Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis 51 (2010) 853–857

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jpba

Pharmacopeial methodologies for determining aerodynamic mass distributions of ultra-high dose inhaler medicines

William Wong[a], John Crapper[b], Hak-Kim Chan[a], Daniela Traini[a], Paul M. Young[a,*]

[a] Advanced Drug Delivery Group, Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia
[b] Pharmaxis Ltd, Unit 2, 10 Rodborough Rd, Frenchs Forest, Sydney, NSW 2086, Australia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 18 August 2009
Received in revised form 19 October 2009
Accepted 19 October 2009
Available online 29 October 2009

Keywords:
MSLI
ACI
NGI
Dry powder inhaler
Impactor efficiency

ABSTRACT

Three different impactor methodologies, the Andersen cascade impactor (ACI), next-generation impactor (NGI) and multistage-liquid impinger (MSLI) were studied to determine their performance when testing ultra-high dose dry powder formulations. Cumulative doses of spray-dried mannitol (Aridol™) were delivered to each impactor at a flow rate of 60 L min^{-1} (up to a max dose of 800 mg delivering 20 sequential 40 mg capsules). In general, total drug collected in both the ACI and NGI falls below the range 85–115% of label claim criteria recommended by the United States of America Food and Drug Administration (FDA) at nominal mannitol doses exceeding 20 mg and 200 mg, respectively. In comparison analysis of the MSLI data, over a 5–800 mg cumulative dosing range, indicated that the percentage of nominal dose recovered from the MSLI was within the ±15% limits set in this study. Furthermore all samples, apart from the 5 mg and 10 mg analysis were within 5% of the nominal cumulative dose. While the MSLI is not routinely used for regulatory submission, the use of this impinger when studying ultra-high dose formulations should be considered as a complementary and comparative source of aerosol deposition data.

1. Introduction

Dry powder inhalers (DPIs) pose significant advantages over nebulizers and pressurised metered dose inhalers (pMDIs), since they are generally cheaper to manufacture, have improved patient compliance, greater stability and can be used to deliver higher doses than pMDIs over short timescales than nebulizers. Many respiratory medicines have relatively low dose formulations (for example β2-agonists DPIs range from 6 to 500 μg dose^{-1} and corticosteroid DPIs from 50 to 500 μg dose^{-1} [1]). In addition, these devices can be used to what is usually classified as high dose regimes (such as sodium cromoglycate and nedocromil sodium at up to 4 mg dose^{-1} [2], and zanamivir at 10 mg dose^{-1} [3]). However, recent developments in the field have seen the emergence of 'ultra-high dose' DPI medicines for the treatment of asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, cystic fibrosis and infectious diseases (such as tuberculosis and pneumonia) where doses range from 40 mg to 800 mg per treatment [1,4–7].

Aridol™ and Bronchitol™, produced by Pharmaxis Ltd. (Sydney, Australia) are two examples of ultra-high dose medicines, used in the diagnosis of asthma and the treatment of cystic fibrosis and bronchiectasis [1,6]. Specifically, Aridol is a bronchial challenge diagnostic kit consisting of a micron-sized dry powder mannitol filled in hard gelatin capsules, which can be aerosolised through a conventional DPI device. The diagnostic kit contains 1× 5 mg, 1× 10 mg, 1× 20 mg and 15× 40 mg. The patient is exposed to cumulative dosing up to 635 mg, and their forced expiratory volume monitored to determine the severity of asthma.

Pharmacopeial methodologies [8,9] and US federal guidelines [10] exist for the testing of DPI products. These guidelines include methodologies for the testing of aerosol performance and particle size distribution using *in vitro* cascade impactor methodologies such as the Andersen cascade impactor (ACI) [11] and next-generation impactor (NGI) [12]. Excluding the NGI, many of these methods would have originally been developed to test environmental particulates and/or used for low dose medicaments. Subsequently, both the United States and European Pharmacopeia state that the plates should be coated with silicone oil or equivalent [8,9] to avoid particle bounce effects when using DPI based formulations.

The use of silicone oil to reduce particle bounce and inter-stage loss appears to be critical to the successful characterisation of aerodynamic mass distributions in many impactors. The phenomenon of particle bounce and stage overloading has been well observed [13]. Previous studies have shown the degree of particle bounce to be drug and dose specific. For example, Hindle et al., have shown drug specific bounce effects with terbutaline sulphate and cromolyn sodium powders delivered to a Marple–Miller impactor, and

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +61 2 9036 7035; fax: +61 2 9351 4391.
E-mail address: py@pharm.usyd.edu.au (P.M. Young).

0731-7085/$ – see front matter © 2009 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.jpba.2009.10.011

reported that bounce effects were avoided with cumulative dosing up to 40 mg cromolyn sodium when the plates were coated [14]. Dunbar et al., reported bounce effects when 5–10 mg of large porous particles were delivered to an ACI at 60 L min^{-1}. They also noted that bounce effect could be reduced, but not eliminated, with reduction in the jet velocity along with plate coating [15]. Nasr et al. showed that even low dose pMDI formulations, containing 100 μg albuterol, had appreciable plate deposition differences if Marple–Miller or ACI impactor plates were not coated [16]. More recently, Kamiya et al., evaluated ACI and NGI stage-deposition efficiencies at 90 L min^{-1} with a high dose (5 mg of zanamivir) formulation and concluded that the NGI was within the pharmacopeial guidelines for impactor losses (<5%) when coated, while the ACI failed regardless of plate coating.

While these previous studies have demonstrated the variability in impactor efficiency with respect to both low and high dose medicaments, to the authors' knowledge, no study has been conducted to evaluate ultra-high dose formulations (for example cumulative dosing up to 800 mg). The United States of America Food and Drug Administration (FDA) recommends that the total mass of drug collected on all stages of the cascade impactor and accessories (i.e. throat and mouthpiece adaptor) be between 85% and 115% of the label claim [10]. As such, the authors aim to evaluate three impactor methodologies: the ACI, NGI and multistage-liquid impinger (MSLI), for the study of the deposition and performance of cumulative doses of mannitol for inhalation and whether each methodology can satisfy the FDA recommendations for ultra-high doses. It is hypothesised that due to factors such as particle bounce and stage overloading, the ACI and NGI will be inappropriate for testing ultra-high doses.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Materials

Commercial 5 mg, 10 mg, 20 mg and 40 mg mannitol Aridol capsules (mannitol production batch number M08-060) were supplied by Pharmaxis Ltd. (Sydney, NSW, Australia). Samples were provided in sealed blister packs and contained spray dried mannitol of inhalable size with no excipient. Water was purified by reverse osmosis (MilliQ, Molsheim, France). All solvents were analytical grade and were supplied by Sigma-Aldrich (Sydney, NSW, Australia). Silicone oil (Q7-9120, 12,500 Centistokes) was supplied by DOW Corning (Sydney, NSW, Australia).

2.2. Particle size analysis

The volumetric particle size distribution of the mannitol samples was measured using laser diffraction (Malvern 2000, Malvern Instruments, Worcestershire, UK). Mannitol was dispersed in chloroform and sonicated for 5 minutes prior to analysis. An aliquot of the suspension was then transferred to the small volume dispersion unit (Hydro SM, Malvern, Worcestershire, UK) of the Malvern particle sizer, operating at a pump speed of 2000 RPM until an obscuration between 15% and 30% was achieved. Particle size was measured using a refractive index of 1.52 for mannitol and 1.44 for chloroform, determined using a refractometer (Thermo Spectronic 334610, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA).

2.3. Scanning electron microscopy

The morphology of the mannitol particles was investigated using scanning electron microscopy (SEM) at 10 keV (FESEM JEOL 6000, JEOL, Japan). Samples were deposited on carbon sticky tabs, mounted on SEM stubs and sputter coated with a 15–20 nm layer of gold prior to imaging.

2.4. Content uniformity

Content uniformity analysis of each capsule formulation was conducted. Five capsules of each lower dose formulation or 10 capsules of the 40 mg formulation were washed into separate volumetric flasks with water and analysed using the high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) method described in Section 2.6 [8].

2.5. In vitro aerosol performance analysis

The aerosol size distribution of different cumulative doses of mannitol was assessed using three cascade impactor methodologies: the ACI, NGI and MSLI. These three impactors are specified in the USP Chapter <601> and Ph. Eur. Chapter 2.9.18 for their use in measuring the mass distribution of pharmaceutical aerosols by aerodynamic diameter.

At 60 L min^{-1} the three impactors have a range of cut-off diameters as shown in Table 1, with particles captured on any specific stage having an aerodynamic diameter less than preceding stage, assuming ideal collection behaviour on each stage.

All three impactors had a USP/Ph Eur stainless-steel induction port (throat) (and mouthpiece adapter) connected to the impactor. As the formulation contains no excipients, no pre-separator stage was utilised for any of the impactors.

Each impactor flow rate was set to 60 L min^{-1} using a Rotary vane pump and solenoid valve timer (Erweka GmbH, Germany) and a calibrated flow meter (TSI 3063, TSI instruments Ltd., Buckinghamshire, UK).

Prior to measurement the ACI and NGI impactor plates were coated with silicone oil, as outlined in the pharmacopeial specifications for DPIs. Specifically, each plate was submerged in a 10% (v/v) silicone/hexane solution before placing in a fume-hood to air-dry for 10 minutes. This procedure was not repeated for the MSLI since it is technically a wet impinger and does not have plates or

Table 1
Effective cut-off diameters for the three impactors at 60 L min^{-1}.

ACI[a]	Aerodynamic cut-off diameter (μm)	NGI[b]	Aerodynamic cut-off diameter (μm)	MSLI[b]	Aerodynamic cut-off diameter (μm)
Stage −1	9.0	Stage 1	8.1	Stage 1	13
Stage 0	5.8	Stage 2	4.5	Stage 2	6.8
Stage 1	4.7	Stage 3	2.9	Stage 3	3.1
Stage 2	3.3	Stage 4	1.7	Stage 4	1.7
Stage 3	2.1	Stage 5	1.0	Filter	<1.7
Stage 4	1.1	Stage 6	0.6	–	–
Stage 5	0.7	Stage 7	0.3	–	–
Stage 6	0.4	MOC	<0.3	–	–
Filter	<0.4	–	–	–	–

Aerodynamic cut-off diameter *s* obtained from the following sources.
[a] USP Pharmacopeial Forum volume 28, number 2, pp. 601–603.
[b] [8].