50E-07	4.66E-13
-80/+100	0.0163	8.7	0.30792	0.2871	2.27E-06	2.72E-06	7.81E-07	2.40E-07	1.88E-13
							Sum=	2.95E-06	2.85E-11

Table V. Predicted % *CV*s obtained from the theoretical model along with the observed tablet weight corrected % *CV* (shown is the mean and for individual batches, n=3)

Particle loading (%w/w)	Tablet weight (mg)	<i>CV</i> Eq. 4.1	<i>CV</i> Eq. 4.10	<i>CV</i> Observed (tablet weight corrected)	$CV_{All\ errors}^2$
5.0	100	7.66	7.87	8.3 (8.9, 7.0, 9.0)	10.2
12.5		4.39	4.83	6.1 (6.8, 6.4, 5.2)	17.9
25.0		2.53	3.30	4.7 (4.0, 5.5, 4.7)	15.7
5.0	250	4.85	4.98	4.7 (4.2, 5.7, 4.3)	0
12.5		2.77	3.06	3.7 (3.7, 3.5, 4.0)	6.0
25.0		1.60	2.09	2.2 (2.2, 1.8, 2.5)	2.3
5.0	500	3.43	3.52	3.6 (3.1, 4.0, 3.8)	1.2
12.5		1.96	2.16	2.6 (2.5, 2.9, 2.4)	2.9
25.0		1.13	1.48	1.9 (1.8, 2.0, 2.0)	2.3