



# Research Journal of Pharmaceutical, Biological and Chemical Sciences

## Design and Evaluation of Buccal Mucoadhesive Patches Containing Oxybutynin Hcl

Subhash Chandra Bose P \*, Srikanth Reddy P, Sarithad<sup>1</sup>, Nagaraju R<sup>2</sup>

\* Dept. of Pharmaceutics, MNR College of Pharmacy, Sangareddy, India.

<sup>1</sup> Dept. of Pharmaceutics, Sultan-ul-uloom college of Pharmacy, Hyderabad, India.

<sup>2</sup> Dept. of Pharmaceutics, Sri Padmavathi visva vidyalayam, Tirupathi, India.

### ABSTRACT

The buccal region offers an attractive route for systemic drug delivery. Oxybutynin HCl is an antispasmodic, anticholinergic agent indicated for the treatment of overactive bladder with symptoms of urge urinary incontinence, urgency, and frequency. It shows less oral bioavailability as it undergoes first pass metabolism. Oxybutynin HCl patches were prepared using HPMCK4M, Chitosan, HPMCP, PVP and PVA. FTIR and DSC studies revealed that there was no interaction between Oxybutynin HCl and polymers. Gas phase chromatography was carried to estimate the residual Methanol, acetic acid and dichloromethane. The patches were evaluated for their thickness, folding endurance, weight uniformity, content uniformity, swelling behaviour, tensile strength, and surface pH. The tensile strength was higher for formulations containing HPMCP and HPMCK4M. *In vitro* release studies were conducted for Oxybutynin HCl loaded patches in 6.6 pH phosphate buffer solution. Patches containing chitosan and HPMCK4M exhibited greater release than other formulations containing HPMCP, PVP, PVA and HPMCK4M. Patches exhibited drug release in the range of 63.8 to 99.9% in 8 hrs. Data of *in vitro* release from patches were fit to different equations and kinetic models to explain release profiles. Many of the buccoadhesive systems followed zero-order release kinetics. Buccoadhesive patches of Oxybutynin HCl can be developed as potential controlled release formulations for the treatment of hypertension.

**Key Words:** Oxybutynin HCl, buccal patches, Mucoadhesion, First pass metabolism, Residual solvents.

*\*Corresponding author*



## INTRODUCTION

Conventional routes of drug administration have several disadvantages. The rate and extent of absorption can vary greatly depending on the drug, its formulation, the presence of food, drug interactions, first-pass metabolism and gastrointestinal pH. So various other routes for drug delivery are being developed which minimize these problems.

Buccal mucosa offers a convenient route for local and systemic drug delivery. In recent years, buccoadhesive drug delivery systems have gained considerable interest with regard to systemic delivery of drugs undergoing hepatic first-pass metabolism and premature drug degradation within the gastrointestinal tract. Lower enzymatic activity of saliva, facile removal of formulation, better patient acceptance and compliance are some other prominent meritorious visages of buccoadhesive systems. These factors make the oral mucosa a very attractive and feasible site for systemic drug delivery. A few drugs, such as Fluconazole [1], Carvedilol [2], Cetylpyridinium Chloride [3], Oxytocin [4], Miconazole Nitrate [5], Nystatin [6] have been successfully administered via the buccal route.

Over active bladder (OAB) or urinary incontinence is associated with symptoms of urinary urgency. OAB increases with age approximately more than 65 years and is reported that 5% to 10% of the adult populations and its prevalence increases with age affected by this disorder worldwide, which has impaired quality of life of patients. Oxybutynin HCl is the drug choice in treatment of urinary incontinence.

It is rationale to formulate the buccoadhesive dosage forms of Oxybutynin HCl as it is known to have low oral bioavailability due to an extensive first-pass effect. Further, its short half-life (2-4 hrs) requires frequent dosing (3 to 4 times/day) and low molecular weight (393.3) makes it an appropriate candidate for formulating it into a buccoadhesive dosage form.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Materials

Oxybutynin HCl was a gift sample (Micro labs, Bengaluru, India), HPMCP(Hydroxy propyl methyl cellulose pthalate), HPMCK4M were obtained from Dr. Reddy's lab, Hyderabad and Chitosan was obtained from Marine chemicals, Cochin. All the chemicals, solvents and reagents were of analytical grade and used further purification.

### Preparation of mucoadhesive patches

In the present investigation, buccoadhesive patches of Oxybutynin HCl were prepared by the solvent casting (solvent evaporation) method. HPMCK4M was dissolved in sufficient quantity of water and used as basic polymer solution. Various polymeric solutions were prepared in suitable solvents as - Chitosan is soaked in 1% glacial acetic acid for 24 hours to get

a clear solution, HPMCP is dissolved in a mixture of equal volumes of methanol, dichloromethane and PVP was dissolved in water. The polymer solutions are blended in combinations as shown in the table1 and checked for air entrapment. Drug was dissolved in little amount of water and further was added to polymer solution. Glycerine was used as plasticizers in the concentration of 20% w/w of the polymer. This solution was poured on to a glass mould and left over night for air drying at room temperature; the dried polymeric patches were packed in aluminium foil and kept in desiccator till further use.

**TABLE 1: Composition of mucoadhesive buccal patches**

Oxybutynin HCl (8mg/cm <sup>2</sup> )						
Ingredients	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
HPMCK4M (%)	1	1	1	1	1	1
Chitosan (%)	0.5	1	--	--	--	--
HPMCP (%)	--	--	0.5	1	--	--
PVP	--	--	--	--	0.5	1
Glycerine (mg)	60	80	60	80	60	80
Dichloro Methane (ml)	--	--	5	5	--	--
Methanol (ml)	--	--	5	5	--	--
Water (ml)	20	20	--	--	20	20

HPMC- Hydroxy Propyl Methyl Cellulose, HPMCP- Hydroxy Propyl Methyl Cellulose Pthalate, PVP – Poly vinyl Pyrrolidone.

## DRUG-POLYMER COMPATIBILITY STUDIES

### FT-IR spectroscopy

The test samples were dispersed in KBr powder and analyzed. FT-IR spectra were obtained by diffuse reflectance on FT-IR spectrometer type Shimadzu model 8033, USA. Compatibility between the drugs and polymers were compared by FT-IR spectra. The positions of FT-IR bands of important functional groups of drugs were identified and cross checked in FT-IR spectra of formulation.

### Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC)

To study the compatibility between drug and polymers DSC studied were carried. DSC studies were carried out on Du Pont thermal analyzer with 2010 DSC module. Calorimetric measurements were made with empty cell (high purity gold discs of Du Pont Company) as the reference. The instrument was calibrated using high purity indium metal as standard.

## EVALUATION OF THE PATCHES

### Thickness of the patches

The thickness of the patch was measured by screw gauge at five different positions of the patch and the average was calculated.

### Uniformity of weight of the patches

Twenty patches (Each 1cm<sup>2</sup>) were weighed individually. Average weight of the patches was calculated.

### Drug content uniformity of the patches

In the estimation of Oxybutynin HCl- 3.5 pH phosphate buffer, Methanol, Acetonitrile (640:160:200) was used as a mobile phase.

### Preparation of Standard Solution

25 mg of Oxybutynin HCl working standard (WS) was transferred into a 50 ml volumetric flask, dissolved in mobile phase and diluted with diluent (mobile phase) to make up the volume. 5 ml of this solution was diluted to 50 ml with diluent (mobile phase).

### Preparation of Sample Solution

Twenty patches (Each 1cm<sup>2</sup>) were dissolved in little quantity of mobile phase and transferred into a 100 ml volumetric flask. 40 ml of mobile phase was added and sonicated for 10 minutes, shaken mechanically for 45 min and diluted to 100 ml with mobile phase, filtered through the 0.45 µm membrane filter.

### Analytical Method

The standard and test sample solutions were injected into HPLC (Agilent, 1100 Series) 125 x 4 mm column packed with licrospher CN (cynonitril) and the column was run with mobile phase mixture at flow rate 1.0 ml/min. The column and sample temperature were kept at 25°C and 15°C respectively. Detector was set at 210 nm. Area enclosed under the sample peak and standard were noted. Amount of Oxybutynin HCl present in sample was calculated by using the formula.

Oxybutynin HCl in mg =

$$\frac{\text{Sample Area}}{\text{Standard Area}} \times \frac{\text{Standard weight}}{50} \times \frac{\text{Dilution}}{\text{Factor}} \times \frac{100}{\text{Patch-Weight}} \times \frac{\text{Purity}}{100} \times \text{Average weight} \times 1000$$

### Folding endurance

Folding endurance of the patches was determined by repeatedly folding one patch [7] at the same place till it broke or folded upto 200 times manually, which was considered

satisfactory to reveal good patch properties. The number of times of patch could be folded at the same place without breaking gave the value of the folding endurance.

### **Determination of surface pH**

The surface pH of the patch was determined in order to predict the possible irritative effects of the formulation on the buccal mucosa. The patches were allowed to swell at  $37 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$  for 2 hrs in 40 ml phosphate buffer pH 6.6. The surface pH was measured by means of pH paper placed on the surface of the swollen patch [8].

### **Stability in buffer solution [9]**

Patches were placed in different phosphate buffer solutions of pH 6.0, pH 6.6 and pH 7.0 and stirred at 50 rpm maintained at  $37 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$ . The solution was withdrawn at 1, 12 and 24 hr. and analyzed for the drug content by using HPLC.

### **Swelling studies**

Each patch which was individually weighed ( $W_1$ ) were placed in Petri dishes containing 4ml of phosphate buffer pH 6.6 and incubated at  $37^\circ\text{C}$  [10]. At time intervals of 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 hrs one Petri dish was removed from the incubator and swollen patches were weighed out ( $W_2$ ). Swelling index (SI) was calculated using following formula.  $S_1 = (W_2 - W_1) / W_1$ .

### **Tensile strength of the patches**

The tensile strength of the Patches was carried out using Instron UTM ( Hounsfield, UK) equipment at a speed of 50 mm/min. The method used a constant rate of straining method. A specimen patch sample of  $10 \times 5$  sq.cm was placed in the grips of the testing machine. The grips were tightened evenly and firmly to prevent slippage and the maximum load and extension were recorded [11].

### **In vitro bioadhesion test**

The mucoadhesive strength of buccoadhesive systems was measured by a modified two-arm balance using porcine buccal mucosa [12] as shown in fig.2. Porcine buccal mucosa was fixed to steel piece with adhesive. This was kept in a beaker and pH 6.6 buffer was added into the beaker upto upper surface of the mucosa to maintain mucosal viability. The patch was attached to the upper clamp with adhesive. The beaker was then slowly raised until the substrate comes in contact with the patch. A preload of was placed on the clamp for 5 minutes (preload time) so that the adhesion could be established. After this time, the preload was removed and water was added into the beaker by the burette at a constant rate. The addition of water was stopped when buccoadhesive system was detached from buccal mucosa. Weight

required to detach the system from buccal mucosa was noted. Experiment was repeated with fresh mucosa in an identical manner.

### **Water vapor transmission rate studies for patch**

A modification of the ASTM method [13] was used. One gram of calcium chloride was accurately weighed and placed in previously dried empty vials of equal diameter. The polymer patches were pasted over the brim with the help of an adhesive, and then the vials were weighed and placed over a mesh in dessicators, containing 200 ml of saturated sodium bromide and saturated potassium chloride solutions. The dessicators were tightly closed and maintained at the 75% RH. Initial weight of the vial with patch was noted. The vials were removed from the dessicators after 24 hours and checked for weight loss, which was equal to the amount of water vapor transmitted. The average of triplicate readings was taken.

### **In vitro residence time**

In vitro residence time was determined according to the method [14] described by Nafee et.al. Briefly, the apparatus consists of disintegration apparatus (Electrolab,EF-2, Mumbai, India) with 800 ml of phosphate buffer pH6.6 maintained at  $37 \pm 1^\circ\text{C}$ . Porcine buccal mucosa was glued to the glass slide and held vertically in the apparatus. The buccoadhesive patch was hydrated with 0.5 ml of phosphate buffer pH6.6 and the hydrated surface was brought in contact with the buccal mucosa. The glass slide was allowed to move up and down so that the patch was completely immersed in the buffer solution at the lowest point and was out at the highest point. The time required for the complete erosion or detachment of the patch from the mucosal surface was recorded (mean of triplicate).

### **Determination of residual solvents concentration [15]**

Gas chromatography (Shimadzu GC-14B chromatograph, Japan) was used to estimate residual Methanol, acetic acid and dichloromethane in patches.

### **In vitro release studies**

100 ml dissolution medium, phosphate buffer pH6.6 maintained at  $37 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$  in 150 ml beaker was kept on a magnetic stirrer and stirred at 50 rpm. The backing layer of the patch was stuck to a glass disk of 2 cm. diameter using glue [14]. This glass disk was attached to an L-shaped glass rod, which is fitted to a stand. Samples were withdrawn at regular intervals and the same volume of prewarmed ( $37 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$ ) phosphate buffer pH6.6 was introduced into the beaker after each withdrawal to maintain sink condition. The samples were analyzed for drug content.

### **In vitro permeation studies**

Porcine buccal tissue from domestic pigs was obtained from local slaughterhouse and used in within two hours of slaughter. The tissue was stored in Krebs buffer at 4°C after collection. The epithelium was separated from the underlying connective tissue by surgical method and the delipidized membrane was allowed to equilibrate for approximately for one hour in receptor buffer to gain the lost elasticity.

The buccal epithelium was carefully mounted in between the two compartments of a Franz diffusion cell [10]. A, 1 cm<sup>2</sup> patch under study was placed in intimate contact with the excised porcine buccal mucosa and the topside was covered with aluminum foil as a backing membrane. Teflon bead was placed in the receptor compartment filled with 50 ml of pH 6.6 phosphate buffer. The cell contents were stirred with a magnetic stirrer and temperature of 37±1°C was maintained throughout the experiment. The samples were withdrawn at every hour. Sink conditions were maintained. The samples were filtered, diluted suitably and analyzed using HPLC method.

## RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Oxybutynin HCl and its formulations were subjected to FT-IR analysis. The obtained spectra are given in Figure 3. The characteristic peaks of pure drugs were compared with the peaks obtained for its respective formulations. From the FT-IR peaks it can be concluded that the peaks of pure Oxybutynin HCl and formulations were found to be similar indicating that there was no significant interaction between Oxybutynin HCl and polymers used.

DSC study was carried out to investigate the possible interactions between the drug and polymers. DSC thermograms of the formulations were compared with the DSC thermogram of the pure drug. The DSC thermograms obtained are reported in Figure 4. The pure Oxybutynin HCl displayed a sharp endothermic peak at 120-130°C corresponding to the melting point of the drug and a similar peak was also observed in the formulation. From the DSC thermograms it was observed that the peak melting point of the pure drug and the formulation remained the same. Hence it can be concluded that there was no interaction between drug and the polymers used. Slight change in the melting point of formulations may be due to presence of residual solvents.

The results of thickness and weight variation studies are given in Table2. It was observed that the thickness of buccoadhesive patches containing chitosan and HPMCK4M was less compared to the other formulations. The weight of the patch was uniform irrespective of the composition. The results of the drug content studies are given in Table 2. It was observed from the results that the prepared patches are uniform in drug content. Patches did not crack even after folding for more than 200 times. Hence it was taken as the standard limit. Folding endurance values of the patches were found to be optimum so they exhibit good physical and mechanical properties. Considering high alkaline or high acidic pH may cause irritation to the buccal mucosa and influence the degree of hydration of polymers [16, 17]. So the surface pH of

patches was determined to optimize release and adhesion. The surface pH of all formulations was in the range 6-7 pH, i.e; close to buccal pH.

**TABLE 2: Evaluation Parameters of mucoadhesive patches.**

Formulation code	Thickness (µm)	Uniformity of weight (mg)	Drug content	Folding endurance	Surface pH
F1	175±2.95	17.97±1.26	7.85±1.38	>200	6-7
F2	181±2.28	18.9±2.16	<u>8.62±1.91</u>	>200	6-7
F3	212±1.42	18.37±1.26	7.88±1.30	>200	6-7
F4	202±2.21	17.19±1.11	8.13±0.94	>200	6-7
F5	193±2.18	18.13±0.25	8.07±1.16	>200	6-7
F6	202±2.28	17.80±0.38	7.93±1.09	>200	6-7

**TABLE 3: Data of Stability studies of patches in different phosphate buffer solutions.**

Sl No.	Time (Hr.)	% drug content in buffers of different pH		
		pH 6.0	pH 6.6	pH 7.0
1	0	99.82 ± 1.7	99.12 ± 2.4	99.32 ± 4.4
2	1	99.10 ± 2.4	98.94 ± 1.3	98.88 ± 2.1
3	6	98.94 ± 0.92	98.82 ± 1.2	98.78 ± 0.8
4	24	98.86 ± 1.42	98.24 ± 0.98	98.29 ± 1.2

At the end of 24hrs Oxybutynin HCl patches were stable in phosphate buffer solutions pH 6.0, 6.6 and 7.0. And found that drug loss was within the permissible limits (Table 3) indicates that there is degradation of drug in buffers.

Swelling studies were carried out in phosphate buffer pH 6.6 and is reported as swelling index in Table 4 Swelling index for the formulations is gradually increased. Formulation containing chitosan and HPMCK4M (F1& F2) showed faster swelling compared to other formulations. Maximum swelling was attained in 3hr, after which polymer started eroding slowly in the medium. The high initial uptake of water may be due to the faster hydration rate of HPMCK4M. Formulations containing HPMCP and HPMCK4M showed less swelling rate which may be attributed to low water solubility of HPMCP. The formulations containing PVP showed good swelling due to hydrophilic nature. The results of the tensile strength for the patches are given in Table 4. Highest tensile strength was observed formulation F4 and F2 showed least value. In formulations F1 and F2 the tensile strength decreased with increase in chitosan concentration. The tensile strength of patches F3 and F4 was more due to the presence of HPMCP which is hydrophobic in nature. The tensile strength of other formulations F5 and F6 showed less tensile strength due to hydrophilic nature of polymers (PVP). In vitro bioadhesive strength of the patches was measured using porcine buccal mucosa as biological membrane. The results are given in Table 4. The highest bioadhesive strength was observed in the formulation F4. Previous studies have demonstrated that the bioadhesive strength depends on the rate of swelling, pH, applied strength, initial contact time, and selection of the model substrate surface. As the concentration of chitosan was increased, the bioadhesive strength of the film decreased further, because chitosan has less solubility and swelling in pH6.6.

TABLE 4: Evaluation Parameters of mucoadhesive patches.

Formulation	Swelling Index	Tensile Strength (MPa) mean $\pm$ SD *	Bio adhesive strength(Gm)	WVTR (g/m <sup>2</sup> /day) mean $\pm$ SD *	<i>In vitro</i> residence time (h)
F1	4.86	17.21 $\pm$ 2.34	8.95 $\pm$ 1.95	27.16 $\pm$ 2.2	>6
F2	4.17	15.23 $\pm$ 2.13	7.83 $\pm$ 2.53	23.46 $\pm$ 3.53	>6
F3	4.57	20.94 $\pm$ 1.28	8.96 $\pm$ 1.76	17.96 $\pm$ 1.47	>6
F4	4.88	22.28 $\pm$ 1.37	10.17 $\pm$ 1.37	20.09 $\pm$ 1.76	>6
F5	4.96	18.03 $\pm$ 1.64	8.82 $\pm$ 1.24	20.32 $\pm$ 2.18	>6
F6	5.75	20.54 $\pm$ 1.28	9.73 $\pm$ 1.84	27.18 $\pm$ 1.97	>6

TABLE 5: Residual solvent contents in Buccal patches

Residual Solvent	Concentration Limit(ppm) (According to ICH guide lines)	Concentration (ppm) in patches			
		F1	F2	F3	F4
Acetic Acid <sup>a</sup> (Class III)	5000	19.275	23.3482	-	-
Dichloromethane <sup>a</sup> (Class II)	600	-	-	17.3973	19.2839
Methanol <sup>a</sup> (Class II)	3000	-	-	14. 8167	18.9361

<sup>a</sup> Estimated by Gas Chromatography

The *in vitro* residence of patches showed that none of the polymer combination patches became detached from the porcine buccal mucosa during the experiments (Table 4). All the formulations exhibited more than 6 hours residence time. Water vapor transmission rate studies were carried out for all the formulations. F3 and F4 showed less WVTR compared to all other formulations. This may be due to the hydrophobic nature of HPMCP, which is less permeable to water vapor. Residual solvent concentration of Methanol, acetic acid and dichloromethane are largely below the tolerated limits (table 5).

*In vitro* release of Oxybutynin HCl from buccal patches showed decrease in percent release with an increase in the amount of polymer (Figure 5) and time required for 50% of release was found to be maximum for F6 (5 hours) followed by other formulations. The least t<sub>50%</sub> around 2.5 hours was observed for F1 formulation. The release of Oxybutynin HCl from the formulations F1-F6 was found to be in the range 74.8 to 95.1%. As the swelling index decreased rate of release increased. The best fit model for F1 formulation was Higuchi matrix type of release. For other formulations 'n' is determined by Korsmeyer-Peppas's equation. For formulation F2 'n' value is 0.8873, which suggest that more than one type of release phenomenon could be involved. For other formulations the n value is more than one indicates the zero order release.

Formulations which showed good in vitro release were selected for permeation study. In permeation study, the drug permeation from the formulations F1, F3 and F5 was found to be 58.92%, 48.55% and 46.82% respectively after 12 h (Figure 6).

### CONCLUSION

The present work indicates a good potential of mucoadhesive buccal patches containing Oxybutynin HCl for systemic delivery with an added advantage of circumventing the hepatic first pass metabolism. It exhibited well controlled and delayed manner and results shown that therapeutic levels of Oxybutynin HCl can be delivered through buccal route.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are thankful to Jyothi Karan, Vice President, Granules India, Hyderabad, India for the gift sample of Oxybutynin HCl, MNR Educational Trust, Hyderabad and Dr. V. Alagarsamy, Professor and Principal, MNR College of Pharmacy, Sangareddy for their valuable support to carry out this research. We also thank the Quality Assurance Deputy Manager, Macleods Pharmaceuticals, Vapi, Gujarat for gas chromatographic analysis.

### REFERENCES

- [1] Soad A, Yehia ON, El-Gazayerly Emad BB. *Curr Drug Deliv* 2009; 6: 17-27.
- [2] Vamshi vishnu Y, Chandrasekhar V, Ramesh G, Madhusudan rao Y. *Curr Drug Deliv* 2007; 4: 27-39.
- [3] Noha adel nafee, Nabila ahmed boraie, Fatma ahmed ismail, Lobna mohamed mortada. *Acta Phar* 2003; 53: 199–212.
- [4] Cheng LI, Padmanabh P, Bhatt B, Thomas PJ. *Pharm Dev Technol* 1996; 1: 357-364.
- [5] Noha AN, Fatma AI, Nabila AB, Lobna MM. *Int J Pharm* 2003; 264: 1–14.
- [6] Llabot JM, Palma SD, Manzo RH, Allemandi DA. *Int J Pharm* 2007; 336: 263–268.
- [7] Khanna R, Agrawal SP, Ahuja A. *Ind J Pharm Sci* 1997; 59: 299-305.
- [8] Noha AN, Nabila AB, Fatima A, Ismail, Lobna MM. *Acta pharm* 2003; 53: 199-212.
- [9] Kim CK, Choi HG. *J Control Rel* 2000; 68: 397-404.
- [10] Semalty A, Mona B, Bhatt GK, Gupta GD, Shrivastava AK. *Ind J Pharm Sci* 2005; 67: 548-552.
- [11] Khan TA, Peh KK, Ch'ng HS. *J Pharm Pharmaceut Sci* 2000; 3: 303-311.
- [12] Smart JD. *Int J Pharm* 1991; 73: 69–74.
- [13] Murthy TEGK, Kishore VS. *Ind J Pharm Sci* 2007; 69: 646-650.
- [14] Nafee NA, Ismail FA, Boraie NA, LobnaMM. *Drug Dev Ind Pharm* 2004; 30: 995-1004.
- [15] Piera Di Martino, Roberta Di Cristofaro, Christine Bar-Thelemy, Etienne Joiris, Giovanni Palmieri Filippo, Martelli Sante. *Int J Pharm* 2000; 197: 95-106.
- [16] Chang HS, Park H, Kelly P, Robinson JR. *J Pharm Sci* 1985; 74: 399-405.
- [17] Park H, Robinson JR. *J Control Rel* 1985; 2: 47-57.