FORMULATION, OPTIMIZATION, AND IN VITRO EVALUATION OF POLYMERIC NANOSUSPENSION OF FLURBIPROFEN
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ABSTRACT

Objective: At present, more than 40% of drugs are poorly water-soluble that leads to reduced bioavailability. The objective of the present investigation was to overcome the issue of poor aqueous solubility of drug; therefore, stable flurbiprofen (FBF) nanosuspensions were developed by nanoprecipitation method.

Materials and Methods: Based on particle size, zeta potential, and entrapment efficiency, the polymeric system of hydroxypropyl methylcellulose E15 and poloxamer 188 was used effectively. The prepared formulations were evaluated for Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy, transmission electron microscopy, differential scanning calorimetry, powder X-ray diffraction, saturation solubility, entrapment efficiency, particle size, zeta potential, dissolution profile, and stability.

Results: The resultant FBF nanosuspensions depicted particles in size range of 200–400 nm and were physically stable. After nanonization, the crystallinity of FBF was slightly reduced in the presence of excipients. The aqueous solubility and dissolution rate of all FBF nanosuspensions were significantly increased as compared with FBF powder.

Conclusion: This investigation demonstrated that nanoprecipitation is a promising method to develop stable polymeric nanosuspension of FBF with significant increase in its aqueous solubility.
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INTRODUCTION

The large number of active pharmaceutical ingredients emerging from the drug discovery process exhibits poor aqueous solubility resulting in a low dissolution rate and oral bioavailability [1,2]. Solubility, dissolution, and permeability of drugs are rate-limiting parameters for its oral absorption [1,2]. Various physicochemical and physiological parameters of drug affect the oral bioavailability of drugs [1,2]. Size reduction of drugs improves oral bioavailability of drug by increasing its effective surface area and thus increasing solubility and dissolution rate of drugs [1,2]. High log p value and molecular weight of the substance are important factors regarding nanosuspension of less aqueous solubility of drugs [2]. Nanosuspension is a novel approach to overcome the problem of low dissolution rate and compromised oral bioavailability and reduce the delivery issues by maintaining the drug in preferred crystalline state [3-8]. Nanosuspension signifies sufficient safety and efficacy [4-6]. According to Nernst-Brunner diffusion layer model, the peripheral layer of the solid particle gets saturated by small portion of an adjacent solvent. Afterward steady-state mass transfer takes place into the bulk solution [8-12]. The formulation can be achieved by top-down (fracturing larger particles to smaller particles) or bottom-up (generation of smaller particles by precipitation at molecular level) approaches [1,9-13]. Nanoprecipitation is one of the promising techniques for the development of nanosuspension of low water-soluble drug molecules [14]. However, particle agglomeration and crystal growth due to Van der Waals forces or Ostwald ripening can be prevented by addition of one or more stabilizer(s) [15]. The selection of polymers and stabilizers is very crucial in the development of nanof ormulations. Hydroxypropyl methylcellulose E15 (HPMC E15) and poloxamer 188 (Pluronic F68) are steric stabilizers provide stabilized dispersion by steric hindrance [1,13]. Nanosuspension formulations of several drugs such as Rapamune (sirolimus) and Tricor (fenofibrate) are already successfully marketed [16].

Flurbiprofen (FBF) is a phenylalkanoic acid derivative (Fig. 1), nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory and classified as Biopharmaceutics Classification System Class II drug due to its practical insolubility in water. Its oral bioavailability is affected by low aqueous solubility having pKa value ~ 4.03. The high log p value of FBF is an important feature in the development of its nanosuspension [17,18]. This study was focused to develop stable polymeric nanosuspension for enhancement of dissolution and oral bioavailability of FBF. The solidification of formulations was carried out by freeze-drying.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Materials

FBF, HPMC E15, and poloxamer 188 (Pluronic F68) were kindly gifted by Sun Pharma Pvt., Ltd., Ahmednagar. Polyvinylpyrrolidone K30 (PVP K30), polyethylene glycol 6000 (PEG 6000), and sodium dodecyl sulphate (SDS) were procured from BASF Ltd. All used supplementary chemicals and reagents were of analytical grade and utilized without additional purification. Double distilled water was used during the experimental work.

Methods

Screening of stabilizer based on settlement volume ratio

To select the optimal stabilizer, the FBF (0.5% w/v) nanosuspensions were prepared using different stabilizers (0.5% w/v) such as PVP K30, PEG 6000, SDS, and poloxamer 188, respectively, by nanoprecipitation technique. The obtained nanoformulations were analyzed by settlement volume ratio (F) for a week, and suitable stabilizer was selected based on the stability of the system [19].

**Conclusion:** This investigation demonstrated that nanoprecipitation is a promising method to develop stable polymeric nanosuspension of FBF with significant increase in its aqueous solubility.
Screening of stabilizer based on solubility study
The solubility of FBF was determined in the solutions of stabilizers. Briefly, excess amount of FBF was added to the stabilizer solution (5 ml) in sealed glass vials. The vials were shaken at rotary shaker (Remi RS BL) at 75 rpm (rotations per minute) for 72 h at 37°C and centrifuged at 40,000 rpm for 10 min at 4°C (Remi C30 PLUS) to remove non-dissolved drug. The supernatant was suitably diluted with distilled water and was analyzed for FBF by ultraviolet (UV) spectrophotometer (Shimadzu UV Spectrophotometer 1800) at 247 nm. Each experiment was carried out in triplicate.

Experimental design
Initial screening studies were carried out to check the effect of process parameters and formulation parameters on FBF nanosuspension as well as its stability. The stirrer speed of mixing was identified as a critical process parameter and polymer: surfactant ratio as a critical formulation parameter. The design of experiment was used systematically to evaluate and optimize the selected process and formulation parameters at three levels (-1, 0, and +1) using 3

| Responses                      | Sources | Model p value | Adj-R² | Lack of fit test p value |
|--------------------------------|---------|---------------|--------|--------------------------|
| Entrapment efficiency          | -       | -             | 0.2371 |                          |
| Particle size                   | 0.0488  | 0.8415        | 0.9727 |                          |
| Zeta potential                  | 0.0081  | 0.952         | 0.5359 |                          |

Particle size distribution and zeta potential
The mean particle size analysis and polydispersity index (PDI) of suspended particles in nanosuspensions were carried out using Nanoparticle Analyzer SZ-100 with a Zetasizer (Horiba Scientific, Japan). Zeta potential is an index of the stability of suspension depending on the surface charge of particles. The zeta potential was determined by a laser Doppler anemometer coupled with Nanoparticle Analyzer SZ-100 (Horiba Scientific, Japan). The samples were properly diluted with de-ionized water before analysis. Each sample was assessed in triplicate [13].

Determination of % drug entrapment efficiency
FBF nanosuspensions (10 ml) were centrifuged at 10,000 rpm and 6°C using a cooling centrifuge (Remi C30 PLUS) for 30 min. The supernatant was separated out, and the absorbance was measured for the free drug content by UV spectrophotometer (Shimadzu UV Spectrophotometer 1800) at 247 nm. Entrapment efficiency was determined by subtracting the amount of free drug from the initial amount of drug. The % drug entrapment efficiency calculated by the following equation [20],

\[
\% \text{Entrapment efficiency} = \frac{\text{Initial drug concentration} - \text{Final drug concentration}}{\text{Initial drug concentration}} \times 100
\]

Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC)
The DSC thermograms of FBF, HPMC E15, poloxamer 188, physical mixture, and lyophilized powder of optimized nanosuspension (FB8) were recorded on DSC (Mettler Toledo, Staresw 920) at a rate of 10°C/min over a temperature range of 25–200°C in an atmosphere of nitrogen having flow rate of 40 ml/min.

Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy (FTIR)
FTIR spectra were recorded on the infrared spectrophotometer (Alpha T Bruker). Samples about 2–3 mg were mixed with dry potassium bromide and scanned over the range 4000–400 cm⁻¹.

Powder X-ray diffraction (PXRD)
PXRD patterns of FBF, HPMC E15, poloxamer 188, physical mixture, and lyophilized powder of optimized nanosuspension (FB8) were recorded on diffractometer (MiniFlex 600 X-ray diffractometer, Rigaku Corporation, Japan). The samples were scanned from 5 to 80° 2θ at a scan rate of 2°/min.

Transmission electron microscopy (TEM)
Surface morphology of suspended nanoparticles in FBF nanosuspensions was observed by TEM (A Hitachi H-7500, Japan). The images were viewed at different magnifications.
Saturation solubility study

The saturation solubility of FBF, physical mixture, and lyophilized powder of optimized nanosuspension FB8 was determined using three different mediums. Briefly, excess amount of each crude FBF, physical mixture, and lyophilized powder was added to each 5 ml of 0.1 N HCl (pH 1.2), phosphate buffer (pH 4.5), and phosphate buffer (pH 7.2), respectively, in sealed glass vials at 37±0.5°C. All vials were agitated at 100 rpm for 72 h using rotary shaker (Remi RS-BL). The obtained dispersions were centrifuged (Remi C30 PLUS, Mumbai, India) at 40,000 rpm for 10 min at 4°C. The supernatant was filtered and analyzed by UV spectrophotometer at 247 nm. Each experiment was performed in triplicate [21].

Dissolution testing

In vitro dissolution study of crude FBF, physical mixture and lyophilized powder of optimized nanosuspension FB8 were investigated by USP 37 Type II dissolution test apparatus (Electrolab ED'T08Lx) in three different dissolution media 0.1 N HCl (pH 1.2), phosphate buffer (pH 4.5), and phosphate buffer (pH 7.2), respectively. The samples equivalent to 100 mg of FBF were added in 900 ml of dissolution medium maintained at 37±0.5°C. The paddle speed was 75 rpm. Samples (5 ml) were collected after 5, 10, 20, 30, 45, and 60 min with immediate replacement by fresh dissolution medium to maintain the sink condition. All samples were filtered through 0.10 μm PTFE filter and analyzed by UV spectrophotometer at 247 nm. Each experiment was performed in triplicate [22-24].

Physical stability

The physical stability of optimized nanosuspension FB8 was evaluated at 4°C and 25°C for a period of 3 months. Small aliquots of nanosuspension were withdrawn after 3 months of storage for analysis of particle size, PDI, and zeta potential. Each sample was analyzed in triplicate.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Optimization

Formulation optimization by stabilizer

The selection of suitable stabilizer is an important aspect of the stability of nanosuspension. In the present investigation, settlement volume ratio (F) and aqueous solubility of FBF in the presence of different stabilizers were used as stability index for the nanosuspension.

Selection of stabilizer by settlement volume ratio (F) method

Settlement volume ratio (F) is the ratio of the volume of sedimentation after and before for a given time. Larger the F value more is the stable suspension. The settlement volume ratios for FBF loaded nanosuspensions formulated with different stabilizers are recorded in Table 1.

The stabilization effect observed was followed by Pluronic F68 >PVP K30 >PEG 6000. From the results, it could be concluded that reasonably poloxamer 188 should be selected for development of stable nanosuspension.

Selection of stabilizer by solubility study

Fig. 2 represents the apparent solubility profiles of FBF in the presence of different stabilizers. FBF represents higher aqueous solubility in the presence of SDS. This could be due to SDS micelle formation. Increased solubility can exert Ostwald ripening, resulting in increased particle size during storage. Comparatively minimum solubility was observed in the presence of poloxamer 188; therefore, it was selected as a steric stabilizer.

Experimental design

Regression and graphical analysis of data acquired from the experimental runs generated following equations in which F ratios were statistically significant (p<0.05) with Adj-R² value in the range of 0.8–1 (Table 2) and with a statistically non-significant lack of fit values (p>0.05). These model equations fitted the data well. A positive sign indicates a synergistic effect, while negative sign indicates an antagonistic effect.

Entrapment efficiency=+83.93 (Surface mean model) (1)

Particle size=271.8−9.45× X₁−28.02× X₂+18.1× X₁X₂+20.25× X₂²+16.75× X₁² (Quadratic model) (2)

Zeta potential=−11.65 + 2.69× X₁+1.11× X₂−0.4×X₁X₂−0.098×X₁²+0.23× X₂² (Quadratic model) (3)

Where X₁ and X₂ are FBF: HPMC E15:poloxamer 188 ratio and stirring speed, respectively.

Equations (2) and (3) represent that increase in stirring time decreases particle size and increase in the concentration of surfactant to certain level increases entrapment efficiency. An increased concentration of surfactant decreases zeta potential.

Effect of formulation parameter and process parameter on entrapment efficiency, particle size, and zeta potential

Fig 3a and c displays that the ratio 1:1:2 of drug, polymer, and surfactant, respectively, showed greater entrapment efficiency. An increase in the concentration of surfactant above optimum level depicted decreased entrapment efficiency probably due to surface adsorption of drug by it. A small decrease in zeta potential was observed with increase in concentration of surfactant. This could be explained by the reality that micelle formation and increased surface adsorption of drug. As shown in Fig. 3b, the increase in stirring speed gradually decreases the particle size of nanosuspension.

Table 3: Observed and predicted values of responses of optimized nanosuspension (FB8)

| Factors          | Predicted value | Observed value* |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                  | FBF: HPMC E15:poloxamer 188 |                  |                  |
|                  | Stirring speed (rpm) | Entrapment efficiency (%) | Mean particle size (nm) | Zeta potential (mV) | Entrapment efficiency (%) | Mean particle size (nm) | Zeta potential (mV) |
| 1:1:2            | 1500            | 83.92           | 271.8            | −11.65          | 89.83±0.93            | 263.3±2.73             | −10.2±0.42          |

*All values are mean±SD (n=3). FBF: Flurbiprofen, HPMC E15: Hydroxypropyl methylcellulose E15, SD: Standard deviation
### Table 4: Preparation of FBF nanosuspensions using 3^2 factorial design

| Formulation code | Independent variables | Process variable | Dependent variables* |
|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|
|                  | Formulation variable  | Process variable | Y<sub>1</sub>          | Y<sub>2</sub>          | Y<sub>3</sub>          |
|                  | X<sub>1</sub>          | X<sub>2</sub>     | Entrapment efficiency (%) | Mean particle size (nm) | Zeta potential (mV) |
| FB1              | −1                    | 1:1:1            | 8.47±1.12            | 37.2±2.00            | −15.91±0.08          |
| FB2              | 0                     | 1:1:2            | 8.61±1.07            | 315.6±2.28           | −12.7±0.13           |
| FB3              | +1                    | 1:1:3            | 8.13±0.77            | 303±0.93             | −9.18±0.88           |
| FB4              | −1                    | 1:1:1            | 8.19±0.94            | 289.7±1.59           | −13.93±0.94          |
| FB5              | 0                     | 1:1:2            | 8.29±1.08            | 270.0±1.11           | −11.6±0.18           |
| FB6              | +1                    | 1:1:3            | 8.05±0.87            | 296.2±2.21           | −9.63±0.18           |
| FB7              | −1                    | 1:1:1            | 8.17±0.82            | 277.1±1.16           | −13.03±0.17          |
| FB8              | 0                     | 1:1:2            | 8.93±0.93            | 263.3±2.73           | −10.2±0.42           |
| FB9              | +1                    | 1:1:3            | 8.21±1.13            | 281.7±0.73           | −7.91±0.37           |

*All values are mean±SD (n=3). FBF: Flurbiprofen, HPMC E15: Hydroxypropyl methylcellulose E15, SD: Standard deviation

Fig. 3: Response surface plots showing the effect of flurbiprofen:hydroxypropyl methylcellulose E15:poloxamer 188 concentrations and stirring speeds on (a) entrapment efficiency, (b) mean particle size, and (c) zeta potential.

**Model verification**

The desirability function was evaluated by Design-Expert software to obtain the optimized FBF nanosuspension. The model verification results indicate that the optimized formulation has improved entrapment efficiency, reduced mean particle size, and a higher zeta potential, which are desirable properties for a nanosuspension formulation.
are displayed in Table 3 that compare observed and predicted values of entrapment efficiency, particle size, and zeta potential using model equations.

**Evaluation of optimized FBF nanosuspension**

**Particle size and zeta potential analysis**

Table 4 depicts mean particle size, % entrapment efficiency, and zeta potential data of all formulations. The observed mean particle size of raw FBF powder was 16.41±2.41 μm while that of optimized nanosuspension (FB8) was 263.3±2.73 nm which represents significant (62-fold) reduction in particle size. The PDI of all batches of nanosuspension was found to be in the range of 0.258±0.01–0.411±0.02 indicates mono-dispersion of nanosuspensions. The PDI
Table 5: Kinetic profiles of *in vitro* drug release of optimized FBF nanosuspension FB8

| Dissolution medium       | Zero-order R² | First-order R² | Higuchi model | Hixson-Crowell R² | Korsmeyer–Peppas R² | Release exponent (n) | Diffusion mechanism |
|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| 0.1 N HCl                | 0.998         | 0.992         | 0.985         | 0.967             | 0.970               | 0.225               | Fickian diffusion    |
| Phosphate buffer pH 4.5  | 0.993         | 0.989         | 0.988         | 0.991             | 0.993               | 0.240               | Fickian diffusion    |
| Phosphate buffer pH 7.2  | 0.990         | 0.863         | 0.979         | 0.975             | 0.995               | 0.239               | Fickian diffusion    |

FBF: Flurbiprofen

Table 6: Particle size, PDI, and zeta potential values of optimized FBF nanosuspension (FB8) during 3 months of storage at 4°C and 25°C

| Parameter                  | At 4°C Initial* | At 4°C After 3 months* | At 25°C Initial* | At 25°C After 3 months* |
|----------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Particle size (nm)         | 263.3±2.73      | 271.12±0.93           | 263.3±2.73      | 293.12±1.09            |
| PDI                        | 0.26±0.02       | 0.27±0.01             | 0.26±0.02       | 0.27±0.01              |
| Zeta potential (mV)        | −10.2±0.42      | −10.41±0.77           | −10.2±0.42      | −11.16±0.45            |

*All values are mean±SD (n=3). PDI: Polydispersity index, FBF: Flurbiprofen

Drug entrapment efficiency (%) analysis

Entrapment efficiency is the percentage of the actual mass of drug entrapped in the polymeric carrier compared to the initial amount of loaded drug. The results (Table 4) suggested that the formulation FB8 having FBF: HPMC E15:poloxamer 188 (1:1:2) ratio showed increased drug entrapment efficiency due to formation of polymeric matrix with optimum viscosity. The drug entrapment efficiency of optimized nanosuspension (FB8) was 0.266±0.02. Zeta potential is the stability index of prepared nanosuspension. Sterically stabilized systems show lower zeta potential values with sufficient stabilization [12]. Zeta potential of all batches of nanosuspension was found to be in the range from −15.91±0.08 mV to −7.91±0.37 mV. The zeta potential (Fig. 4) depicted that optimized nanosuspension (FB8) was −10.2±0.42 mV.

Fig. 6: Differential scanning calorimetry curves of crude flurbiprofen (a), hydroxypropyl methylcellulose E15 (b), poloxamer 188 (c), physical mixture (d), and lyophilized nanosuspension FB8 (e)
FTIR analysis

FTIR spectra of FBF and its nanosuspension (Fig. 5) depicted a typical broad peak of FBF in the range of 3000–3500 cm\(^{-1}\) due to hydrogen bonding in the compound which was broadened in the spectra of lyophilized formulation. The distinctive sharp peak at 1404 cm\(^{-1}\) represents stretching of C-F and peak at 1687 cm\(^{-1}\) represents the carbonyl stretch (C = O) in the FBF. The O-H stretch of carboxylic acid group represented by peak at 3072 cm\(^{-1}\) and C-H stretch characterized by peaks at 2945 cm\(^{-1}\) and 2981 cm\(^{-1}\). Slight shifting of peaks in lyophilized nanosuspension FB8 from 2976 cm\(^{-1}\) to 2981 cm\(^{-1}\) and 3072 cm\(^{-1}\) to 3074 cm\(^{-1}\) indicates an enhancement of hydrogen bonding. The spectra of physical mixture and lyophilized nanosuspension showed the same absorbance pattern indicating the compatibility of drugs and polymers. Therefore, no shifting of position of the functional groups and no major interaction between FBF and polymers have been observed. Results likewise indicated that upgrade in the dissolution rate of FBF was not caused because of any chemical interaction among FBF and polymers.

DSC analysis

Fig. 6 represents the DSC thermograms of crude FBF, HPMC E15, poloxamer 188, physical mixture, and lyophilized nanosuspension. FBF demonstrated a sharp endotherm at 117.88°C ascribed to its crystalline nature. The peak of FBF (117.54°C) was maintained in the physical mixture of FBF with HPMC E15 and poloxamer 188 which noticeably indicates the absence of the physical interaction between drugs and excipients. Lyophilized nanosuspension revealed a sharp endotherm at 117.08°C which may represent the decreased particle size or miscibility of drugs with excipients. The above results signify the fact that there formulation (FB8) is statistically significant (p<0.05) when compared with FB6 by one-way ANOVA followed by Dunnett’s test.
is no significant change in crystallinity during the formulation of FBF. Results of DSC were verified by XRD analysis.

**PXRD analysis**

X-ray diffraction study (Fig. 7) of crude FBF, HPMC E15, poloxamer 188, physical mixture, and lyophilized nanosuspension FB8 was conducted to investigate the effect of excipients and method of formulation on the crystallinity of FBF. Pure FBF exhibited sharp and distinctive peaks at 20 values of 12.1°, 18.0°, 19.8°, 19.9°, 22.7°, and 24.1° indicating its crystalline nature. The halo XRD pattern of HPMC E15 and poloxamer exhibited their amorphous nature. Distinctive peaks of FBF were evident in physical mixture and lyophilized nanosuspension, but their intensities were slightly reduced. The slight change in crystallinity could be due to the minor interactions of the added excipients with drug at specific angles.

**Surface morphology by TEM study**

The morphology of FBF nanoparticles suspended in nanosuspension was illustrated by TEM analysis, and obtained TEM micrographs of optimized nanosuspension are shown in Fig. 8. The images indicate spherical shapes with better dispersity of particles and level of particle agglomeration.

**Saturation solubility study**

Saturation solubility data of FBF, physical mixture and lyophilized powder in 0.1 N HCl (pH 1.2), phosphate buffer (pH 4.5), and phosphate buffer (pH 7.2) is presented in Fig. 9. The saturation solubility of lyophilized powder was significantly increased over 77 times (799.7±10.3 µg/ml vs. 10.3±2.1 µg/ml) in 0.1 N HCl over 14 times (981.3±3.2 µg/ml vs. 67.33±3.7 µg/ml) in phosphate buffer pH 4.5, and over 10 times (1023.7±7.4 µg/ml vs. 98.22±4.1 µg/ml) in phosphate buffer pH 7.2 as compared with pure FBF. As being acidic in nature, FBF exhibited an increase in solubility with an increase in pH. A significant enhancement in solubility was observed in 0.1 N HCl. FBF is acidic in nature having pKa value ~ 4.03 has revealed an increase in solubility with an increased pH. Considerable enhancement in solubility was observed in 0.1 N HCl. Thus, an enrichment of solubility has the potential to increase its bioavailability. A significant increment in saturation solubility of FBF in physical mixture was observed might be due to the wetting action of surface stabilizers.

**Dissolution study**

FBF loaded nanosuspension is illustrated in Fig. 10 biphasic drug release outline. Rapid release of drugs was observed in the first phase due to the presence of free drugs not entrapped in polymer system. The second phase of slow release of drugs was observed due to slow diffusion of FBF through the polymer matrix. All the batches were optimized on the basis of minimum initial burst release and maximum release profile of drug. The batches with smaller particle sizes and lower entrapment of drugs showed high burst effect. The dissolution profile of optimized FBF nanosuspension in all three mediums displayed remarkable increase in dissolution rate compared with the physical mixture and pure FBF. Nanosuspension F8 showed 96.33%, 84.31%, and 72.09% drug release compared with 38.21%, 34.41%, and 25.9% drug release by pure FBF in phosphate buffer (pH 7.2), phosphate buffer (pH 4.5), and 0.1 N HCl (pH 1.2), respectively. This stamped increment in dissolution rate might be because of decrease in particle size and wettability of the polymers. As indicated by the Noyes and Whitney equation, increment in the effective surface area builds the dissolution rate generally. HPMC E15 and poloxamer 188 are steric stabilizers which avert accumulation of particles and give wettability for better drug dissolution.

Table 5 indicates that in vitro drug release profile of optimized FBF nanosuspension (FB8) was best fitted with zero-order kinetics for dissolution in 0.1 N HCl and phosphate buffer pH 4.5 based on regression coefficient values (R²=0.998 and R²=0.993) respectively. It was best fitted with Korsmeyer–Peppas model for dissolution in phosphate buffer pH 7.2 (R²=0.995). The release exponent (n) values of Korsmeyer–Peppas model for all FBF nanosuspensions were below 0.45 which indicates that the drug release follows Fickian diffusion mechanism. When dissolution pattern of FBF in 0.1 N HCl was compared with that in phosphate buffer pH 7.2, the difference factor (fd) and similarity factor (f2) were found to be 14 and 64, respectively, exhibiting similar pattern of drug dissolution.

**Physical stability study**

Physical stability is a fundamental problem in the development of nanosuspension due to aggregation of nanoparticles and Ostwald ripening effect. Ostwald ripening is the process of growth of larger particles from smaller particles that contribute to instability of nanosuspension. The physical stability study of optimized FBF nanosuspension was performed at 4°C and 25°C over 3 months. The minor increase in particle size and PDI was seen at both storage conditions after the completion of 3 months (Table-6). Therefore, the increase in particle size was insignificant. The initial and at the end of 3 months absolute zeta potential values of nanosuspension remained in between −15.91±0.08 mV and −7.91±0.37 mV indicating that nanosuspensions were physically stable. It might be due to the presence of HPMC E15 and poloxamer 188, which probably served as crystal agglomeration inhibitor by adsorbing onto the surface of FBF nanoparticles.

**CONCLUSIONS**

In the present work, FBF nanosuspensions were successfully developed by the nanoprecipitation method. Prepared nanosuspensions exhibited a great degree of aqueous solubility, dissolution rate, and stability. The resultant FBF nanosuspensions were physically stable with mean particle size range of 200–400 nm. There was a slight reduction in crystalline nature of FBF in the nanosuspensions due to the presence of HPMC E15 and poloxamer 188.
of excipients. Hence, the polymeric system of HPMC E15 and poloxamer 188 was proved effective in the development of stable nanosuspension of FBF by exerting steric stabilization.
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