

Solubility of sparingly-soluble ionizable drugs[☆]

Alex Avdeef^{*}

pION INC, 5 Constitution Way, Woburn, MA 01801 USA

Received 23 March 2007; accepted 10 May 2007

Available online 29 May 2007

Abstract

The experimental and computational basis of the pH-dependent measurement of solubility of sparingly-soluble ionizable drugs is reviewed. Recently described compound-sparing (but still accurate) approaches, suitable for application in preclinical development, and appropriate for the analysis of solubility of “problematic” molecules, are critically examined. A number of useful experimental methods are reviewed, including the miniaturized shake-flask microtitre plate, the micro solubility self-calibrating direct UV, potentiometric, and the micro dissolution methods. Several molecules were selected as case studies to illustrate important concepts, with re-analysis of literature data using recently established computational tools.

© 2007 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Sparingly-soluble ionizable compounds; pH-dependent solubility; Solubility equations; Aggregation; Complexation; Shake-flask method; Miniaturized shake-flask method; Dissolution template titration method; Micro dissolution method

Contents

1.	Introduction	569
1.1.	Poor wettability, low solubility, and the facilitated dissolution method (FDM)	570
1.2.	Aggregation/micelle formation	570
1.3.	Metastable gel states and equilibration time	570
1.4.	Polymorphism and amorphous states	570
1.5.	Mathematical modelling	570
2.	Solubility equations	570
2.1.	Solubility–pH profiles (simple Henderson–Hasselbalch equations)	570
2.1.1.	Monoprotic weak acid, HA	570
2.1.2.	Equations for other equilibrium models	571
2.2.	Gibbs pK_a	572
2.3.	Aggregation reactions in solubility measurement	573
2.3.1.	Sample derivation of ionic aggregation of a weak acid (CASE 2a)	574
2.3.2.	Solubility equations for other cases involving aggregation reactions	574
2.4.	Complexation reactions in solubility measurement (phase-solubility method)	574
2.4.1.	Simple 1:1 complexation	574
2.4.2.	Simple 2:1 ligand–drug complexation	575
2.4.3.	Simple 1:1 complexation with deprotonation of the complex	575
2.4.4.	Summary of complexation equations	576

[☆] This review is part of the *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews* theme issue on “Drug solubility: How to measure it, how to improve it”.

^{*} Tel.: +1 781 935 89 39x22; fax: +1 781 935 89 38.

E-mail address: aavdeef@pion-inc.com.

2.5.	Micellar binding reactions in solubility measurement	576
2.6.	Refinement of aggregation/complexation/binding constants	577
3.	Solubility measurement	577
3.1.	Saturation shake-flask methods	577
3.2.	Micro dissolution apparatus for solubility measurement (μ DISS method)	577
3.3.	Modified-equilibrium microtitre plate methods	577
3.3.1.	DMSO-containing methods	578
3.3.2.	Micro solubility method (0.5–1% v/v DMSO μ SOL method)	578
3.3.3.	DMSO-free methods (lyophilization GeneVac method)	578
3.3.4.	Partially-automated solubility screening (volatile immiscible solvent PASS method)	578
3.3.5.	Miniaturized shake-flask method (DMSO-free MSF method)	578
3.4.	Potentiometric method (DTT method)	579
3.5.	Facilitated dissolution method (FDM)	579
3.6.	Solubility can depend on the amount of excess solid	580
3.7.	Excipient screening	580
3.8.	Need for accurate pK_a determinations	581
4.	Case studies	581
4.1.	Carboxylic weak acids	581
4.1.1.	Ketoprofen	581
4.1.2.	Ibuprofen	582
4.1.3.	Naproxen	582
4.1.4.	Gemfibrozil	583
4.1.5.	Diclofenac	583
4.1.6.	Mefenamic acid	583
4.1.7.	Prostaglandin F2 α	584
4.2.	Nitrogenous weak acids	584
4.2.1.	Phenytoin	584
4.2.2.	Glibenclamide	584
4.3.	Weak bases	585
4.3.1.	Papaverine	585
4.3.2.	Dipyridamole	585
4.3.3.	Terfenadine	585
4.4.	Effects of excipients on the solubility of sparingly-soluble drugs	585
4.4.1.	Ketoprofen with sodium lauryl sulfate (SLS)	585
4.4.2.	Mefenamic acid and hydroxypropyl- β -cyclodextrin (HP- β -CD)	587
4.4.3.	Mefenamic acid and sodium taurocholate (NaTC)	587
4.5.	Salt solubility — amount of excess solid determines solubility	588
4.5.1.	Terfenadine	588
4.5.2.	Flurbiprofen	588
4.5.3.	Chlordiazepoxide	588
5.	Conclusions	588
	Acknowledgements	589
	References	589

1. Introduction

The experimental and computational basis of the pH-dependent measurement of solubility of sparingly-soluble ionizable drugs is reviewed. New, compound-sparing (but still accurate) approaches, suitable for application in preclinical development, and appropriate for the analysis of solubility of “problematic” molecules, are critically examined. “Kinetic” solubility methods (nephelometry/turbidity) are beyond the intended scope of coverage in this review.

Several selected molecules which illustrate important concepts are considered in detail, with some literature data re-analyzed and illustrated, using newly-improved computational tools. Exhaustive compilations of experimental results are covered elsewhere [1–5].

Several excellent books and reviews serve as background material for the present discussions: in-depth coverage of solubility [6–8]; phase-solubility methods [9]; salt formation/selection [10–12]; polymorphism/amorphism [13–15]; excipient effects [16]; complex analysis [17]; solubility/dissolution profiling [18,19].

Solubility reactions, being heterogeneous, are often slow to reach equilibrium. Surface-active compounds, when dissolved in water to saturation, can form self-associated aggregates which can complicate the interpretation of the aqueous solubility data. Use of cosolvents (e.g., ethanol, propylene glycol, polyethylene glycol 400, 1-methyl-2-pyrrolidone) can mitigate some of these effects. If measurements are done in the presence of surfactants (e.g., sodium lauryl sulfate, bile salts, mixed micelles, simulated intestinal fluids), or complexing

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/2072007>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/2072007>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)