Pharmaceutical amorphous solid dispersion: A review of manufacturing strategies
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Abstract Amorphous solid dispersions (ASDs) are popular for enhancing the solubility and bioavailability of poorly water-soluble drugs. Various approaches have been employed to produce ASDs and novel techniques are emerging. This review provides an updated overview of manufacturing techniques for preparing ASDs. As physical stability is a critical quality attribute for ASD, the impact of formulation, equipment, and process variables, together with the downstream processing on physical stability of ASDs have been discussed. Selection strategies are proposed to identify suitable manufacturing methods, which may aid in the development of ASDs with satisfactory physical stability.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Amorphous solid dispersions (ASDs) for oral drug delivery

Drug solubilization is an essential step for orally administered medications to be absorbed systemically. Unfortunately, a large percentage of marketed drugs (~40%) and those in the R&D pipeline (~90%) are poorly water-soluble. Therefore, various formulation strategies have been employed to overcome the solubility and/or dissolution challenges of these drugs. Drug solubility and dissolution rate of poorly water-soluble drugs can be successfully improved by formulating them as ASDs. ASDs are a solid dispersion in which the active ingredient is dispersed within an excipient matrix in a substantially amorphous form. The amorphous state of the drug in ASDs is critical for increasing their solubility. With the drug in an amorphous form, no energy is required to break the drug crystal lattice. For this reason, relative to the crystalline form, the amorphous form of many poorly water-soluble drugs can achieve substantially higher apparent solubility and markedly faster dissolution. ASDs are also known to result in higher membrane flux due to a higher supersaturation and thus, improve bioavailability. ASDs also have a higher wettability due to the presence of hydrophilic polymers.

Based on formulation composition, solid dispersions are classified as first, second, or third generation. Solid dispersions prepared using crystalline carriers are the first generation. Their drug release rate is generally slower than the other two generations of solid dispersions. ASDs, which consist of an amorphous drug in combination with an amorphous polymer, constitute the second generation. ASD formulations could also contain additional excipients, such as additional polymer and/or surfactants to further enhance drug release and stability. Such ASDs are known as the third generation. Due to their solubility and dissolution advantages, ASD formulations have drawn increasing interest over the last decade, in both academia and industry. Table 1 summarizes the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved pharmaceutical products based on ASDs. There has been an increase in the number of ASDs under development and reaching the market over the last decade. Currently, there are numerous methods available for ASD preparation, each of which has its advantages as well as limitations. This review aims to discuss the different manufacturing approaches to preparing ASDs.

1.2. Physical stability challenges of ASDs

Below the melting point, the liquid/amorphous form of a drug has a higher free energy than the crystalline form, hence there is a thermodynamic drive for crystallization. The solid-state physical instabilities associated with ASDs include amorphous—amorphous phase separation (AAPS) and/or the conversion of the amorphous drug to a crystalline form (crystallization), both of which negate the solubility advantage of ASDs. AAPS is a phenomenon wherein distinct drug-rich and polymer-rich amorphous phases are formed throughout the ASD matrix, which initially consisted of molecularly mixed drug and polymer. These drug-rich phases are more prone to crystallization due to the reduction in the inhibitory effect of the polymer. Therefore, the drug within an ASD system exhibiting AAPS crystallizes faster than a drug within a completely miscible system. Since AAPS and the subsequent decrease in the inhibitory effect of the polymer occur prior to crystallization, increasing the polymer concentration in the ASD does not necessarily lead to improved stability to crystallization. This is contrary to the trend typically observed for ASDs that remain miscible. Janssens et al. demonstrated a varying degree of drug-polymer miscibility in itraconazole/Eudragit® E100 solid dispersions prepared by film casting and spray drying. The miscibility limit for itraconazole into Eudragit® E100 was 15% when prepared by film casting and 27.5% when prepared by spray drying. This highlighted the influence of processing parameters such as solvent evaporation rate on AAPS. Exposure of ASDs to moisture upon storage can also result in AAPS.

Crystallization, in general, can be viewed as consisting of two steps, viz. nucleation and crystal growth. Nucleation is the formation of small nuclei where the term nucleus refers to the minimum amount of a new crystalline phase that is capable of independent existence. Nucleation is then followed by nuclei crystal growth. An ideal manufacturing process should be able to produce homogenous ASDs which can retain their amorphous form for the required duration of time. In the following discussions, ‘stability’ of an ASD would refer to the solid-state physical stability of the ASD—particularly its tendency not to crystallize unless otherwise specified.

Ideally, the molecularly dispersed polymer in an ASD offers protection against drug crystallization by altering the thermodynamics and kinetics of the system. The ease of drug crystallization from its amorphous state depends on the driving force for crystallization. This force is governed by the free energy difference between the amorphous and crystalline states and the molecular interactions. The presence of functional groups that are either hydrogen bond donors or acceptors results in energetically favorable drug-polymer intermolecular interactions. These interactions, together with a higher entropy result in lower chemical potential of the drug in a miscible drug—polymer ASD system than that of a pure amorphous drug. This lowered chemical potential translates to a reduction in the thermodynamic driving force for the drug to convert to its crystalline form. However, since the drug in the ASD is often supersaturated, it is also important to reduce the mobility of the drug molecules to delay phase separation and crystallization. A viscous polymer matrix can help provide this kinetic stabilization. Hence, although the glass transition temperature of the amorphous drug is usually lower than that of the polymer, an ASD system would typically have a lower somewhere between the and the polymer. This increase in increases the kinetic barrier to crystallization. This is also the primary reason for the °C rule. According to this rule, the molecular mobility of an amorphous solid becomes negligible °C below its °C. Therefore, a polymer with high °C is generally crucial for an ASD. When the drug-polymer system is miscible and contains drug amounts lower than the saturation solubility of the drug in the polymer, the ASD will be thermodynamically stable. Therefore, amorphous formulations benefit from the presence of a polymeric carrier, which serves as an amorphous form stabilizer. Also, because a majority of polymers used for ASD preparation are hydrophilic, they enhance drug dissolution by increasing formulation wettability. Further, in some drug loading regimens, the dissolution of the drug is controlled by the dissolution of the polymer. The polymer properties for generating successful ASDs have been comprehensively reviewed in the past along with a description of approaches and methods for a rational polymer selection. Briefly, besides an acceptable toxicological profile, a polymer capable of generating a homogenous dispersion with a single amorphous drug-polymer phase is preferred. For this, the polymer should provide a certain degree of drug solubility and kinetic stabilization. The typically-used polymers for ASDs are often utilized across different manufacturing platforms and include povidone derivatives such as polyvinylpyrrolidone (PVP) and polyvinylpyrrolidone/vinyl acetate (PVPVA), polymethacrylates.
derivatives (Eudragit® series)\textsuperscript{58–59}, hydroxypropyl methylcellulose (HPMC)\textsuperscript{51}, hydroxypropyl methylcellulose acetate succinate (HPMCAS)\textsuperscript{52}, and polyvinyl caprolactam-polyvinyl acetate-polyethylene glycol graft copolymer (Soluplus®)\textsuperscript{53}. Their \(T_g\) and solubility in organic solvents have been listed in Table 2.

Additives such as secondary stabilizers or surfactants are often added to ASDs to augment the product. The inclusion of surfactants can favor nanodroplet formation\textsuperscript{48}. The formation of nanodroplets increases apparent drug solubility\textsuperscript{55,56}. However, surfactants can cause drug leaching from ASDs and enhance nucleation, promoting drug crystallization during dissolution\textsuperscript{64}. For certain ASD systems, excess moisture can also reduce the drug-polymer solubility\textsuperscript{65,66}. During the formulation process, mechanical stress such as grinding, crushing, or compressing can promote deformation-induced molecular mobility in ASDs\textsuperscript{67,68}. In fact, the generation and maintenance of an amorphous drug form remains a primary challenge associated with many ASD systems and is a limiting factor for their wider application\textsuperscript{69–73}. Therefore, while reviewing ASD preparation methods, it is important to also focus on the impact of manufacturing variables on the physical stability of ASDs. Common factors affecting ASD stability are listed in Table 3. The impact of parameters of specific manufacturing processes is discussed in their relevant sections.

2. Manufacturing methods for preparing amorphous solid dispersions

ASDs can be manufactured by several methods but the underlying principle for their formation is the same. Firstly, the lattice structure of a crystalline drug is broken and converted into a liquid state by applying heat or dissolving it in a solvent. The system is then rapidly cooled (if using heat) or dried (if using solvent), causing it to fall out of the equilibrium at the \(T_g\). This results in the generation of a solid drug in an amorphous state. To generate an amorphous state, the liquefied drug should be cooled or dried at a sufficiently fast rate. ASD manufacturing methods can be broadly classified into solvent-based methods and melting or fusion formation\textsuperscript{62}. For certain ASD systems, excess moisture can also reduce the drug-polymer solubility\textsuperscript{65,66}. During the formulation process, mechanical stress such as grinding, crushing, or compressing can promote deformation-induced molecular mobility in ASDs\textsuperscript{67,68}. In fact, the generation and maintenance of an amorphous drug form remains a primary challenge associated with many ASD systems and is a limiting factor for their wider application\textsuperscript{69–73}. Therefore, while reviewing ASD preparation methods, it is important to also focus on the impact of manufacturing variables on the physical stability of ASDs. Common factors affecting ASD stability are listed in Table 3. The impact of parameters of specific manufacturing processes is discussed in their relevant sections.

### Table 1: Examples of FDA-approved products that are based on amorphous solid dispersions.

| Trade name | Chemical name | Manufacturing technique | Company | Year of Approval |
|------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------|-----------------|
| Cesamet® | Nabilone | Solvent evaporation | Meda Pharmaceuticals | 1985 |
| Isoptin® SR | Verapamil | Melt extrusion | Ranbaxy Laboratories | 1987 |
| Sporanox® | Itraconazole | Fluid bed bead layering | Janssen | 1992 |
| Prograf® | Tacrolimus | Spray drying | Astellas Pharma | 1994 |
| NuviaRing® | Etonogestrel/Ethinyl Estradiol | Melt extrusion | Merck | 2001 |
| Kaletra® | Lopinavir/Ritonavir | Melt extrusion | AbbVie | 2007 |
| Intenience® | Etravirine | Spray drying | Janssen | 2008 |
| Modigran® | Tacrolimus | Spray drying | Astellas Pharma | 2009 |
| Zortress® | Everolimus | Spray drying | Novartis | 2010 |
| Norvir® Tablet | Ritonavir | Melt extrusion | AbbVie | 2010 |
| Olumel® | Itraconazole | Melt extrusion | Merz Pharma | 2010 |
| Incivek® | Telaprevir | Spray drying | Vertex | 2011 |
| Zelboraf® | Vemurafenib | Spray/solvent precipitation | Roche | 2011 |
| Kalydeco® | Ivacafactor | Spray drying | Vertex | 2012 |
| Noxafil® | Posaconazole | Melt extrusion | Merck | 2013 |
| Astagraf XL® | Tacrolimus | Wet granulation | Astellas Pharma | 2013 |
| Belsomra® | Suvorexant | Melt extrusion | Merck | 2014 |
| Harvoni® | Ledipasvir/Sofosbuvir | Spray drying | Gilead Sciences | 2014 |
| Viekira XRTM | Dasabuvir/Ombitasvir/Paritaprevir/Ritonavir | Melt extrusion | AbbVie | 2014 |
| Epclusa® | Sofosbuvir/Velpatasvir | Spray drying | Gilead Sciences | 2016 |
| Orkambi® | Lumacafor/Ivacafactor | Spray drying | Vertex | 2016 |
| Venclexta® | Venetoclax | Melt extrusion | AbbVie | 2016 |
| Zepatier® | Elbasvir/Grazoprevir | Spray drying | Merck | 2016 |
| Stivarga® | Regorafenib | - | Bayer | 2017 |
| Mavyret® | Gilecaprevir/Pibrentasvir | Melt extrusion | AbbVie | 2017 |
| Lynparza® | Olaparib | Melt extrusion | AstraZeneca | 2018 |
| Onlissa® | Elagolix | Wet granulation | AbbVie | 2018 |
| Erlorda® | Apalutamide | Spray drying | Janssen | 2018 |
| Trikafta® | Elexacaftor (Crystalline)/Ivacafactor/Tezacaftor | Spray drying | Vertex | 2019 |
| Symdeko | Tezacaftor/Ivacafactor and Ivacaftor | Spray drying | Vertex | 2019 |
| Braltar® | Encorafenib | Melt extrusion | Pfizer | 2020 |
| Oriahnt® | Elagolix/estradiol/norethindrone acetate | Melt extrusion | AbbVie | 2020 |
methods. Solvent evaporation-based methods include spray drying (SD), electrospraying, and rotary evaporation, wherein the drug and polymer are dissolved in a solvent which is then evaporated to form an ASD. These are suitable methods for thermolabile drugs. In melting methods, the physical mixture of the drug and the polymer is melted and solidified rapidly to form the ASD.

Although some of the methods to produce ASDs have been well-established, researchers have made consistent efforts over the past decade to further improve and understand them. In addition, novel manufacturing techniques are constantly emerging. Therefore, the purpose of this review is to provide an updated overview of manufacturing techniques for ASDs.

Different manufacturing processes will generate ASD products with different physical and functional properties. An adequate understanding of manufacturing processes and their impact on product properties is crucial for obtaining a successful ASD product. To aid the development of robust ASDs, we will discuss the impact of formulation, equipment, and process variables together with downstream processing on the critical physical stability of ASDs for each method. In addition, the advantages and limitations of each of the processes have been evaluated. Lastly, in consideration of the several variables mentioned above, selection strategies have been proposed to identify suitable manufacturing methods.

2.1. Solvent evaporation-based methods

The solvent evaporation processes for preparing ASDs essentially involve drug—polymer dissolution in organic solvent systems and their subsequent evaporation. Aqueous solvents can also be used in conjunction with organic systems to enhance polymer solubility, and/or reduce the extent of organic solvent usage. Amorphous drug—polymer dispersion is generated by rapidly evaporating the solvent from the drug—polymer solution. Because organic solvent evaporation is usually performed at temperatures well below the drug melting point, solvent evaporation is particularly suitable for thermolabile formulation systems.

An important consideration when developing an ASD using a solvent evaporation process is the choice of a solvent system. The

| Polymer                        | $T_g$ (°C) | Solubility in solvents                                      |
|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| Hydroxypropyl methylcellulose | 175–185   | Water, ethanol:dichloromethane (1:1, 2:1), methyl acetate:methanol (1:1) |
| Hydroxypropyl methylcellulose acetate succinate | 100–110   | Caustic water, acetone, methanol, dichloromethane, chloroform |
| Hydroxypropyl methylcellulose phthalate | 133–137   | Water, acetone, ethyl acetate, methyl ethyl ketone, ethanol:dichloromethane (1:1) methanol, dichloromethane, tetrahydrofuran |
| Polyvinylpyrrolidone          | 175–180   | Water, acetone, ethanol, methanol, ethyl acetate, methyl ethyl ketone, dichloromethane, tetrahydrofuran |
| Polyvinylpyrrolidone/vinyl acetate | 70–110   | Water, acetone, ethanol, methanol, ethyl acetate, methyl ethyl ketone, dichloromethane, tetrahydrofuran |
| Polymethacrylates derivatives (Eudragit®-L100, S100) | >150      | Water (only L100), acetone, ethanol, methanol, ethanol:dichloromethane (1:1) |
| Cellulose acetate phthalate   | 160–170   | Acetone, ethyl acetate, methyl ethyl ketone, water, acetone, ethanol, methanol, dichloromethane |
| Soluplus®                     | 72        |                                                           |

Table 2 Commonly used polymers for ASD preparation.

Table 3 General factors impacting the stability of amorphous solid dispersions.

| Factor (increase)         | Stability | Cause                                         | Ref.  |
|---------------------------|-----------|------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Glass transition temperature ($T_g$) | Increases | Antiplasticization effect by polymers          | 74    |
| Molecular mobility        | Decreases | Molecular mobility is directly responsible for drug recrystallization | 75    |
| Configurational entropy   | Increases | Low configurational entropy will favor crystallization | 76    |
| Configurational enthalpy  | Decreases | The greater thermodynamic driving force for crystallization causes an increased rate of nucleation | 77    |
| Drug chemical potential   | Decreases | Systems with lower drug chemical potential are generally more stable | 78    |
| Humidity, mechanical stress, and temperature | Decreases | These factors can significantly increase molecular mobility and may plasticize the material | 79    |
| Polymer concentration     | Increases | Kinetic stabilization                           | 11    |
| Surfactant concentration  | Decreases | Enhance nucleation, accelerate solution-mediated crystallization | 57    |
most challenging aspect of this method is obtaining a solvent system that can solubilize the drug—polymer system and be compatible with the formulation\textsuperscript{84}, and has a low residue in the product. Poor or partial solubility of the constituents may lead to longer processing times and non-homogenous ASDs. In order to obtain the desired solvent parameters, often a combination of solvents is used. In such cases, azeotrope forming solvents such as water with ethanol (95.5%, w/w) or isopropanol (87.7%, w/w) are preferred. This is because binary solvents with different evaporation rates can cause a variable degree of supersaturation that can result in rapid precipitation of selective components at some point in the evaporation process. Such an event generates a strong potential for phase separation\textsuperscript{85}. Similarly, significant differences in the solubility of components can result in a faster rate of drying and selective precipitation of the component with lower solubility on the droplet surface\textsuperscript{86,87}. This in turn could further affect ASD stability. The solvent should not affect the physical or chemical stability of the formulation constituents during the manufacturing process before being evaporated from the system. The amount of residual solvent(s) in the final ASD products must be within the acceptable values of the International Council for Harmonization Q3C (R6) guideline\textsuperscript{88,89}. This guideline defines three different classes of solvents: Classes I, II, and III. Of these, the Class I solvents are to be avoided and Class III are the most preferable. However, Class II solvents can also be used to a limited extent if Class III solvents fail to provide adequate manufacturing conditions. Adequate removal of the residual solvent from the final product is particularly crucial when toxic organic solvents have been employed\textsuperscript{90,91}. Therefore, ASD preparation by solvent evaporation-based method is usually followed by secondary drying\textsuperscript{92–95}. Other important considerations for a solvent—evaporation based method are operator exposure to harmful organic solvents and the environmental impact of solvent waste.

Additional important solvent properties include drying efficiency, combustibility, viscosity, and toxicity\textsuperscript{96}. The drying efficiency is governed by the extent of heat and mass transfer which in turn depends on heat supply and solvent vapor removal. Thus, in order to obtain adequate drying efficiency, solvent parameters affecting its evaporation rate such as vapor pressure, boiling point, specific heat, the heat of vaporization, and viscosity need to be assessed\textsuperscript{97}. A high feed solution viscosity can also cause sticking of the solution to the processing equipment, which can result in low product yields\textsuperscript{98}. Typical solvents used for solvent evaporation methods are water\textsuperscript{99}, alcohols (methanol, ethanol or isopropanol)\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{98,99}} or other organic solvents such as dichloromethane\textsuperscript{100}, acetone\textsuperscript{101}, ethyl acetate\textsuperscript{102}, and methyl ethyl ketone\textsuperscript{103} (Table 4).

There are several methods based on the principle of solvent evaporation like spray drying, electrospraying, fluidized bed drying, supercritical fluid methods, spray freeze-drying, as well as many laboratory-scale methods. Each method has unique processing procedures and parameters, which may impact ASD product properties. Small changes in the processing conditions can lead to substantial differences in product characteristics and performance\textsuperscript{86}. Therefore, a fundamental understanding of different processes is essential for selecting the most appropriate manufacturing method.

### 2.1.1. Spray drying

Spray drying is one of the widely used processes for manufacturing ASDs\textsuperscript{102,103} because it is a continuous and commercially scalable drying process\textsuperscript{104}. The schematic set-up of the process is presented in Fig. 1a. The spray drying process constitutes several steps. First, the feed solution/suspension containing the drug and the polymer (and possibly other additives) is pumped into the drying chamber through a spray-nozzle. The different types of commonly used nozzles are shown in Fig. 1 (b, c, d). The two-fluid nozzle has been the most commonly used nozzle for preparing spray-dried ASDs, particularly on a laboratory-scale\textsuperscript{105}. The energy required to atomize the liquid is primarily provided by a gas. Liquid fed into the nozzle under low pressure can be mixed either internally or externally with the

| Table 4 | Commonly used solvents for ASD preparation. |
|---------|-------------------------------------------|
| Solvent | Boiling point (°C) | Solubility in water (g/100 g) | Density (at 25 °C, g/mL) | Viscosity (at 25 °C, cP) | Dielectric constant | ICH Class (limit ppm) |
|---------|-------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Acetone | 56.2              | Miscible                      | 1.049                  | 0.295               | 20.7              | Class 3          |
| Butanone | 79.6              | 29                            | 0.805                  | 0.4                 | 18.51             | Class 3          |
| Butyl acetate | 126.1 | 0.68                          | 0.882                  | 0.685               | 5.07              | Class 3          |
| Chloroform | 61.7              | 0.795                         | 1.498                  | 0.536               | 4.81              | Class 2 (60)     |
| Dichloromethane | 39.6 | 1.32                          | 1.326                  | 0.413               | 9.08              | Class 2 (600)    |
| Dimethyl acetamide | 165 | Miscible                      | 0.937                  | 0.92                | 37.78             | Class 2 (1090)   |
| Dimethyl formamide | 153 | Miscible                      | 0.944                  | 0.97                | 36.7              | Class 2 (880)    |
| Dimethyl sulfoxide | 189 | 25.3                          | 1.092                  | 1.987               | 47                | Class 3          |
| Ethanol | 78.5              | Miscible                      | 0.789                  | 1.04                | 24.6              | Class 3          |
| Ethyl acetate | 77 | 8.7                           | 0.895                  | 0.428               | 6                 | Class 3          |
| Glycerin | 290              | Miscible                      | 1.261                  | 954                | 42.5              | —                |
| Isopropanol | 82.6             | Miscible                      | 0.786                  | 1.96               | 18.2              | Class 3          |
| Methanol | 64.6              | Miscible                      | 0.791                  | 0.543               | 32.6              | Class 2 (3000)   |
| Tetrahydrofuran | 66 | Miscible                      | 0.889                  | 0.48                | 7.52              | Class 2 (720)    |
| Water | 100               | —                             | 0.998                  | 1                  | 78.5              | —                |

\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{—}}, not applicable.
Another widely used nozzle in the pharmaceutical industry is the pressurized nozzle, which solely uses the feed liquid pressure for atomization. The potential energy of the liquid is converted into kinetic energy within the pressure-swirl nozzle. Due to internal instability as well as instability arising from the interaction with the surrounding air, the annular liquid lamella disintegrates. The pressure-swirl nozzle does not atomize highly viscous liquids effectively. A higher solution viscosity decreases the swirl intensity and leads to a higher liquid throughput as the cross-sectional area of the liquid increases. Pressurized nozzles provide the ability to produce larger particles with better flow properties and are easy to scale-up. This is particularly advantageous for downstream processing, as it can improve powder flow, die filling, compression, and tablet uniformity. Sildenafil was spray-dried with poly(lactide-co-glycolide) using a pressurized nozzle to form microparticulates of ASDs. No significant changes in physicochemical properties or in vitro drug release were observed during a scaled-up manufacturing process using the same procedure.

The choice of the feed pump depends on the feed material viscosity, the type of atomization nozzle, and the drying capacity. The droplets atomized by the nozzle come in contact with the heated gas, which causes evaporation of the solvent in the drying chamber. The duration of particle residence in the drying chamber will vary depending on the equipment and process parameters, however, it is usually in the range of a few milliseconds. Industrial spray dryers are equipped to have a gas flow rate as high as 5000 kg/h that can result in a solvent evaporation capacity of up to 400 kg/h. The dried material is carried to the cyclone separator, where the heavier particles are separated from the drying gas and collected. The finer particles are removed with the exhaust gases which are collected via a filter. Particles can deposit at the bottom of the drying chamber in some cases and may be scraped. Scraping can be done with the aid of vibratory devices, and/or compressed air. Although mechanical brushes can also be used, they might result in additional stresses.

One of the concerns in using spray drying is the amount of residual solvent. Therefore, spray drying is usually followed by secondary drying. ASD product characteristics and performance can vary significantly by fine-tuning the formulation and process parameters. Relevant manufacturing parameters are shown in Fig. 1a. Of these, two of the crucial processing variables are the inlet temperature and the feed rate. Optimization of these factors is essential to obtain a homogenous amorphous dispersion. Selection of the inlet temperature is dictated by the physical and chemical stability of formulation constituents and the boiling point of the solvent(s).

An operating and processing space for generating stable ASDs is shown in Fig. 2. During rapid solvent evaporation from the atomized droplet, if the surface film formed is permeable, a porous particle is formed. A hollow particle with a thicker shell is formed if the initial film is impermeable. Slower rates of evaporation can provide adequate time for molecular rearrangement. This can cause phase separation or even crystallization. The extent of phase separation/crystallization is dependent upon the strength of the drug-polymer interactions. Studies have shown that the extent of drug-polymer miscibility varies depending on the location in the spray dryer from which it has been collected. Naproxen-PVP-VA ASDs collected from the cyclone of the (Pro-C-epT Micro) spray dryer showed the narrow glass transition width, indicating a higher degree of drug-polymer miscibility relative to the ASDs sampled from the collector.

Recently, solvent composition during spray drying has also been shown to have a significant impact on ASDs despite the complete solubilization of drug and polymer in the selected solvent system. In their work, Li et al. found that water addition to the solvent system can lead to phase separation of ASDs during spray drying even for an initially one-phase feed solution. For the investigated ritonavir-PVP system, phase separation appeared to be subtle at a 25% drug loading with the co-solvents of water and methanol (10:90 ratio). However, a significant reduction in drug release rate was noted for this batch. Both experimental and modeling results indicated that the extent of phase separation increased when a higher amount of water (60:40 water—methanol...
of the active ingredient, especially for those expensive drugs. Mailing walls reduces product yield which can be a limiting factor.

Spray-dried ASDs, likely due to the varying evaporation and ratio has also been shown to alter the surface composition of homogeneous136. The increase in temperature of the feed solution recrystallize130. For an in-depth reading regarding the fundamentals of ASD particle engineering by spray drying, readers are referred to some previously published reviews84,102,124,131.

The solubility of the drug and excipients in the feed solvent limits the output of a traditional spray drying process. If the solubility of the solute and excipient in the solvent is very different, spray-dried ASDs obtained from such solutions are often not homogeneous139. Recently, modified spray drying techniques have been developed for ASD production in which the aqueous, organic, or combination feed solution is heated by a heat exchanger before being atomized and spray-dried135,136. This process generally leads to spray-dried ASDs that are more homogeneous139. The increase in temperature of the feed solution increases the solubility of the drug and other excipients. Such temperature increase of feed solution can reduce its viscosity and enable improved uniformity of atomization136. In addition, this modification allows for the rapid evaporation of the solvent and shorter times of particle solidification than conventional spray drying135,136. However, operation safety and formulation stability concerns must be carefully evaluated before employing this method for preparing ASDs.

Spray drying has some limitations. A major concern in spray-dried ASDs is solvent residue123,138. The low bulk density ASD powder prepared by this method often needs densification to improve its flow properties for further processing into the final dosage forms. Additionally, adhesion of the material to the equipment walls reduces product yield which can be a limiting factor early in development where the developers have a limited amount of the active ingredient, especially for those expensive drugs. Adding silicon dioxide into the feed has been shown to increase bulk density, and therefore the recovery of ASD product139,140. Nevertheless, spray drying remains one of the most popular methods due to its applicability to a wide variety of compounds and its ability to obtain a product with a high drug load and the desired particle properties by fine-tuning multiple processing variables. For example, albendazole was found to be degrading up to 97.4% during hot-melt extrusion, despite the precautions of earlier forced chemical and thermal degradation tests141,142. However, no degradation was seen for spray-dried ASDs. The capability of spray drying to prepare high drug-loaded indomethac-in-PVP ASDs was compared with co-milling and supercritical anti-solvent process in another report142. The spray drying method could prepare formulations up to a higher drug load (80%, w/w) relative to the other processes (60%, w/w)142. In a very short timeframe, spray drying can generate particles with a size range from nano-to-micrometer scales. Nanoparticles of celecoxib-phospholipoid E80 and trehalose were prepared via spray drying143. Microspheres (3–10 μm) of caffeine ASDs were generated when it was spray-dried with poly (lactic-co-glycolic acid) and polylactic acid144. It is also a process that can be scaled up from laboratory to industrial manufacturing. For example, Sawicki et al.98 showed that spray drying is more suitable to scale-up than freeze-drying. For a Phase one clinical trial of docetaxel or paclitaxel, spray drying was a method of choice over freeze-drying since the values of both saturation solubility and precipitation onset time of spray-dried ASDs were either similar or better to the freeze-dried ASD98.

2.1.2. Electrospraying

In electrospraying, electrical forces atomize feed solution (containing drug and other additives) into small droplets in the range of a few nanometers or micrometers. Similar to spray drying, the rapid rate of solvent evaporation contributes to the formation of the amorphous drug state within the ASD. With atomization of the drug-containing solvent and rapid drying, the method is somewhat similar to that of spray drying124,125,137. However, one of the key advantages of electrospaying over spray drying and many other techniques is its capability to produce small particles, with a narrow particle size distribution145–147.

The ‘free-fall’ of the droplets with subsequent rapid solvent evaporation allows for minimal to no agglomeration of the electrosprayed particles148. This technique additionally offers adaptability with basic equipment designs to generate particles with the desired size, shape, and morphology149,150.

The standard electrospraying set-up is comprised of four significant parts: a siphoning system (usually a pump), a spray nozzle set-up with a variable high voltage, and a grounded substrate151. The electrically conductive feed is pumped gradually into the spray nozzle, which has an applied electrical potential difference. When the feed solution is ejected from the nozzle, at an adequate high applied voltage, the free charges on the solution surface create an electrical pressure. This results in the generation of the ‘Taylor cone’, where the meniscus at the nozzle tip is shaped like a cone (Fig. 3)152. The solution at the tip of the cone has a high free charge and is pulled away rapidly towards the collector, forming a highly charged solution jet153. During the flight to the collector, solvent evaporation on the primary droplet surfaces causes them to shrink. This increases charge concentration causing the droplet to undergo Coulomb fission and break into even smaller droplets154. These nano- or micro-sized droplets allow for instant solvent evaporation so that only solidified particles reach the grounded substrate153,154. Several studies have also used an additional assembly of a corona neutralizer. The
neutralizer is placed opposite to or concentrically around the nozzle and is used to prevent further Coulomb fission and disruption of charged droplets to obtain monodispersed particles. Besides the Taylor cone-jet mode, many other electrospaying modes can be achieved by adjusting the electrical potential. However, the Taylor-cone mode, which emits a steady stream of microscopic jet and breaks up periodically into uniformly sized droplets is the preferred mode for the generation of monodisperse particles.

For electrospraying, the processing conditions are optimized such that the solution kinetic energy and surface tension are overcome by the electrostatic repulsion, allowing the jet to break into smaller droplets. This forms fine polymeric fibers (instead of particles) with their diameter ranging from a couple of nanometers to a few micrometers. This process is known as electrospinning. Although ASDs can be prepared using electrospinning, electrospaying is preferred due to its ability to generate spherical and monodisperse particles with better flow characteristics relative to electrospun fibers.

Bohr et al. formulated celecoxib-poly (lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA) microspheres of ASDs with electrospraying. Not only was the drug release from ASDs faster than that of a pure crystalline drug, but optimization of electrospraying allowed for varying ASD properties like particle size and porosity which helped alter drug release profiles. Yu et al. prepared ketoprofen-PVP ASD nanoparticles using electrospraying with drug-polymer ratios of 1:10, 2:10, and 5:10. Almost complete drug release was achieved for all the ratios within 1 min at a 50 mg drug dose in phosphate buffer solution. Similar rapid release (<1 min) was exhibited for acetaminophen/PVP K25 prepared by electrospraying. Electrospraying can also be useful for preparing ASDs of drugs that are poorly soluble in common solvents or have a high melting point, which makes using traditional heat or solvent-based methods challenging. For instance, quercetin is one such drug with a high melting point of 326 °C. Li et al. formulated a quercetin-PVP ASD by electrospraying their dimethylacetamide and ethanol-based solution, which exhibited rapid release (<10 s) and 10-fold higher permeation rates across porcine sublingual mucosae than crystalline quercetin.

Although there are studies indicating successful ASD formation by electrospraying, there are also reports highlighting the complexity of electrospaying in preparing ASDs. When clarithromycin ASDs were prepared by electrospraying, Mohammadi et al. observed an incomplete amorphization of the drug. Similarly, even though the -Eudragit® L100 ASDs prepared by Zhang et al. had a significantly enhanced drug release, incomplete amorphization (<5% crystallization) was observed in the formulation. Besides the nature of the drug, ambient pressure is one of the factors that results in incomplete amorphization during electrospraying. For example, Nyström et al. reported the varying effect of ambient pressure on drug amorphization during electrospraying. Electrospraying the solutions of budesonide and piroxicam at low pressure (0.3 bar) led to powders exhibiting higher degree of amorphization compared to solutions electrosprayed at atmospheric pressure. On the other hand, indomethacin solutions electrospayed at lowered pressure (0.3 bar) prompted the formation of more crystalline drug than that produced at atmospheric pressure.

An important parameter impacting the crystallinity of electrospayed solids is the electrical field, especially for dipolar compounds. Increased interaction of the compound dipole moments with a strong electrical field, can cause molecular rearrangements that promote crystallization. Also, it is important for the feed solution to have sufficient conductivity and low viscosity so that the solution jet can be broken into smaller droplets. Fig. 3 shows some other equipment and process variables that can affect the drug amorphization during electrospraying.

Since even a small trace of crystalline phase can induce subsequent crystallization of the ASD, residual crystallinity is a parameter that needs to be monitored while manufacturing ASDs, especially via electrospraying. Although there is some advancement in scale-up approaches of electrospaying like multi-spray nozzle, nozzle-free, and high-speed electrospinning, the use of electrospinning for ASD preparation is restricted due to its
low production rates and complex process design. For in-depth reading regarding the fundamentals of electrospraying, readers can refer to some previously published reviews.\(^{151-154,185}\).

2.1.3. Fluidized bed technology

Fluid bed technology is used for various pharmaceutical unit operations including granulation (fluidized bed granulator), coating (fluidized bed coater), drying (fluidized bed dryer), and cooling.\(^{160-168}\) Along similar lines, fluidized bed coaters and granulators are also used to manufacture ASDs.\(^{189,190}\) For ASD preparation, the drug-polymer solutions are sprayed onto inert excipient cores, with the solvent evaporation and ASDs layering occurring simultaneously. The organic solvent can be recovered and recycled.\(^{191}\) This method has been used to formulate both controlled- and immediate-release solid dispersions.\(^{192,197}\) Direct formation of ASD granules by this method reduces additional downstream processing steps, which aids in avoiding potential stability issues during these processes.\(^{145,194}\) In addition, such granules allow an additional coating of suitable excipients which can control the release profiles or enhance the ASD stability.\(^{195}\) For example, indomethacin-PVP ASDs prepared by coating onto sugar spheres were further coated with various polymers to achieve the desired drug release and diffusion rates.\(^{194}\)

Based on the nozzle location, there are four types of setups available for fluidization as shown in Fig. 4.\(^{196}\) In both the bottom and tangential spray process, the drying air and feed solution are introduced in the same direction. This presents a more controlled particle movement and allows for a uniform ASD coating. Therefore, these two configurations are usually the preferred fluidization methods to prepare ASDs.\(^{197}\) The typical formulation and process parameters of fluidized bed manufacturing that affect product properties are shown in Fig. 4.\(^{198}\) Dipyr- idamole controlled release ASD pellets were formulated by Beten et al.\(^{192}\) using the bottom spray fluidized bed process. When Ho et al.\(^{193}\) prepared nifedipine-HPMC ASDs by layering them on sugar spheres using a fluidized bed coater, they observed varying rates of drug release with varying drug-polymer ratios. Similarly, Sun et al.\(^{196}\) employed a fluidized bed coating method to prepare silymarin-PVPP ASDs. Additionally, Zhang et al.\(^{200}\) demonstrated the success of this process to prepare ASDs at low air temperatures of <30 °C for thermolabile drugs. This technique was also utilized to produce wax-based (floating) ASD pellets which gave a sustained release for 12 h.\(^{201}\) The wax-based core was coated with protocatechuic acid and ethylcellulose solution in a single-step fluidized bed coating method. Fluid bed layering has also been used to prepare an amorphous complex of drug and cyclodextrins to enhance the drug dissolution profile.\(^{202}\) For ASD preparation, fluid bed layering can be challenging on a larger scale due to stickiness of the material and over-agglomeration; though there are still a few marketed products manufactured using the fluid bed process,\(^{203,204}\) probably because the fluidized bed offers a one-step granulation-coating-drying approach with the possibility of relatively lower operating temperatures than spray drying.

2.1.4. Supercritical fluids

Supercritical fluids (SCFs) have also been used to produce ASDs. SCFs are simply gases that simultaneously present gaseous and liquid state properties under specific pressure and temperature conditions.\(^{205-207}\) The liquid property of SCFs is useful for drug-polymer solubilization whereas the gaseous property aids in solid diffusion and solvent evaporation.\(^{208}\) Although theoretically nearly all gases can be SCFs, practically only a few are used due to the limitation of attainable temperature and pressure conditions. In fact, >98% of all SCF applications have been developed with carbon dioxide (CO\(_2\)).\(^{205}\) This is because CO\(_2\) has a low critical temperature (31 °C) and pressure (7.4 MPa), making it easier to achieve adequate conditions for an SCF process. In addition, it is non-flammable, reusable, non-toxic, and inexpensive.\(^{206,208,209}\) Another gas used as an SCF in the pharmaceutical industry is trifluoromethane.\(^{209}\) The major advantage of SCF-based methods is that they are relatively greener in nature and have lower production costs compared to other solvent-evaporation processes. The solvent vaporization process can also be controlled more by adjusting the temperature and pressure conditions. The low viscosity of SCFs result in a high diffusivity and rapid solvent evaporation with faster and higher yields.\(^{210}\) Drawbacks of using SCF-based methods for ASD preparation include the difficulty in removing residual organic solvents (if used), and the high capital investment.\(^{205}\)

SCF-based processes can be divided into three groups.\(^{206}\) The first includes processes that use SCFs as solvents. An example of such a process is the rapid expansion of a supercritical solution (RESS). In RESS the drug and polymer/s are dissolved in an SCF and the SCF is then rapidly expanded by sudden decompression.
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**Figure 4** Fluidized bed manufacturing variables affecting product properties and the different types of fluidized bed dryers (a) top spray; (b) bottom spray; (c) Wurster; (d) tangential or side rotor spray.
This is usually done by passing the SCF solution through an orifice at low pressure\textsuperscript{219}. RESS is an advantageous single-step process requiring minimal to no organic solvent. However, a typical issue with this process is particle agglomeration. Many poorly water-soluble compounds have inadequate solubility in SCFs under moderate conditions of temperature (<60 °C) and pressure (<300 bar)\textsuperscript{206,210}. Cosolvents such as methanol can be added to CO\textsubscript{2} to aid drug solubility. However, this necessitates an additional step for removing the residual solvent which increases process complexity and expense\textsuperscript{211–213}.

The second group consists of processes that use SCFs as antisolvents. In these processes, the drug-polymer system is solubilized in an organic solvent and then mixed with an SCF which acts as an antisolvent. The solubilization capability of the organic solvent reduces as SCF is being added to the organic solvent. Thus, the new liquid mixture now becomes supersaturated with respect to the drug and the polymer causing them to precipitate as ASDs. To successfully produce an ASD by this method, the drug and polymer must possess high solubility in the selected organic solvent and limited/no solubility in the SCF. Also, the selected organic solvent should be miscible with the selected SCF (antisolvent). The precipitated particles are subsequently filtered. There are different techniques that have the same underlying principle but differ in the mixing method of the solvent and antisolvent\textsuperscript{214–216}. The examples include precipitation with compressed fluid antisolvent (PCA), supercritical antisolvent (SAS), supercritical fluid extraction (SFE), and solution-enhanced dispersion by SCF (SEDs). For the PCA method, the organic solvent solution is introduced via capillaries into the controlled chamber containing the SCF\textsuperscript{215,216}, whereas in SAS the solvent solution is introduced via a nozzle\textsuperscript{215,216}. These methods have been applied to provide ASDs on an industrial-scale\textsuperscript{217}. Atorvastatin\textsuperscript{218} megestrol acetate\textsuperscript{219}, and valsartan\textsuperscript{220} are ASDs produced by the SAS approach and have exhibited improved solubility and bioavailability. Indomethacin\textsuperscript{221}, cefdinir\textsuperscript{222}, and glycyrrhizic acid ASDs\textsuperscript{223} produced by this process have shown enhanced solubility whereby the formulated powder also exhibited uniform particle size. Glibenclamide ASDs prepared by the SAS were shown to have similar solubility as those prepared by solvent evaporation using a rotary evaporator\textsuperscript{226}. A recent study further demonstrated improved permeability of zidovudine-poly (l-lactic acid) solid dispersions relative to the pure crystalline drug when tested in an ex vivo everted rat intestinal sac model\textsuperscript{228}. The observed effect was attributed to the enhanced poly (l-lactic acid) polymer plasticization and increased extent of drug diffusion in the polymer matrix. In the ASES method, the organic solvent solution and SCF are atomized simultaneously\textsuperscript{226,230}. These methods have been applied to provide ASDs on an industrial scale\textsuperscript{230–232}. Puerarin microparticles produced by SEDS were amorphous whereas the particles prepared by GAS were crystalline\textsuperscript{230}, likely due to the slow process of GAS.

The third group includes methods that use SCFs as solutes, including precipitation from gas-saturated solutions (PGSS). It utilizes the ability of supercritical CO\textsubscript{2} (scCO\textsubscript{2}) to diffuse into organic compounds like polymers. When scCO\textsubscript{2} diffuses into the polymer, it lowers polymer T\textsubscript{g} and viscosity. In the PGSS process, the drug-polymer physical mixtures are first introduced into SCF. Elevated pressure and SCF cause the mixture to melt. This nonviscous solution is sprayed into a receiving chamber with controlled pressure. Due to rapid decompression, SCF escapes the solid matrix, and ASDs are formed. This method is particularly suitable for materials like PVP and PLGA which easily absorb SCF. PGSS is an advantageous SCF-based process since it does not require organic solvents and usually operates at lower pressures with lower gas consumption relative to other processes such as RESS. Composite solid dispersions of fenofibrate and stearoyl macrocol-32 glycerides (Gelucire\textsuperscript{8}) have been prepared using PGSS by Pestieau et al.\textsuperscript{231} Biphasic dissolution of the formulation indicated a significantly higher concentration of the drug in the aqueous (0.1 mol/L HCl) as well as organic (octanol) layer relative to the physical mixture. In another study, progesterone solid dispersions were prepared with PGSS\textsuperscript{232}. Amongst the tested variables, a yield of 94.7% and the highest extent of progesterone dissolution after 20 min (85.6%) was observed for lower progesterone-to-excipient ratio (1:10) and process values of higher pressure (186 bar), higher temperature (60 °C), and a longer processing time (30 min).

SCFs have also been used as processing aids in combination with melt extrusion (usually in RESS or PGSS mode)\textsuperscript{233}. A schematic for the selection of an appropriate SCF-based process for ASD preparation is shown in Fig. 5. Among SCF-based processes, SAS-based processes are generally favored for ASD preparation due to easier scale-up and more tunable variables\textsuperscript{234}. Besides the formulation composition (discussed in previous methods), the key variables that affect product attributes in the SCF-based methods are pre-expansion conditions (temperature and pressure of vessel), nozzle type (atomization, dimension) and angle of impact of the jet stream, feed rate of solution, flow rate of the SCF, and final drying/extraction time\textsuperscript{234}.

2.1.5. Spray-freeze-drying

Spray-freeze-drying is one of the cryogenic technology for preparing ASD powders (Fig. 6)\textsuperscript{235,236}. During the spray-freeze-drying process, the feed solution or suspension comprising of the drug, polymer, and possibly other excipients are atomized and sprayed directly into a cryogenic liquid\textsuperscript{237,238}. The frozen particles are then transferred to a freeze-dryer to generate a flowable ASD powder. This process can be further categorized depending on the type of injection devices (capillary, rotary, pneumatic, ultrasonic, two-fluid/three fluid nozzle), location of the nozzle, and the molecular rearrangement and is therefore not ideal for ASDs. SEDS, another process of the second group uses a unique patented nozzle that allows SCF to function both as an antisolvent and a dispersing agent for the organic solution\textsuperscript{237}. Thus, the organic solution and SCF are atomized simultaneously\textsuperscript{239}. There are two types of a nozzle in the SEDS: one with two channels (one each for SCF and organic solution) and another with three channels. The nozzle with three channels provides more choices in operating variables. For example, one channel can be for the organic solution with a drug, a second for polymer in aqueous solution, and a third for SCF\textsuperscript{230}.
composition of the cryogenic liquid (liquid nitrogen, liquid argon, compressed CO$_2$). However, generally, spray-freeze-dried powders are amorphous and porous, which results in a high surface area and a high dissolution rate. Also, relative to spray drying, spray-freeze-drying offers a higher control over particle size, compatibility with more excipients, less thermal stress, and a higher yield. The spray-freeze-drying process has been successfully used to enhance the dissolution and bioavailability of poorly soluble drugs like carbamazepine and danazol. He et al. demonstrated that this technology could be employed for producing stable and free-flowing baicalein powders that could not be obtained by a conventional solvent evaporation method (i.e., rotavapor). Pluronic F68 was used as a carrier and inhibited baicalein from crystallizing. In comparison with the ASDs prepared by rotary evaporation, the spray-freeze-dried ASDs exhibited significantly enhanced baicalein dissolution rate and improved oral bioavailability in rats, likely as a result of their porous structure and higher specific surface area.

Since spray-freeze-drying is a combination of spraying and freeze-drying processes, the manufacturing considerations for preparing stable ASD systems using this method are a combination of those two as well (discussed in their respective sections). Nevertheless, an important distinction is the solvents used for preparing the feed solution. Spray drying solvents may have a high ratio of organic components. However, for spray-freeze-drying, it is preferable that the feed solution have a low organic component since freeze-drying usually does not permit high organic solvent content. Another concern with spray-freeze-drying is that the porous and low-density structures of the ASDs may make them fragile and difficult for secondary processing.

2.1.6. Other solvent-based methods
Solvent casting is a commonly used laboratory process for preparing ASDs. A drug—polymer solution (mostly organic) is spread onto a substrate and then the solvent is evaporated at room temperature under normal pressure. The solvent evaporation can also be sped up using a hot plate or by placing it in an oven (at low temperatures and pressure) and followed by cooling. The films that form are usually milled to obtain powders. However, this method is limited to drugs that can be solubilized in solvents with low boiling points like ethanol, chloroform, dichloromethane, or their mixtures. Also, it might be challenging to completely evaporate the residual solvent.

Solvent evaporation using a rotary evaporator is another frequently used process for a small-scale ASD preparation. In this process, the drug—polymer solution, typically using an organic solvent, is evaporated under vacuum and at slightly elevated temperatures. Simultaneous application of vacuum and heat increases the rate of solvent evaporation and allows the use of a solvent with higher boiling points if required. In the rotary evaporator process, solvents like tetrahydrofuran or dimethylformamide that could not be used in a solvent casting process can be used. The final product is collected from the flask and, if necessary, can be further milled.

Sandhu et al. reported rotating jet-spinning as an alternative to electrospinning for ASD production. The typical set-up consists of a rotating reservoir containing drug-polymer solutions attached to a motor. The reservoir can either be perforated, or equipped with a side nozzle, or possibly placed over metal plates with perforations for ejecting the solution. The drug-polymer solution is placed into a preheated or room temperature rotating metal container (spinning...
reservoir) which rotates at high speed (generally in the range of 2000–13,000 rpm). When the reservoir is rotated (about its axis) at a rate that overcomes the capillary and centrifugal forces, the solution jet is ejected from a side nozzle/perforations on the reservoir or a gap between metal plates holding the reservoir. This jet is propelled along a long spiral trajectory extended by the centrifugal forces. This generates a higher surface area. Solvent evaporation also occurs during this step. The solvent evaporation rate is dependent upon the solvent diffusion coefficient in the polymer. Relative to solvent evaporation methods like spray drying or electrospraying, challenges posed by this method include its lower ability to remove the residual organic solvent(s) to a satisfactory level, and the necessity of a batch mode. Further study on the scale-up capability of this method for producing ASDs is warranted for the feasibility of industrial manufacturing.

2.2. Melting-based methods

In melt-based methods, the formulation components are heated to form dispersions, followed by cooling. Solvent avoidance is a significant benefit of the melting techniques. However, a major drawback of these methods is that the high temperatures may induce drug degradation. Melting methods also require sufficient solubility/miscibility of drugs in the polymer melt, which can be very difficult for certain molecules to achieve. An efficient ASD production by melting depends on the operational as well as compositional variables. The use of a polymer in the production of an ASD is of course to stabilize the amorphous form, but it is also important for processing because the polymer provides a molten medium for drug solubilization or dispersion. Therefore, the polymers used in melting processes are usually polymers or waxes with a low melting point of \( T_m \). Commonly used carriers include PVP, PVPA, cellulose esters and acrylicates, and polyethylene glycol. There are some commercial polymers specifically designed for melting processes such as HPMCAS, Soluplus, and Afinisil® HPMC HME (modified HPMC). These carriers can also be used in combination to achieve improved amorphization, stability, dissolution, and bioavailability.

Sufficient plasticization is essential to form an ASD during the melting process. Although the drug itself can provide some plasticizing effect, additional plasticizers can be added to aid the mixing of drug and polymer. Melting-based ASD preparation processes are also often characterized by high shear stress, which can be reduced by the incorporation of a plasticizer. Plasticizers reduce the viscosity of the mixture and therefore can lower the processing temperature. Some examples of frequently used plasticizers are di-α-tocopheryl, poloxamers, low molecular-weight poly (ethylene glycol) (PEGs), and surfactants.

Plasticizer selection is dependent on its intended formulation functionality, such as lowering the processing temperature or lowering the melt viscosity. Added plasticizers that remain in the product, can affect its properties and performance (physicochemical stability, dissolution, \( T_g \), hygroscopicity, or appearance). In addition, conventional plasticizers are used in a concentration range of 5%–30%, \( w/w \), which increases the total weight of the formulation and may result in large, unacceptable dosage forms. Therefore, an ideal plasticizer should be capable of providing the desired plasticizing effect and then be removed from the formulation to mitigate its possible negative effects before final processing. For this reason, scCO₂, low boiling solvents, or reagents that can evaporate or sublime are being used.

2.2.1. Hot-melt extrusion (HME)

For commercial-scale production, only two types of melting processes are available, hot-melt extrusion (HME) and melt agglomeration (discussed later in the ‘Granulation’ subsection). HME, and especially the twin-screw melt extrusion with Meltrex™ as a representative example, is one of the most widely used techniques for producing ASDs. The drug and the polymer are mixed, melted, dispersed, and then extruded under specific processing conditions. The drug and the polymer are mixed, melted, dispersed, and then extruded under specific processing conditions. Fig. 8 shows the HME process, which can be divided theoretically into five steps, namely: feeding, melting and plasticizing, mixing/kneading and conveying, discharging, and cooling for further downstream processing. Important parts of a hot-melt extruder include a feed hopper, barrel, extrusion screws, torque sensors, heating-cooling system and dies.

The HME equipment has a flexible design, which enables processes to be tailored to achieve the desired outcomes and to accommodate varying raw materials, by adjusting the modular design elements, namely the screws and barrels. It is also possible to apply HME technology to drugs liable to oxidation and hydrolysis by excluding oxygen and moisture from the mixture. The barrels can be flanged together or linked via internal tie rods. The most critical component of the extruder is the screw, which determines the quality and quantity (per unit time) of the extruded material. Based on the screw configuration, the process may be categorized into single-screw or twin-screw extrusion. A twin-screw provides many benefits over the single screw model, with decreased drug residence time in the extruder and facilitated continuous mass flow with better mixing. It can also be designed with two separate hoppers, both of which can vary in temperature over a wide range and are equipped with the self-cleaning function. In addition, twin-screw extruders can limit thermal stress on the materials by reducing the ‘non-motion’ and preventing localized overheating. It also presents easier feeding of materials and less propensity to overheat.

Depending on the desired shear level and operating speed, two screws can be designed in different configurations of co-rotating (rotating in the same direction) or counter-rotating (rotating in the opposite direction), depending on the desired mixing intensity. Co-rotating screws are usually used in pharmaceutical manufacturing because they generate relatively lower shear forces than the counter-rotating. Nakamichi et al. demonstrated that the physicochemical properties of the extruded material were substantially impacted by the machine operating conditions. The study reported that since the kneading screws kept the material in the

![Figure 7](image-url) A typical set-up of the rotating jet-spinning process. The reservoir containing feed solution is rotated such that the solution jet is ejected with a higher surface area, resulting in rapid solvent evaporation.
machine for a prolonged period under shear, stable ASDs exhibiting super-saturation upon dissolution could be prepared irrespective of changes in operating conditions such as the rate of revolution of the screws (20–100 rpm) and the amount of water (0%–50%) introduced in the feed. When the kneading screws were detached from the screws and only the feed screw elements were used for ASD preparation, the extent of amorphization and dissolution profiles of the extruded material was substantially impacted by the machine operating conditions. Although partial crystallinity was observed in all the batches, the extent of crystallinity decreased with a reduction in rotation rate and amount of water. Slow screw rotation and the addition of a sufficient amount of water to the mixture increased the rate of dissolution of the drug, although no supersaturation occurred in any of the batches tested.

The kneading paddles play a vital role in drug amorphization. Verhoeven et al. reported that at least one kneading zone was necessary for the homogeneous distribution of metropol tartrate in ethyl cellulose matrices, even though the homogeneity of distribution and drug release rate were not significantly altered by the number of kneading zones or their location along the extruder barrel. The impact of screw configuration on the dissolution behavior was studied by Liu et al. with indomethacin-Eudragit® EPO ASDs. They observed that indomethacin dissolution into the polymer melt was accelerated by the kneading blocks. Adequate shear stress, shear rate and mean residence time (which is linked to lower screw speed and feeding rate), are required to ensure complete drug amorphization. However, excessively high shear stress, shear rate, and residence times pose the risk of material degradation.

The molten mass can be conveyed to the dies of a variety of shapes and sizes depending on the desired product properties. For example, the production of films and patches use flat dies, whereas pelletization and spherization use circular dies. Injection molding can also be utilized to fill the molten drug-polymer mass into molds. Tablets, granules, capsules, or ear inserts can be produced in these molds. After cooling at room temperature, the resulting product is collected and can be further milled to obtain the required particle sizes. Apart from these important variables, other parameters such as temperature, die geometry, barrel design, and screw speed can also impact the final product properties. Recent work has shown that the degassing process can remove volatile substances and subsequent air bubbles, which facilitates consistent production of extrudates with improved cross-sectional uniformity.

HME is continuous, single-step, solvent-free, and capable of scaling up. The HME method can be equipped with on-line and in-line quality-control analysis such as near-infrared, Raman, and dielectric spectroscopies, which facilitate quality by design and continuous manufacturing. Some drawbacks include the higher energy usage and exclusion of thermolabile compounds. Changes in the design of the equipment (e.g., presence of kneading elements), as well as the addition of plasticizers, can lead to a reduction in processing temperatures and/or residence time, and thus minimize the potential of thermal degradation of drugs during the processing.

2.2.2. KinetiSol®

KinetiSol® is a modern fusion-based method that uses high shear force combined with heat to melt the drug-polymer blend and generate an ASD. A rapid temperature rise is generated by the combined mechanical forces involved in the process. This creates a molten mass that is immediately quenched and processed further. The schematic representation of KinetiSol® technology is shown in Fig. 9. A series of paddles rotating in a cylindrical vessel and shaft with high-speed mixing blades produce a large amount of frictional and shear energy. This mechanical force results in the generation of heat, and the material temperature increases without applying external heating. Computer software controls the real-time temperature of the composition inside the KinetiSol® chamber, and the molten mass is quickly ejected from the processing vessel upon reaching the user-defined temperature endpoint. The entire process duration is normally <20 s, and the material is generally exposed to high temperatures for <5 s before the product is discharged and cooled. The method is designed to operate in a batch mode at a
laboratory-scale, whereas it can be run semi-continuously at an industrial-scale with output as high as 1000 kg/h \(^{309,310}\).

Being a short process in which desired temperature is reached within seconds, and material is ejected rapidly when the target temperature is reached, it lowers the exposure of the material to thermal stress, which is beneficial to ASD regarding degradation. Hydrocortisone-HMPC and -PVP matrices were found to be chemically ‘preserved’ during KinetiSol\(^{\circledast}\) processing (160 °C, <30 s); while heating the mixture at higher temperatures of >180 °C reduced drug potency due to decomposition \(^{311}\). Griseofulvin ASDs prepared with this method did not exhibit any sign of crystallinity or increased impurity, even after storage at 40 °C\(^{14}\) and 43% relative humidity (RH) for 6 months\(^{309}\). The utilization of heat generated by the process (with no added external heating) in KinetiSol\(^{\circledast}\) makes it one of the few methods applicable to drugs with high melting points as well as low solubility in organic solvents. This also enables the elimination of plasticizers and reduces the risk of extended heat exposure \(^{312}\). Even viscous polymers (e.g., PVP K30, PVP K90, HPMC K15 M) can be applied in KinetiSol\(^{\circledast}\) processing without the aid of plasticizers.

Another benefit of KinetiSol\(^{\circledast}\) is that it permits high drug loading without high torque and degradation, unlike other thermal processes\(^{306}\). Itraconazole dispersion with Methocel E50LV was prepared using KinetiSol\(^{\circledast}\) at a temperature range below the drug melting point without excessive shear \(^{312}\). \(T_g\) values of itraconazole-Eudragit\(^{\circledast}\) E L100-55 ASDs prepared by KinetiSol\(^{\circledast}\) (at 1:2 ratio) were higher than those prepared using other thermal techniques, suggesting improved stability. This improved stability was attributed to the ability of KinetiSol\(^{\circledast}\) to offer a short processing time of <10 s, a processing temperature lower than the polymer degradation temperature, and the use of low torque (even without plasticizers)\(^{306}\).

Hughey et al.\(^{312}\) conducted a design of experiment matrix to examine the effect of KinetiSol\(^{\circledast}\) process variables on drug stability. Meloxicam-Soluplus\(^{\circledast}\) ASDs were prepared at varying processing temperatures (110–140 °C) and processing speeds (2250–3000 rpm). The results indicated that the residence time was inversely related to process speed; when the processing speed was increased from 2250 to 3000 rpm, the residence time decreased from 22 s to less than 3 s. No definite relationship between the processing speed and drug degradation was observed. Ejection temperature and degradation, however, were found to be correlated. The samples ejected at 110 and 118 °C showed a drug content of >95%, but when the ejection temperature was raised above 125 °C it decreased to <90%, and further decreased to 79% when the ejection temperature was raised to >140 °C.

Similar effects of KinetiSol\(^{\circledast}\) processing conditions have been reported on the stability of ritonavir-PVPVA ASDs \(^{308}\). The processing time was decreased, but the amount of impurity increased with an increase in mechanical energy (processing speed), indicating that exceeding the mechanical energy over a certain limit can result in drug degradation. Of important note was that even though the ejection temperature was maintained at 80–100 °C, which was far below the drug degradation temperature of 160 °C, a high processing speed of 2000 rpm still caused the drug to degrade. The above case studies illustrate the capacity of KinetiSol\(^{\circledast}\) for generating ASDs after adequate process optimization.

### 2.2.3. Three-dimensional (3D) printing

Three-dimensional printing (3DP) is a relatively innovative technology that can transform 3D computer models into physical objects by additive manufacturing \(^{313,314}\). The significance and relevance of 3DP for pharmaceutical applications have been discussed in depth elsewhere\(^{315–322}\). It is a technique to manufacture customized medicines for patients\(^{323}\) by delivering multiple drugs\(^{324–327}\) with varying print settings, allowing for better control over the drug dissolution kinetics\(^{328–331}\). There are several techniques and variations in 3DP, such as material jetting, binder jetting, and material extrusion\(^{332}\). The most widely used technology in the pharmaceutical sector is material extrusion and fused deposition modeling (FDM)\(^{333,334}\). In vivo experiments in animals as well as humans have demonstrated good tolerance of FDM 3D printed formulations\(^{335–337}\).

---

**Figure 9** Schematic of KinetiSol\(^{\circledast}\) technology. Mechanical forces involved in the process result in a rapid temperature increase. This creates a molten mass which is immediately quenched to generate ASDs.
For ASD preparation, 3DP has often been used in conjunction with HME. HME + FDM 3DP involves heating a drug–polymer mix and extruding it with the HME technique, followed by 3DP, and cooling-solidification of the molten mass into the desired form on the build plate. Although many polymers have been studied for HME + FDM 3DP, hydroxypropyl cellulose (HPC) remains the most commonly used one due to its suitable properties of particle size, viscosity, and $T_g$ which allow for ease of extrusion, shape retention, and dimensional accuracy while generating a stable product. Friability of the tablets greatly depends on the particle size of the employed polymer with smaller polymer particles improving the friability, whereas disintegration time and dissolution properties mainly depend on the viscosity of the employed polymers. The polymers with higher viscosity usually lead to slower disintegration and dissolution. One obvious drawback of FDM 3DP is the need for drug dispersions to be prepared by HME, which increases the probability of thermal drug degradation. Another significant downside is the constraint on the use of excipients and drugs because they need to generate filaments with the necessary mechanical and physical characteristics for a successful 3DP. Nowadays many 3DP studies in pharmaceutical applications have focused on the selection and optimization of excipient filaments appropriate for 3DP. The drug loading potential of the process is typically limited since a significant amount of polymer is required to impart adequate rheological properties to the extrudate. Therefore, the possibility of eliminating the HME step in FDM 3DP would be of great value in the pharmaceutical product development. In the plastics industry, direct pellet extrusion, a new 3DP material extrusion process, has recently been introduced as a possible alternative to FDM 3DP. This technology uses a single screw extruder with a printer nozzle to directly print material in the form of pellets/powder. Since this technology does not require the preparation of filaments using HME, it may potentially permit the extrusion of mixtures which, due to the insufficient mechanical properties of the filaments, would not be printed by conventional FDM (e.g., being too brittle or too flexible). Similar technology was employed by Goyanes et al. to prepare cylindrical ‘printlets’ or 3D printed tablets of ASDs. This new, single-step 3DP technique was used to prepare itraconazole ASD printlets directly from powdered materials using four different grades of HPC (HPC-UL, SSI, SL, and L). All the generated printlets exhibited acceptable mechanical and physical characteristics complying to pharmacopeial limits. In addition, no drug degradation was detected in the printlets and they exhibited a sustained drug release profile with drug concentrations exceeding the crystalline drug solubility. This research demonstrated the ability of this technology to resolve one of the major drawbacks of HME FDM 3DP, i.e., the need for filament preparation by HME.

Recently another single-step 3DP process, selective laser sintering (SLS), was used to produce ritonavir–copovidone ASDs. A complete conversion of the crystalline drug to its amorphous form was obtained as a function of laser-assisted selective fusion. In this study, powder flow properties, surface temperature, chamber temperature, laser speed, and hatch spacing were found to be crucial for successful ASD formation. Moreover, ritonavir in the SLS 3D printed tablets exhibited a 20-fold increase in solubility relative to the crystalline drug. These novel, single-step technologies could be advantageous for the preparation of ASDs for preclinical studies where the quantity of drugs is limited or the use of traditional HME is challenging.

2.2.4. Microwave heating

Microwave-induced in situ amorphization is being investigated, wherein the crystalline drug in the final dosage form is amorphized in situ inside the final dosage type using a microwave oven. Several experiments have demonstrated the feasibility of using microwaves to prepare ASDs. Doreth et al. obtained indomethacin–PVP ASDs generated in situ by microwave heating. The indomethacin-PVP ASDs exhibited no microwave-induced drug degradation and the dissolution rate of the microwaved amorphous tablets was 6-fold higher than that of the physical mixture containing crystalline indomethacin-PVP.

The microwave-induced amorphization process consists of three main steps. First, preparing the drug–polymer physical mixture. Second, inducing drug amorphization with continuous or intermittent microwave heating. The last step is cooling, followed by possible pulverizing and sieving. In order to achieve a higher degree of drug amorphization, the formulation should be optimized such that the drugs have high solubility in the polymer, and the polymers can be melted or softened at relatively low temperatures. To date, only a few polymers have been studied for this technology, with a primary focus on PVP K12. Therefore, it is important to identify more potential carriers to be used with the microwave heating method to expand its applicability in pharmaceutical applications.

High input of microwave energy is needed for the amorphization because unlike water, polymers and drug molecules are weak absorbers of microwave. Usually, the following two techniques are applied to generate sufficient heat: i) convective heating, i.e., a microwave absorbing reactor or a sample holder is heated and this heat is then indirectly transferred to the sample; and ii) The addition of microwave absorbing solvent or solvent slurry to the drug-polymer solution mix and followed by solvent evaporation due to heating. For example, Moneghini et al. placed the physical mixture of ibuprofen and PVP-VA in a glass sample holder, and materials were heated due to the convective heating from glass, whereas Abreu-Villela et al. manufactured ASDs by microwaving suspensions prepared by adding defined amounts of water to the drug-polymer physical mixture.

The microwave heating time is typically less than 15 min, which has a relatively short exposure time to heat and thus potentially shields drug degradation. The potential of the microwave heating method is its applicability to introduce drug amorphization in the final dosage form without downstream processing. Of a particular note, such in situ amorphization process by microwave heating can take place in the final dosage form. Doreth et al. demonstrated an in situ amorphization process where a drug can be amorphized within its final dosage form (tablets) through microwave irradiation. The authors also noted that increasing moisture content resulted in a higher fraction of amorphous drug. For the tablets in which the absorbed water evaporated rapidly from the surface after storage, the microwaves could not be absorbed, leaving a shell of the crystalline drug at the surface. In regard to the drug chemical stability, there is potential for drug degradation during microwave processing due to the microwave energy applied. But even before microwaving, the presence of absorbed water, which is a prerequisite for facilitating in situ amorphization by microwave irradiation, can potentially lead to drug hydrolysis and degradation. A potential explanation why Doreth et al. did not detect drug degradation during their in situ amorphization process may be due to the short storage time (RT and 54% RH for two weeks) prior to microwaving at 1000 W for...
90 s. It is possible that long-term storage can have a substantial effect on the drug stability profile, especially considering the large quantity of absorbed water (approx. 10%) present in such systems. Therefore, it is important to perform more systematic studies to evaluate the drug degradation propensity during formation as well as storage of ASDs prepared by microwave heating. There are presently only a few other publications on microwave-induced in situ amorphization in the final dosage form 377–379.

2.2.5. Other melt-based methods

On a laboratory-scale, ASDs can be produced by the melt-quench method, where formulation ingredients are melted, and followed by a natural or forced rapid cooling 380. A water bath 381 or a hot plate 382 can be used to melt the formulation components while the molten mass can then be solidified either by allowing it to cool naturally to room temperature 380 or by immersing in an ice bath 380–388 or liquid nitrogen 380. However, during early drug discovery and development of ASD formulations there is a limited amount of drug to work with. Therefore, a high throughput method that can prepare ASDs in small batches is particularly useful and efficient. Guo et al. 390 proposed a novel acoustic fusion method, which can provide a fast process with only a small amount of drugs. In this method, a Labram resonant acoustic mixer was used for acoustic fusion. The heating metal plate attached to the mixer was preheated to 80–160 °C and 10 mg of solid load (2 mg drug and 8 mg polymer) was filled into each glass vial of the 24-vial plate. The vials were then sealed and placed in the acoustic fusion heating block. The powder was mixed at an intensity of 50–80 G. The heating/mixing time varied between 15 and 60 min depending on the formulation. The samples were then removed and cooled to room temperature, which resulted in a dense glassy solid. The batch size limit for this process can vary from 10 mg to 2000 mg depending on the powder density. Torcetrapib, iraconazole and lopinavir of ASDs were prepared using a variety of polymer systems, including HPMCAS (L, M, and H), copovidone, Soluplus®, Vitamin-E TPGS, Kolliphor EL, and Eudragit®. These ASDs demonstrated significantly higher drug solubility compared to the crystalline form. Thus, this approach can be used to prepare and optimize ASDs during early screening.

Another potential method for early-stage pre-clinical investigations of ASDs is ultrasonic-assisted or ultrasound compaction (USC). USC is a modified tabletting process that provides heat, pressure, and shear to melt the powders during compaction with ultrasonic energy. The USC method is a relatively new fusion-based technique in pharmaceutical research 390–398. Fini et al. 395 pioneered the use of USC for drug amorphization. In this earlier study, the effectiveness of USC in preparing indomethacin and β-cyclodextrin SDs was examined 395. Indomethacin melted during processing and eventually was dispersed in β-cyclodextrin. Due to the presence of amorphous indomethacin, the USC formulations displayed enhanced dissolution properties over the physical mixture or kneaded compositions. Sancin et al. 393 also prepared a ketoprofen–Eudragit® S100 ASD system using USC. The findings showed that the dispersed ketoprofen crystallized at a much lower rate (>6 months) than the pure ketoprofen produced using USC (<1 day). Similarly, Fini et al. 393 prepared PVP-based indomethacin systems using USC. The use of a PVP matrix allowed a faster dissolution rate than the formulations prepared with β-cyclodextrin. Fini et al. 392 also investigated PEG-based compositions of indomethacin prepared by USC. It was hypothesized that, due to the low melting point of the material, the USC process would soften or melt each material, enabling a solid dispersion to be formed inside the die cavity. However, despite the observed increased dissolution rate, the formulations prepared by USC were not able to reach the dissolution rate of the ASD control samples prepared by the melt-quench method, suggesting, incomplete amorphization 392. This is perhaps the reason for the observed increase in indomethacin dissolution rate with an increase in the input of ultrasonic energy, suggesting that higher energy input leads to a higher extent of amorphization 392.

When monitoring the USC process, Ueda et al. 391 noted changes in both the punch position and the die pressure with respect to the phase transition process of the polymer. Their study inferred that a sudden increase in the pressure on the lower punch can detect the optimum ultrasound energy for complete transformation. This is why the polymer as well as system $T_g$ are important considerations during the USC process.

The primary advantages of using this method are the low quantities of material required and elimination of downstream processing. However, a crucial limitation of this method is the incomplete amorphization of the drug due to the lack of distributive mixing with ultrasonic energy. The product may show some inhomogeneity, and phase separation or presence of a small amount of crystalline phase which can be detrimental to the stability of an ASD system, as discussed in the earlier sections. For wider applicability of this method, more in-depth studies are required to understand the requisite physicochemical properties of the drug and the polymer, stability of the materials during and after processing, as well the method reproducibility 399.

2.3. Others miscellaneous techniques

2.3.1. Granulation

Preparation of ASDs by the granulation approach enables the direct generation of ASD granules with a reduced number of manufacturing unit operations and minimized cost for investing in new equipment 400,401. Depending on the nature of the binder fluid, granulation can be categorized into solvent evaporation or melting process categories. Several granulation techniques can be utilized to produce ASDs including fluidized bed granulation, tumbling granulation, and mixing granulation 390,402–407. Fig. 10 shows the commonly used high-speed granulator and the associated manufacturing variables affecting ASD properties.

The principle of granulation for ASD preparation by solvent evaporation is the same as discussed in the fluidized bed technique section earlier (fluidized bed granulators). In this case, the binder usually consists of a drug dissolved in appropriate solvent(s) which is then added to the remaining excipients of the formulation. There are several examples in the literature which have utilized solvent evaporation-based granulation for the successful preparation of ASDs 405,406,408. In addition, if it is critical to avoid drug exposure to the organic and/or aqueous solvents, the process of melt agglomeration can be employed wherein a molten mass of the drug and the polymer serves as a binder for forming granules 405,410. This further reduces the drying steps associated with the solvent-based wet granulation process. Melt agglomeration also employs standard granulation equipment such as high shear granulators 411,412 and fluidized bed granulators 413,414. The melted drug-polymer mass serves as a binding liquid for granulation, ensuring sufficient homogeneity. Polymers for melt agglomeration can be liquids such as PEG 300 and caprylocaproyl macrogol-8 glycerides (Labrasol®) or semi-solids like stearyl polyoxyl-32 glycerides (Gelucire® 50/13) 411,414. Solid polymers
Continuous spray. A typical set-up for CSG is a kind of a one-step method generating granules from solution or suspension. In the CSG method, the solution or suspension containing the drug and polymer (and possibly other excipients) is spray-dried and layered by plasticized by the anti-solvent environment. After the controlled co-precipitation, as shown in Fig. 11, begins with the dissolution of the drug and an ionic polymer in the nonvolatile solvents that are usually dimethylacetamide, dimethylformamide, or dimethylsulfoxide. The solution is then transferred gradually into a pH-controlled and chilled anti-solvent (usually water). It is crucial that both the drug and the polymer are insoluble in anti-solvent and that the common solvent is miscible with the anti-solvent to cause rapid precipitation process, as shown in Fig. 11, begins with the dissolution of the drug and an ionic polymer in the nonvolatile solvents that are usually dimethylacetamide, dimethylformamide, or dimethylsulfoxide. The solution is then transferred gradually into a pH-controlled and chilled anti-solvent (usually water). It is crucial that both the drug and the polymer are insoluble in anti-solvent and that the common solvent is miscible with the anti-solvent to cause rapid co-precipitation. An additional condition for the anti-solvent environment is that in the precipitated suspension state, the drug-polymer ASD remains in an amorphous state, i.e., the $T_g$ of the amorphous composite is above the precipitation temperature as plasticized by the anti-solvent environment. After the controlled co-precipitation process, the precipitated wet solid mass can still contain a relatively significant amount of the organic solvent, which with low melting temperature/$T_g$, such as PEG (3000 and 6000 grades) and poloxamer 188 can also be used. However, similar to other melting processes, the use of high temperatures limits its application to thermally sensitive drugs. The limited choice in carriers is another drawback of this method because high $T_g$ polymers are not suitable.

A modified method of granulation is thermal adhesion granulation (TAG). This process can be loosely considered as a combination of solvent- and melt-based processes. In TAG, little to no solvent is added to the drug and excipient mixture relative to the traditional wet granulation methods. The mixture is heated ($30–130 \, ^\circ\text{C}$) to promote the formation of the adhesive binder, and then mixed by tumble rotation until granules are formed. Drying is not needed in most instances because little to no solvent is added in the process. Following cooling, granules of the specific particle size can be collected by sieving. The method imparts good flow properties and binding ability to granules to form tablets with low friability and sufficient hardness. Lin et al. converted hydrophilic polymers such as PVP and HPMC into the matrix materials while processing them with other diluents using TAG. Chen et al. developed cilostazol ASDs by TAG using two adsorbents dibasic calcium phosphate anhydrous (Fujicalin®) and micro-crystalline cellulose (Microcell®) for granule formation. However, a major drawback of TAG is that it is challenging to formulate tablets of high-dose drugs since it necessitates the use of a larger amount of other excipients for inert core. To overcome this challenge, Theismann et al. developed an alternative process of spray granulation capable of preparing high drug-loading (80%, w/w) nicotinamide (NAM) granules by wet extrusion and spheronization. However, it would be a challenge to employ this method for stable ASD preparation due to the higher extent of water/solvent exposure. Continuous-spray granulation (CSG) may overcome the above limitations in solvent exposure. This is a one-step method generating granules from solution or suspension. In the CSG method, the solution or suspension containing the drug and polymer (and possibly other excipients) is spray-dried generating small particles. These are then further layered by continuous spray. A typical set-up for CSG is a kind of a combination of spray dryer and fluid bed granulator. It consists of a two-fluid spray nozzle which is placed vertically at the bottom of the drying chamber. Additional air nozzles are present on the inside wall of the drying chamber which remove adhered powder off and maintain a continuous flowable state of the particles during drying/layering. Recently, Tanaka et al. prepared ASD granules of rebamipide and PVPVA using a continuous-spray granulator. Dense and smooth granules with satisfactory physical stability (20 °C/75% RH for up to 6 months) and improved dissolution properties relative to the pure crystalline drug were obtained with the optimized polymer concentration.

### 2.3.2. Co-precipitation

Antisolvent co-precipitation is another widely employed approach to produce ASDs at both small-scale and industrial-scale. Compared to the spray-dried ASDs, the ASDs produced by the solvent exchange process have a larger particle size and often do not need further densification. These result in a superior compaction profile, limiting the need for added excipients such as compaction aids. In addition, it is possible to maximize drug loading as high as 70% for certain compounds.

Co-precipitation amorphize drugs by the rapid precipitation of the ASD in the anti-solvent. The low processing temperatures circumvent the stability issues for the thermal-labile drugs. The co-precipitation process, as shown in Fig. 11, begins with the dissolution of the drug and an ionic polymer in the nonvolatile solvents that are usually dimethylacetamide, dimethylformamide, or dimethylsulfoxide. The solution is then transferred gradually into a pH-controlled and chilled anti-solvent (usually water). It is crucial that both the drug and the polymer are insoluble in anti-solvent and that the common solvent is miscible with the anti-solvent to cause rapid co-precipitation. An additional condition for the anti-solvent environment is that in the precipitated suspension state, the drug-polymer ASD remains in an amorphous state, i.e., the $T_g$ of the amorphous composite is above the precipitation temperature as plasticized by the anti-solvent environment. After the controlled co-precipitation process, the precipitated wet solid mass can still contain a relatively significant amount of the organic solvent, which is plasticized by the anti-solvent environment. After the controlled co-precipitation process, the precipitated wet solid mass can still contain a relatively significant amount of the organic solvent, which...
A major limitation of the co-precipitation method is that due to pH-dependent solubility and stability, some pH sensitive compounds may not have sufficient time for adequate precipitation in the anti-solvent. Furthermore, heat and moisture may cause stability concerns during the washing and drying processes.

2.3.3. Milling-based methods

On a laboratory-scale, milling/cryogrinding has been employed for preparing ASDs of certain compounds. The reduction in particle size has long been known to decrease crystallinity and achieve amorphization. A partially amorphous anti-inflammatory product has been manufactured using SoluMatrix®, a technique that entails dry milling the crystalline drug with a hydrophilic carrier. However, the method is not widely popular in the pharmaceutical industry as there is often a risk of residual crystallinity, which can act as a seed and induce nucleation/crystallization during the shelf life, even with some stabilizers (e.g., magnesium aluminometasilicate, crospovidone, sugar). Other process variables that need to be monitored and optimized to obtain an optimal product. In many cases, downstream processing is necessary to obtain such desired properties.

During the downstream processing of ASDs, there is often a risk of drug crystallization, especially during operations that expose the ASDs to moisture, thermal or mechanical stress. Therefore, ideal ASDs require minimal downstream unit operations. However, in reality, certain downstream processes might be inevitable. Depending on the manufacturing method, the ASDs obtained can be in the form of a fine powder, granule, extrudate, or fiber. Processes like spray drying, electrospaying, super-critical fluid technology, cryogrinding, and milling usually generate fine ASD powders that require further densification (or granulation) to enhance their density and flow properties for efficiently manufacturing their final dosage forms.

3. Downstream processing

It is clear from the discussion so far that variations in manufacturing techniques have a substantial impact on ASD properties such as particle size, particle porosity, and density, flowability, tabletability, and stability. However, it is important to note that these properties are not only linked with the manufacturing process but also to the formulation composition. Obviously, even slight changes in the process parameters and formulation can alter these physicochemical properties. During the development of a specific ASD product, the process parameters need to be carefully evaluated and optimized to obtain an optimal product. In many cases, downstream processing is necessary to obtain such desired properties.

In order to generate ASD, many variations of solvent-mediated precipitation have been explored, e.g., evaporative aqueous solution precipitation (EPAS), flash nanoprecipitation, and controlled precipitation. In EPAS, the drug–polymer solution is atomized into a heated aqueous solution, where the heated anti-solvent evaporates the solvent (generally dichloromethane). However, this method is limited to low boiling solvents such as dichloromethane that can be readily evaporated due to the use of heated aqueous fluid as an anti-solvent. Also, since this process occurs at elevated temperatures, it may not be ideal for ASD stability, particularly for the thermal-labile compounds. A modification to the EPAS process is controlled precipitation, which involves in-line extraction of solvents by vacuum distillation. The controlled precipitation method also utilizes solvents with low boiling points such as methanol. Mann et al. used a slightly altered co-precipitation system in which nonionic polymers were used and the precipitation was induced by organic anti-solvents as opposed to pH modified aqueous anti-solvents. The integration of surfactants into these ASDs was also possible due to the use of aqueous solvents. Moreover, using solvents and anti-solvents with relatively lower boiling points makes the downstream isolation and drying of the precipitates easier.

Figure 11  Schematic of co-precipitation process to prepare ASDs.
disintegrants, flow aids, compression aids, lubricants, etc. for efficient encapsulation or tableting. HME granules, however, usually have limited compaction properties due to the reduced porosity of the extrudates and the ductile properties of the polymers used. Recently, two types of post-die melt extrudate processing milling techniques were evaluated for itraconazole-HPMC ASDs, viz. hammer mill and air classifier mill. The product was prepared by using the hammer mill melted at higher mill loadings. In contrast, this problem did not emerge when an air classifier mill was used. The addition of an elastic substance (e.g., carrageenan or polyglycolic glyceride) has been shown to prevent an amorphous drug from crystallization during compression and storage, possibly due to the cushioning effect of elastic materials. However, the addition of elastic substances during compression can generate other undesirable effects on product properties and performance such as physicochemical stability, dissolution, 
T_g, hygroscopicity, or appearance.

Large surface area can contribute to the lower stability of amorphous drug because 
T_g of ASD is typically lower on the surface than in the bulk particle region. Increased crystallization rates are often noticed on the particle surface because of greater molecular mobility. Coating celecoxib-PVP ASDs prepared by the fluidized bed (Wurster) process with coating excipients (PVA, inulin, and polyvinyl acetate were tested) formed a barrier layer. This led to lower molecular mobility at the surface and increased protection against moisture. Fig. 13 shows a schematic of possible downstream processes to prepare a solid dosage form of an ASD (tablet/capsule).

4. Selection criteria of an ASD manufacturing method

Besides the drug thermal stability and solubility, other important considerations for selecting a manufacturing method are batch size (scale), and equipment availability. If the drug can melt without degradation, melting methods can be considered. Amongst melting methods, if the purpose of preparation is screening, even DSC pans can be used for ASD preparation by melt-quenching. For a larger laboratory-scale batch, melt-quenching by using a hot-plate/oil bath can be considered. However, a molten mass with a viscosity of >300 cP may make ASD processing with these methods challenging. In such cases, HME or solvent evaporation techniques can be considered.
The key factors to consider when choosing a solvent evaporation-based manufacturing method are the properties of the organic solvents used to solubilize the drug and polymer(s). For a screening study, if the boiling point of the solvent/s is < 50 °C, the solvent cast method can be used. For solvent/s boiling at higher temperatures or for a larger batch, rotavapor or spray drying can be the choice. For intermediate or industrial-scale production, the choice of processes for ASD preparation is limited. This is because, at a larger scale, additional criteria such as the process efficiency, process yield, particle properties, and if applicable, solvent toxicity, environmental impact, the safety of the operator, and flammability/explosion risk need to be considered. Based on formulation properties, a straightforward method selection decision tree for preparing ASDs is shown in Fig. 14.

5. Conclusions

A successful development of amorphous solid dispersion formulations depends on three primary factors: active pharmaceutical ingredient properties, stabilizing polymer, and processing technology. Polymers provide the basic and essential foundation for a stable drug amorphization and the process supplies the energy required to transform the system to an amorphous form. The effectiveness of the process is critical to generate, capture, and preserve the amorphous form. The success of these processes is dependent on the processing time and the supersaturation conditions that are being generated during the formation of the solid dispersion.

Despite the discovery of solid dispersions in the early 1960s, the application of the solid dispersion concept to solve solubility challenges had been limited for several decades, partly due to the lack of commercially viable processing technologies. However, the past two decades have seen remarkable progress in developing pharmaceutical ASD products as our understanding of ASD systems and their manufacturing technologies have evolved considerably, leading to several commercial products in addition to numerous in development. Spray drying and HME have become the mainstay of ASD preparation in the pharmaceutical industry, while newer methods are constantly being added into the toolbox that promise to improve the quality, productivity, and/or better performance of the products.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported, in whole or in part, by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation [No.OPP159809, USA], Qi (Tony) Zhou and Sonal Bhujbal are also supported by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases of the National Institutes of Health under Award (No. R01AI132681, USA). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institute of Health. The authors would like to thank Bristol Myers Squibb and Oral Product Development for supporting this work as a part of Sonal Bhujbal’s summer internship. The Bristol Myers Squibb authors acknowledge that one or more patent applications, related to the work disclosed in this paper, may be planned, pending, and/or has been granted.

Author contributions

Sonal V. Bhujbal, Qi (Tony) Zhou, Sumit Kumar, Biplob Mitra, and Uday Jain were responsible for the conception and design of the review. Sonal Bhujbal wrote the manuscript. Tony (Qi) Zhou, Sumit Kumar, Biplob Mitra, Uday Jain, Yuchuan Gong, Lynne S. Taylor, Anjali Agrawal, and Shyam Karki supervised and revised the manuscript. All of the authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

Conflicts of interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

References

1. Babu NJ, Nangia A. Solubility advantage of amorphous drugs and pharmaceutical cocrystals. Cryst Growth Des 2011;11:2662–79.
2. Benet LZ, Broccatelli F, Oprea TI. BDDCS applied to over 900 drugs. AAPS J 2011;13:519–47.
3. Ku MS. Use of the biopharmaceutical classification system in early drug development. AAPS J 2008;10:208–12.
4. Jatwani S, Rana AC, Singh G, Aggarwal G. An overview on solubility enhancement techniques for poorly soluble drugs and solid dispersion as an eminent strategic approach. Int J Pharma Sci Res 2012;3:942.
5. Di L, Fish PV, Mano T. Bridging solubility between drug discovery and development. Drug Discov Today 2012;17:886–95.
6. Brough C, Williams R. Amorphous solid dispersions and nano-crystal technologies for poorly water-soluble drug delivery. Int J Pharm 2013;453:157–66.
7. Vasconcelos T, Sarmento B, Costa P. Solid dispersions as strategy to improve oral bioavailability of poor water-soluble drugs. Drug Discov Today 2007;12:1068–75.
8. Leunier C, Dressman J. Improving drug solubility for oral delivery using solid dispersions. Eur J Pharm Biopharm 2000;50:47–60.
9. Serajuddin AT, Thakur AR, Ghoshal RN, Fakes MG, Ranadive SA, Morris KR, et al. Selection of solid dosage form composition through drug—excipient compatibility testing. J Pharm Sci 1999;88:696–704.
10. Shah N, Sandhu H, Choi DS, Chokshi H, Malick AW. In: Rathbone MJ, editor. Amorphous solid dispersions. New York City, NY: Springer; 2014.
11. Van den Mooter G. The use of amorphous solid dispersions: a formulation strategy to overcome poor solubility and dissolution rate. Drug Discov Today Technol 2012;9:e79–85.
12. Chioi WL, Riegelman S. Pharmaceutical applications of solid dispersion systems. J Pharm Sci 1971;60:1281–302.
13. Hancock BC, Zografi G. Characteristics and significance of the amorphous state in pharmaceutical systems. J Pharm Sci 1997;86:1–12.
14. Newman A, Hastedt JE, Yazdian N. New directions in pharmaceutical amorphous materials and amorphous solid dispersions, a tribute to professor george zografi. In: Proceedings of the land O’lakes conference at the university of Wisconsin-Madison in June 2016. Springer; 2017.
15. Vaka SRK, Bommana MM, Desai D, Djordjevic J, Phuapradit W, Shah N. Excipients for amorphous solid dispersions. In: Shah N, Sandhu H, Choi DS, Chokshi H, Malick AW, editors. Amorphous solid dispersions. New York City: Springer; 2014. p. 123–61.
16. Miller JM, Beig A, Carr RA, Spence JK, Dahan A. A win—win solution in oral delivery of lipophilic drugs: supersaturation via amorphous solid dispersions increases apparent solubility without sacrifice of intestinal membrane permeability. Mol Pharm 2012;9(2009–16).
17. Newman A, Knipp G, Zografi G. Assessing the performance of amorphous solid dispersions. J Pharm Sci 2012;101:1355–77.
18. Shah N, Iyer RM, Mair HJ, Choi DS, Tian H, Diodone R, et al. Improved human bioavailability of vemurafenib, a practically insoluble drug, using an amorphous polymer-stabilized solid dispersion prepared by a solvent-controlled coprecipitation process. J Pharm Sci 2013;102:967–81.
19. Tekade AR, Yadav JN. A review on solid dispersion and carriers used therein for solubility enhancement of poorly water soluble drugs. Adv Pharm Bull 2020;10:359–69.
20. Kim KT, Lee JY, Lee MY, Song CK, Choi J, Kim D-D. Solid dispersions as a drug delivery system. Int J Pharm Investig 2011;41:125–42.
21. Bindhani S, Mohapatra S. Recent approaches of solid dispersion: a new concept towards oral bioavailability. Asian J Pharm Clin Res 2018;11:72–8.
22. Vo CL-N, Park C, Lee B-J. Current trends and future perspectives of solid dispersions containing poorly water-soluble drugs. Eur J Pharm Biopharm 2013;85:799–813.
23. Baghel S, Cachart H, O’Reilly NJ. Polymeric amorphous solid dispersions: a review of amorphization, crystallization, stabilization, solid-state characterization, and aqueous solubilization of biopharmaceutical classification system class II drugs. J Pharm Sci 2016; 105:2527–44.
24. Schitiny A, Huyycler J, Puchkov M. Mechanisms of increased bioavailability through amorphous solid dispersions: a review. Drug Deliv 2020;27:110–27.
25. Annachalam A, Karchikeyan M, Konam K, Prasad PH, Sethuraman S, Ashutoshkumar S. Solid dispersions: a review. J Curr Pharm Res 2010;4:182.
26. Ma X, Williams III RO. Characterization of amorphous solid dispersions: an update. J Drug Deliv Sci Technol 2019;50:113–24.
27. Pandi P, Bulusu R, Kommineni N, Khan W, Singh M. Amorphous solid dispersions: an update for preparation, characterization, mechanism on bioavailability, stability, regulatory considerations and marketed products. Int J Pharm 2020;586:119560.
28. Jermain SV, Brough C, Williams III RO. Amorphous solid dispersions and nanocrystal technologies for poorly water-soluble drug delivery—An update. Int J Pharm 2018;535:379–92.
29. Singh G, Kaur L, Gupta G, Sharma S. Enhancement of the solubility of poorly water soluble drugs through solid dispersion: a comprehensive review. Indian J Pharm Sci 2017;79:674–87.
30. Vasconcelos T, Marques S, das Neves J, Sarmento B. Amorphous solid dispersions: rational selection of a manufacturing process. Adv Drug Deliv Rev 2016;100:85–101.
31. Rumondor AC, Jackson MJ, Taylor LS. Design. Effects of moisture on the growth rate of felodipine crystals in the presence and absence of polymers. Cryst Growth 2009;10:747–53.
32. Rumondor AC, Stanford LA, Taylor LS. Effects of polymer type and storage relative humidity on the kinetics of felodipine crystallization from amorphous solid dispersions. Pharm Res 2009;26:2599.
33. Janssens S, De Zeure A, Paudel A, Van Humbeeck J, Rombaut P, Van den Mooter G. Influence of preparation methods on solid state supersaturation of amorphous solid dispersions: a case study with itraconazole and eudragit e100. Pharm Res 2010;27:775–85.
34. Mulin JW. Crystalization. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier; 2001.
35. Shamblin SL, Zografi G. The effects of absorbed water on the properties of amorphous mixtures containing sucrose. Pharm Res 1999;16:1119–24.
36. Taylor LS, Zografi G. Spectroscopic characterization of interactions between PVP and indomethacin in amorphous molecular dispersions. Pharm Res 1997;14:1691–8.
37. Khougaz K, Clas SD. Crystalization inhibition in solid solution of MK-0591 and poly (vinylpyrrolidone) polymers. J Pharm Sci 2000;89:1325–34.
38. Marsac PJ, Shamblin SL, Taylor LS. Theoretical and practical approaches for prediction of drug—polymer miscibility and solubility. Pharm Res 2006;23:2417.
39. Aso Y, Yoshioka S. Molecular mobility of nifedipine—PVP and phenobarbital—PVP solid dispersions as measured by 13C-NMR spin-lattice relaxation time. J Pharm Sci 2006;95:318–25.
40. Hancock BC, Zografi G. The relationship between the glass transition temperature and the water content of amorphous pharmaceutical solids. Pharm Res 1994;11:471–7.
41. Van den Mooter G, Wuys M, Blaton N, Busson R, Grobet P, Augustijns P, et al. Physical stabilisation of amorphous ketoconazole in solid dispersions with polyvinylpyrrolidone K25. Eur J Pharm Sci 2001;12:261–9.
42. Yoshioka M, Hancock BC, Zografi G. Crystallization of indomethacin from the amorphous state below and above its glass transition temperature. J Pharm Sci 1994;83:1700–5.
43. Konno H, Handa T, Alonzo DE, Taylor LS. Effect of polymer type on the dissolution profile of amorphous solid dispersions containing felodipine. Eur J Pharm Biopharm 2008;70:493–9.
44. Simonelli A, Mehta S, Higuchi W. Dissolution rates of high energy polyvinylpyrrolidone (PVP)-sulfathiazole coprecipitates. J Pharm Sci 1969;58:538–49.
45. Ayenew Z, Paudel A, Van den Mooter G. Can compression induce demixing in amorphous solid dispersions? A case study of naproxen—PVP K25. Eur J Pharm Biopharm 2012;81:207–13.
46. Janssens S, Van den Mooter G. Physical chemistry of solid dispersions. J Pharm Pharmocol 2009;61:1571–86.
47. Janssens S, De Armas HN, Roberts CJ, Van den Mooter G. Characterization of ternary solid dispersions of itraconazole, PEG 6000, and HPMC 2910 ES. J Pharm Sci 2008;97:2110–20.
48. Gangurde AB, Kundaikar HS, Javeer SD, Jaiviar DR, Degani MS, Amin PD. Enhanced solubility and dissolution of curcumin by a
hydrophilic polymer solid dispersion and its insidio molecular modeling studies. J Drug Deliv Sci Technol 2015;29:226–37.

49. Chen J, Ormes JD, Higgins JD, Taylor LS. Impact of surfactants on the crystallization of aqueous suspensions of celecoxib amorphous solid dispersion spray dried particles. Mol Pharm 2015;12:533–41.

50. Marasini N, Tran TH, Poudel BK, Cho HJ, Choi YK, Chi S-C, et al. Fabrication and evaluation of pH-modulated solid dispersion for telmisartan by spray-drying technique. Int J Pharm 2013;441:424–32.

51. Paidi SK, Jena SK, Ahuja BK, Devasari N, Suresh S. Preparation, in-vitro and in-vivo evaluation of spray-dried ternary solid dispersion of biopharmaceutics classification system class II model drug. J Pharm Pharmacol 2015;67:166–20.

52. Morott JT, Pimpampade M, Park J-B, Worley CP, Majumdar S, Lian Z, et al. The effects of screw configuration and polymeric carriers on hot-melt extruded taste-masked formulations incorporated into orally disintegrating tablets. J Pharm Sci 2015;104:124–34.

53. Homayouni A, Sadeghi F, Nokhodchi A, Varshosaz J, Garekan H. Preparation and characterization of celecoxib dispersions in Soluplus®: comparison of spray drying and conventional methods. Iranian J Pharm Res 2015;14:35.

54. Harmon P, Galipeau K, Xu W, Brown C, Wuefling WP. Mechanism of dissolution-induced nanoparticle formation from a copovidone-based amorphous solid dispersion. Mol Pharm 2016;13:1467–81.

55. Ilevbare GA, Taylor LS. Liquid–liquid phase separation in highly supersaturated aqueous solutions of poorly water-soluble drugs: implications for solubility enhancing formulations. Cryst Growth Des 2013;13:1497–509.

56. Frank KJ, Westedt U, Rosenblatt KM, Höplig P, Rosenberg J, Mågerlein M, et al. What is the mechanism behind increased permeation rate of a poorly soluble drug from aqueous dispersions of an amorphous solid dispersion? J Pharm Sci 2014;103:1779–86.

57. Canselier J, Lin C, Gabas N, Tanori J, Pezon I, Claudes D. Surfactant effects in crystallization: nucleation and crystal habit of y-amino butyric acid. In: Ottewill RH, Rennie AR, editors. Trends in colloid and interface science VIII. New York City, US: Springer; 1994. p. 174–8.

58. Rodríguez-Hornedo N, Murphy D. Surfactant-facilitated crystallization of dihydride carbamazepine during dissolution of anhydrous polymer. J Pharm Sci 2004;93:449–60.

59. Dhumal RS, Shimpri SL, Paradkar AR. Development of spray-dried co-precipitate of amorphous celecoxib containing storage and compression stabilizers. Acta Pharm 2007;57:287–300.

60. Suzuki H, Sunada H. Some factors influencing the dissolution of solid dispersions with nicotinamide and hydroxypropylmethylycellulose as combined carriers. Chem Pharm Bull 1998;46:1015–20.

61. Alonzo DE, Gao Y, Zhou D, Mo H, Zhang GG, Taylor LS. Dissolution and precipitation behavior of amorphous solid dispersions. J Pharm Sci 2011;100:3316–31.

62. Luebbert C, Sadowski G. Moisture-induced phase separation and recrystallization in amorphous solid dispersions. Int J Pharm 2017;532:635–46.

63. Lin X, Hu Y, Liu L, Su L, Li N, Yu J, et al. Physical stability of amorphous solid dispersions: a physicochemical perspective with thermodynamic, kinetic and environmental aspects. Pharm Res 2018;35:125.

64. Xie T, Taylor LS. Effect of temperature and moisture on the physical stability of binary and ternary amorphous solid dispersions of celecoxib. J Pharm Sci 2017;106:100–10.

65. Lehmkemper K, Kyerematen SO, Heinzelering O, Degenhardt M, Sadowski G. Impact of polymer type and relative humidity on the long-term physical stability of amorphous solid dispersions. Mol Pharm 2017;14:4374–86.

66. Marsac PJ, Konno H, Rumondor AC, Taylor LS. Recrystallization of nifedipine and felodipine from amorphous molecular level solid dispersions containing poly (vinylpyrrolidone) and sorbed water. Pharm Res 2008;25:647–56.

67. Yang Z, Nollenberger K, Albers J, Qi S. Molecular implications of drug–polymer solubility in understanding the destabilization of solid dispersions by milling. Mol Pharm 2014;11:2453–65.

68. Német Z, Sztatisa J, Demeter Á. Polymorph transitions of bicalutamide: a remarkable example of mechanical activation. J Pharm Sci 2008;97:3222–32.

69. Zhang Z, Dong L, Guo J, Li L, Tian B, Zhao Q, et al. Prediction of the physical stability of amorphous solid dispersions: relationship of aging and phase separation with the thermodynamic and kinetic models along with characterization techniques. Expet Opin Drug Deliv 2021;18:249–64.

70. LaFountaine JS, McGinity JW, Williams RO. Challenges and strategies in thermal processing of amorphous solid dispersions: a review. AAPS PharmSciTech 2016;17:43–55.

71. He Y, Ho C. Amorphous solid dispersions: utilization and challenges in drug discovery and development. J Pharm Sci 2015;104:3237–58.

72. Qian F, Huang J, Hussain MA. Drug–polymer solubility and miscibility: stability consideration and practical challenges in amorphous solid dispersion development. J Pharm Sci 2010;99:2941–7.

73. Rahman Z, Siddiqui A, Gupta A, Khan M. Regulatory considerations in development of amorphous solid dispersions. In: Shah N, Sandhu H, Choi DS, Chokshi H, Malick AW, editors. Amorphous solid dispersions. New York City, US: Springer; 2014. p. 545–63.

74. Li J, Zhao J, Tao L, Wang J, Waksin V, Pan D, et al. The effect of polymeric excipients on the physical properties and performance of amorphous dispersions: part I, free volume and glass transition. Pharm Res 2015;32:500–15.

75. Nunes TG, Vicipcia MT, Correia NIT, Danede F, Nunes RG, Diogo HP. A stable amorphous statin: solid-state NMR and dielectric studies on dynamic heterogeneity of simvastatin. Mol Pharm 2014;11:727–37.

76. Graser KA, Patterson JE, Zeiter JA, Gordon KC, Rades T. Correlating thermodynamic and kinetic parameters with amorphous stability. Eur J Pharm Sci 2009;37:492–8.

77. Marsac PJ, Konno H, Taylor LS. A comparison of the physical stability of amorphous felodipine and nifedipine systems. Pharm Res 2006;23:2306–16.

78. Guo Z, Lu M, Li Y, Pang H, Lin L, Liu X, et al. The utilization of drug–polymer interactions for improving the chemical stability of hot-melt extruded solid dispersions. J Pharm Pharmacol 2014;66:285–96.

79. Sarode AL, Sandhu H, Shah N, Malick W, Zia H. Hot melt extrusion for amorphous solid dispersions: temperature and moisture activated drug–polymer interactions for enhanced stability. Mol Pharm 2013;10:3665–75.

80. Sogi PL, Ezhkova K, Pataki H, Eke Z, Farkas A, Verrecek G, et al. Comparison of spray drying, electroblowing and electrospinning for preparation of Eudragit E and itraconazole solid dispersions. Int J Pharm 2015;494:23–30.

81. Passerini N, Calogér G, Albertini B, Mott L. Melanization of pharmaceutical powders: a comparison of high-shear mixer and fluidised bed processes. Int J Pharm 2010;391:177–86.

82. Potter C, Tian Y, Walker G, McCoy C, Hornsby P, Donnelly C, et al. Novel supercritical carbon dioxide impregnation technique for the production of amorphous solid drug dispersions: a comparison to hot melt extrusion. Mol Pharm 2015;12:1577–90.

83. Won DH, Kim MS, Lee S, Park JS, Hwang SJ. Improved physicochemical characteristics of felodipine solid dispersion particles by supercritical anti-solvent precipitation process. Int J Pharm 2005;301:199–208.

84. Paudel A, Worka ZA, Meeus J, Guns S, Van den Moeter G. Manufacturing of solid dispersions of poorly water soluble drugs by spray drying: formulation and process considerations. Int J Pharm 2013;453:253–84.

85. Li N, Cape JL, Mankani BR, Zemlyanov DY, Shepard KB, Morgen MM, et al. Water-induced phase separation of spray dried amorphous solid dispersions. Mol Pharm 2020;17:4004–17.

86. Bercea M, Eckelt J, Morariu S, Wolf BA. Islands of immiscibility for solutions of compatible polymers in a common solvent: experiment and theory. Macromolecules 2009;42:3620–6.

90. Marsac PJ, Konno H, Rumondor AC, Taylor LS. Recrystallization of nifedipine and felodipine from amorphous molecular level solid dispersions containing poly (vinylpyrrolidone) and sorbed water. Pharm Res 2008;25:647–56.

91. Yang Z, Nollenberger K, Albers J, Qi S. Molecular implications of drug–polymer solubility in understanding the destabilization of solid dispersions by milling. Mol Pharm 2014;11:2453–65.
87. Bereca M, Eckelt J, Wolf BA. Vapor pressures of polymer solutions and the modeling of their composition dependence. *Ind Eng Chem Res* 2009;48:4603–6.

88. Yue H, Nicholson SJ, Young JD, Hsieh D, Ketner RJ, Hall RG, et al. Development of a control strategy for benzene impurity in HPMCAS-stabilized spray-dried dispersion drug products using a science-based and risk-based approach. *Pharm Res* 2015;32:2636–48.

89. Harmonization ICF International Council for Harmonization. Q3C impurities: residual solvents R6: FDA, 2019.

90. Pouton CW. Formulation of poorly water-soluble drugs for oral administration: physicochemical and physiological issues and the lipid formulation classification system. *Eur J Pharm Sci* 2006;29:278–87.

91. Dhireendra K, Lewis S, Uduna N, Atin K. Solid dispersions: a review. *Pak J Pharm Sci* 2009;22.

92. Dobry DE, Settell DM, Baumann JM. Spray drying and scale-up. In: Newman A, editor. *Pharmaceutical amorphous solid dispersions*. Hoboken, US: Wiley; 2010. p. 1–26.

93. Dobry DE, Ketner RJ, Lyon DK, Mullin JM, inventors; Bend Research Inc., assignee. Drying of drug-containing particles. United States patent US No. 8,834,929. 2014 Sep 16.

94. Ray RJ, Newbold BD, Beyerinck RA, Dobry DE, Grove KD, inventors; Bend Research Inc., assignee. Drying of drug-containing particles. United States patent US No. 8,834,929. 2016 Feb 23.

95. Shepard KB, Dhirendra K, Lewis S, Udupa N, Atin K. Solid dispersions: a review. *Adv Drug Deliv Rev* 2016;76:765–89.

96. Miller DA, Gil M. Spray-drying technology. In: Williams III RO, Lefebvre AH, McDonell VG, editors. Formulation of poorly water-soluble drugs. New York City, US: Springer; 2012. p. 363–442.

97. Tonon RV, Brabet C, Hubinger MD. Influence of process conditions on the physicochemical properties of acai (*Euterpe oleracea* Mart.) powder produced by spray drying. *J Food Eng* 2008;88:411–8.

98. Sawicki E, Beijnen JH, Schellens JH, Nuijen B. Pharmaceutical development of an oral tablet formulation containing a spray dried amorphous solid dispersion of docetaxel or paclitaxel. *Int J Pharm* 2015;471:765–73.

99. Nezić I, Sander A, Mesteirović E, Čavužić D. Production of stable amorphous form by means of spray drying. *Part Sci Technol* 2019;37:632–42.

100. Ohyagi N, Ueda K, Higashi K, Yamamoto K, Kawakami K, Moribe K. Synergetic role of hyproellose and methacrylic acid copolymer in the dissolution improvement of amorphous solid dispersions. *J Pharm Sci* 2017;106:1042–50.

101. Kim JS, Kim MS, Park HJ, Jin SJ, Lee S, Hwang SJ. Physicochemical properties and oral bioavailability of amorphous atorvastatin hami-calcium using spray-drying and SAS process. *Int J Pharm* 2008;359:211–9.

102. Singh A, Van den Mooter G. Spray drying formulation of amorphous solid dispersions. *Adv Drug Deliv Rev* 2016;100:27–50.

103. Ogawa N, Hiramatsu T, Suzuki R, Okamoto R, Shibaegaki K, Fujita K, et al. Improvement in the water solubility of drugs with a solid dispersion system by spray drying and hot-melt extrusion with using the amphiphilic polyvinyl caprolactam-polyvinyl acetate-polyethylene glycol graft copolymer and d-mannitol. *Eur J Pharm Sci* 2018;111:205–14.

104. Mujumdar AS. *Handbook of industrial drying*, revised and expanded. Boca Raton, US: CRC Press; 1995.

105. Bayvel LP, Orzechowski Z. *Liquid atomization*. Boca Raton, US: CRC Press; 1993.

106. Lefebvre AH, McDonell VG. *Atomization and sprays*. Boca Raton, US: CRC press; 2017.

107. Beyerinck RA, Deibele HL, Dobry DE, Ray RJ, Settell DM, Spence KR, inventors; Pfizer Inc., assignee. Method for making homogeneous spray-dried solid amorphous drug dispersions utilizing modified spray-drying apparatus. United States patent US No. 6,783,607. 2004 Jul 20.

108. Beyerinck RA, Ray RJ, Dobry DE, Settell DM, inventors; Bend Research Inc., assignee. Method for making homogeneous spray-dried solid amorphous drug dispersions using pressure nozzles. United States patent US No. 7,780,988. 2010 Aug 24.

109. Wang X, Lefebvre A. Mean drop sizes from pressure-swirl nozzles. *J Propul Power* 1987;3:11–8.

110. Sühle P, Schuchmann HP, Gaukel V. Performance and efficiency of spray-drier and thin-fluid nozzle spray systems providing liquid foods with varying viscosity. *J Food Process Eng* 2017;40: e12317.

111. Bercek M, Eckelt J, Wolf BA. Vapor pressures of polymer solutions and the modeling of their composition dependence. *Ind Eng Chem Res* 2009;48:4603–6.

112. Miller DA, Gil M. Spray-drying technology. In: Williams III RO, Lefebvre AH, McDonell VG, editors. Formulation of poorly water-soluble drugs. New York City, US: Springer; 2012. p. 363–442.

113. Tonon RV, Brabet C, Hubinger MD. Influence of process conditions on the physicochemical properties of acai (*Euterpe oleracea* Mart.) powder produced by spray drying. *J Food Eng* 2008;88:411–8.

114. Sawicki E, Beijnen JH, Schellens JH, Nuijen B. Pharmaceutical development of an oral tablet formulation containing a spray dried amorphous solid dispersion of docetaxel or paclitaxel. *Int J Pharm* 2015;471:765–73.

115. Nezić I, Sander A, Mesteirović E, Čavužić D. Production of stable amorphous form by means of spray drying. *Part Sci Technol* 2019;37:632–42.
solid dispersions prepared by spray-drying and hot melt extrusion. Int J Pharm 2018;540:106—19.
130. Wu T, Sun Y, Li N, de Villiers MM, Yu L. Inhibiting surface crystal-

tization of amorphous indomethacin by nano-coating. Langmuir 2007;23:5148—53.
131. Kemp IC. Fundamentals of energy analysis of dryers. Modern drying
technology 2012;4:1—46.
132. Shetty N, Ahn P, Park H, Bhujbal SV, Zemlyanov D, Cavallaro A,
et al. Improved physical stability and aerosolization of inhalable amorphous cephaloridine powder formulations by incorporating
synergistic colistin. Mol Pharm 2018;15:4004—20.
133. Wang W, Zhou QT, Sun S-P, Denman JA, Gengenbach TR, Barraud N,
et al. Effects of surface composition on the aerosolisation and dissolution of inhibited antibiotic combination powders consisting of colistin and rifampicin. AAPS J 2016;18:372—84.
134. Zhou QT, Loh ZH, Yu J, Sun SP, Gengenbach T, Denman JA, et al. How much surface coating of hydrophobic azithromycin is sufficient to prevent moisture-induced decrease in aerosolisation of hygro-
scopic amorphous colistin powder?. AAPS J 2016;18:1213—24.
135. Kolter K, Schoenherr M, Ascherl H, inventors; BASF Aktiengesell-
schaft, assignee. Production of solid solutions based on poorly-sol-
uble active substances by a short-term heating and rapid drying.
United States patent application US No. 20080248117. 2008 Oct 9.
136. Friese DT, Newbold DD, Baumann JM, Dubose DB, Millard DL,
inventors; Bend Research Inc., assignee. High-temperature spray
drying process and apparatus. United States patent US No.
9,248,584. 2016 Feb 2.
137. Smeets A, Koekoek R, Clasen C, Van den Moooter G. Amorphous
solid dispersions of darunavir: comparison between spray drying and electrospraying. Eur J Pharm Biopharm 2018;130:96—107.
138. Ziaee A, Albadarin AB, Padrela L, Faucher A, O’Reilly E, Walker G.
Spray drying ternary amorphous solid dispersions of ibuprofen—an investigation into critical formulation and processing parameters. Eur J Pharm Biopharm 2017;120:43—51.
139. Tran DT, Majerová D, Veselý M, Kulaviak L, Ruzicka MC, Zámozný P.
On the mechanism of colloidal silica action to improve flow properties of pharmaceutical excipients. Int J Pharm 2019;556:
383—94.
140. Lee Y-C, McNevin M, Ikeda C, Chouzouri G, Moser J, Harris D,
et al. Combination of colloidal silicon dioxide with spray-dried solid dispersion to facilitate discharge from an agitated dryer. AAPS PharmSciTech 2019;20:1—7.
141. Hengsawas Surasaring S, Keen JM, Huang S, Zhang F, McGinity JW,
Williams III RO. Hot melt extrusion versus spray drying: hot melt extrusion degrades albendazole. Drug Dev Ind Pharm 2017;43:
797—811.
142. Lim RTY, Ong CK, Cheng S, Ng WK. Amorphization of crystalline
active pharmaceutical ingredients via formulation technologies. Powder Technol 2017;311:175—84.
143. Fong SYK, Ibsogly A, Bauer-Brandl A. Solubility enhancement of
BCS Class II drug by solid phospholipid dispersions: spray drying versus freeze-drying. Int J Pharm 2015;496:382—91.
144. Söti PL, Nagy ZK, Senneels G, Vajna B, Farkas A, Van der Gucht F,
et al. Preparation and comparison of spray dried and electrosprun bioerosable drug delivery systems. Eur Polym J 2015;68:671—9.
145. Chen D-R, Pui DY, Kaufman SL. Electrospinning of conducting
liquids for monodisperse aerosol generation in the 4 nm to 1.8 μm diameter range. J Aerosol Sci 1995;26:963—77.
146. Hogan Ir CI, Biswas P. Narrow size distribution nanoparticle
production by electrospray processing of ferritin. J Aerosol Sci 2008;39:432—40.
147. De Juan L, De La Mora JF. Charge and size distributions of elec-

trospray drops. J Colloid Interface Sci 1997;186:280—93.
148. Boel E, Koekoek R, Dedroog S, Babkin I, Vetranro MR, Clasen C,
et al. Unraveling particle formation: from single droplet drying to
spray drying and electrospraying. Pharmaceutics 2020;12:625.
149. Kivikero N, Murtonmaa M, Ingelbeen B, Antikainen O, Räsänen E,
Mannermaa J-P, et al. Microscale granulation in a fluid bed powder
processor using electrostatic atomisation. Eur J Pharm Biopharm 2009;71:130—7.
150. Ho H, Lee J. PEG/PLA core/shell particles from coaxial electro-
hydodynamic spray drying. Macromol Res 2011;19:815—21.
151. Nguyen DN, Clasen C, Van den Moooter G. Pharmaceutical appli-
cations of electrospraying. J Pharm Sci 2016;105:2601—20.
152. Yurteri CU, Hartman RP, Marijissen JC. Producing pharmaceutical
particles via electrospraying with an emphasis on nano and nano
structured particles—a review. KONA Powder Part. J 2010;28:
91—115.
153. Jaworek A. Micro-and nanoparticle production by electrospraying.
Powder Technol 2007;176:18—35.
154. Jaworek A, Sobczyk AT. Electrospraying route to nanotechnology: an overview. J Electrosp 2008;66:197—219.
155. Xie J, Marijissen JC, Wang CH. Microparticles developed by
electrohydrodynamic atomization for the local delivery of antancer
drug to treat C6 glioma in vitro. Biomaterials 2006;27:3321—32.
156. Ciacho T. Microencapsulation of drugs by electro-hydro-dynamic at-
omization. Int J Pharm 2006;324:51—5.
157. Nyström M, Roine J, Murtonmaa M, Sankaran RM, Santos HA,
Salonen J. Solid state transformations in consequence of electrospraying—a novel polymorphic form of piroxicam. Eur J Pharm Biopharm 2015;89:182—9.
158. Nyström M, Murtonmaa M, Salonen J. Fabrication and characteriza-
tion of drug particles produced by electrospraying into reduced pressure. J Electrosp 2010;68:42—8.
159. Davies LA, Hannavy K, Davies N, Pirrie A, Coffee RA, Hyde SC,
et al. Electrohydrodynamic comminution: a novel technique for the
aerosolisation of plasmid DNA. Pharm Res 2005;22:1294—304.
160. Eisebaert JC, Geerse KB, Marijissen JC, Lammers J-W, Zanen P.
Electro-hydrodynamic atomization of drug solutions for inhalation purposes. J Appl Physiol 2001;91:2735—41.
161. Xie J, Lim HK, Phua Y, Hua J, Wang CH. Electrohydrodynamic
atomization for biodegradable polymeric particle production. J Colloid Interface Sci 2006;302:103—12.
162. Kessick R, Fenn J, Tepper G. The use of AC potentials in electro-
spraying and electrosprinning processes. Polymer 2004;45:2981—4.
163. Collins G, Federici J, Imura Y, Catalani LH. Charge generation,
charge transport, and residual charge in the electrosprinning of
polymers: a review of issues and complications. J Appl Phys 2012;111:044701.
164. Verreck G, Chan I, Peeters J, Rosenblatt J, Brewster ME.
Preparation and characterization of nanofibers containing amorphous
Drug dispersions generated by electrostatic spinning. Pharm Res 2003;
20:810—7.
165. Nagy ZK, Balogh A, Vajna B, Farkas A, Patyi G, Kramarics Á, et al.
Comparison of electrospray and extruded Soluplus®-based solid dosage forms of improved dissolution. J Pharm Sci 2012;101:
322—32.
166. Yu DG, Shen XX, Branford-White C, White K, Zhu LM, Bligh SA.
Oral fast-dissolving drug delivery membranes prepared from elec-
trospun polyvinylpyrrolidone ultrafine fibers. Nanotechnology 2009;
20:055104.
167. Nagy ZK, Balogh A, Démuth B, Pataki H, Vigh T, Szabó B, et al.
High speed electrospinning for scaled-up production of amorphous
solid dispersion of itraconazole. Int J Pharm 2015;480:137—42.
168. Bohr A, Kristensen J, Stride E, Dyas M, Edirsinghe M. Preparation
of microspheres containing low solubility drug compound by
electrohydrodynamic spraying. Int J Pharm 2011;412:59—67.
169. Bohr A, Kristensen J, Dyas M, Edirsinghe M, Stride E. Release
profile and characteristics of electrosprayed particles for oral delivery of a practically insoluble drug. J R Soc Interface 2012;9:
2437—49.
170. Yu DG, Williams GR, Wang X, Yang JH, Li XY, Qian W, et al.
Polymer-based nanoparticulate solid dispersions prepared by a
modified electrospraying process. J Biomed Sci Eng 2011;4:741.
171. Yu DG, Xu Y, Luo QJ, Zhao JS, Teng L, Kuang QK, et al. Oral rapid-
dissolving polymeric nanoparticles of acetaminophen fabricated
using electrospraying. Adv Mater Res 2014;898:283—7.
172. Li C, Yu D-G, Williams GR, Wang Z-H. Fast-dissolving core-shell composite microparticles of quercetin fabricated using a coaxial electrospray process. *PLoS One* 2014;9: e92106.

173. Mohammadi G, Hemati V, Nikbakht M-R, Mirzaee S, Fatahi A, Ghanbari K, et al. *In vitro* and *in vivo* evaluation of clarithromycin—urea solid dispersions prepared by solvent evaporation, electrospraying and freeze drying methods. *Powder Technol* 2014;257:168–74.

174. Zhang S, Kawakami K, Yamamoto M, Masaoka Y, Kataoka M, Yamashita S, et al. Coaxial electrospray formulations for improving oral absorption of a poorly water-soluble drug. *Mol Pharm* 2011;8: 807–13.

175. Baird JA, Van Eerdenbrugh B, Taylor LS. A classification system to assess the crystallization tendency of organic molecules from undercooled melts. *J Pharm Sci* 2010;99:3787–806.

176. Van Eerdenbrugh B, Baird JA, Taylor LS. Crystallization tendency of active pharmaceutical ingredients following rapid solvent evaporation—classification and comparison with crystallization tendency from under cooled melts. *J Pharm Sci* 2010;99:3826–38.

177. Nyström M, Murtopää M, Salonen J. Fabrication of amorphous pharmaceutical materials by electrospraying into reduced pressure. *J Electrost* 2011;69:351–6.

178. Ziabicki A, Jarecki L. Crystal nucleation in an electric field. *Macromol Symp* 1996;104:65–87.

179. Bohr A, Yang M, Baldursdóttir S, Kristensen J, Dyas M, Stride E, et al. Particle formation and characteristics of Cellexo®-loaded poly (lactic-co-glycolic acid) microparticles prepared in different solvents using electrospraying. *Polymer* 2012;53:3220–9.

180. Bohr A, Wan F, Kristensen J, Dyas M, Stride E, Baldursdottir S, et al. Pharmaceutical microparticulate engineering with electrospraying: the role of mixed solvent systems in particle formation and characteristics. *J Mater Sci Mater Med* 2015;26:61.

181. Gupta P, Elkins C, Long TE, Wilkes GL. Electrospinning of linear homopolymers of poly (methyl methacrylate): exploring relationships between fiber formation, viscosity, molecular weight and concentration in a good solvent. *Polymer* 2005;46:4799–810.

182. Palangetic L, Reddy NK, Srinivasan S, Cohen RE, McKinley GH, Clasen C. Dispersity and spinnability: why highly polydisperse polymer solutions are desirable for electrospraying. *Polymer* 2014;55: 4920–31.

183. Theron S, Yarin A, Zussman E, Kroll E. Multiple jets in electrospraying: experiment and modeling. *Polymer* 2005;46:2899–909.

184. Lu B, Wang Y, Liu Y, Duan H, Zhou J, Zhang Z, et al. Superhigh-throughput needleless electrospraying using a rotary cone as spinneret. *Small* 2010;6:1612–6.

185. Bock N, Dargiville TR, Woodruff MA. Electrospraying of polymers with therapeutic molecules: state of the art. *Prog Polym Sci* 2012;37: 1510–51.

186. Tamrakar A, Ramachandran R. CFD—DEM—PBM coupled model development and validation of a 3D top-spray fluidized bed wet granulation process. *Comput Chem Eng* 2019;125:249–70.

187. Wentzlaff M, Senz V, Seidlitz A. Evaluation of the suitability of a fluidized bed process for the coating of drug-eluting stents. *Eur J Pharm Biopharm* 2019;139:85–92.

188. Rajabi-Siahboomi AR. Overview of multiparticulate systems for oral drug delivery. In: Rajabi-Siahboomi A, editor. *Multiparticulate drug delivery*. New York City, US: Springer, 2017. p. 1–4.

189. Kallakunta V, Sarabat S, Tiwari R. Multiple unit particle systems (MUPS), a versatile strategy for controlled drug delivery: focus on formulation and process concerns. *J Formulation Sci Biolavailability* 2017;1:106.

190. Kwon HJ, Heo EJ, Kim YH, Kim S, Hwang YH, Byun JM, et al. Development and evaluation of poorly water-soluble celecoxib as solid dispersions containing nonionic surfactants using fluidized-bed granulation. *Pharmaceutics* 2019;11:136.

191. Nandi A, Cheng A, Billingham JF, inventors; Praxair Technology Inc., assignee. System and method for solvent recovery in a batch fluidized bed process. United States patent US No. 8,973,283. 2015 Mar 10.

192. Beten DB, Amighi K, Moës AJ. Preparation of controlled-release coevaporates of dipyridamole by loading neutral pellets in a fluidized-bed coating system. *Pharm Res* 1995;12:1269–72.

193. Ho HO, Su HL, Tsai T, Sheu MT. The preparation and characterization of solid dispersions on pellets using a fluidized-bed system. *Int J Pharm* 1996;139:223–9.

194. Dereymaker A, Scurr DJ, Steer ED, Roberts CJ, Van den Mooter G. Controlling the release of indomethacin from glass solutions layered with a rate controlling membrane using fluid-bed processing. Part 1: surface and cross-sectional chemical analysis. *Mol Pharm* 2017;14: 959–73.

195. Varum FJ, Veiga F, Sousa JS, Basit AW. Microporous coatings for targeted delivery to the colon. *Int J Pharm* 2011;420: 11–9.

196. Dybdahl Hede P. *Fluid bed particle processing*. Frederiksberg, Denmark: BookBoon; 2006.

197. Mendonsa N, Almutairy B, Kallakunta VR, Sarabu S, Thrpsiy P, Bandari S, et al. Manufacturing strategies to develop amorphous solid dispersions: an overview. *J Drug Deliv Sci Technol* 2019;55:101459.

198. Guignon B, Regalado E, Duquenoy A, Dumoulin E. Helping to choose operating parameters for a coating fluid bed process. *Powder Technol* 2003;130:193–8.

199. Sun N, Wei X, Wu B, Chen J, Lu Y, Wu W. Enhanced dissolution of silymarin/polyvinylpyrrolidone solid dispersion pellets prepared by a one-step fluid-bed coating technique. *Powder Technol* 2008;182: 72–80.

200. Zhang X, Sun N, Wu B, Lu Y, Gau T, Wu W. Physical characterization of lansoprazole/PVP solid dispersion prepared by fluid-bed coating technique. *Powder Technol* 2008;182:480–5.

201. Yan HX, Zhang SS, He JH, Liu JP. Application of ethyl cellulose, microcrystalline cellulose and octadecanol for wax based floating solid dispersion pellets. *Carbohydr Polym* 2016;148:143–52.

202. Lu Y, Zhang X, Lai J, Yin Z, Wu W. Physical characterization of meloxicam-β-cyclodextrin inclusion complex pellets prepared by a fluid-bed coating method. *Particul Sci Technol* 2009;7:1–8.

203. Narayan P, Porter III WW, Brackhagen M, Tucker C. Polymers and surfactants. In: Cox Gad S, Cavagnaro JA, Nassar AF, Hollenberg PF, Scatina J, Bleavins MR, et al., editors. *Pharmaceutical Sciences Encyclopedia: Drug Discovery, Development, and Manufacturing*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; 2010. p. 1–43.

204. Gilis PM, De Conde VF, Vandecruys RP, inventors; Janssen Pharmaceutica NV, assignee. Beads having a core coated with an anti-fungal and a polymer. United States patent US No. 5,633,015. 1997 May 27.

205. Srinarong P, de Waard H, Frijlink HW, Hinrichs WL. Improved dissolution behavior of lipophilic drugs by solid dispersions: the production process as starting point for formulation considerations. *Expert Opin Drug Deliv* 2011;8:1121–40.

206. Pasquali I, Bettini R, Giordano F. Supercritical fluid technologies: an innovative approach for manipulating the solid-state of pharmaceuticals. *Adv Drug Deliv Rev* 2008;60:399–410.

207. Yang W, Owens DE, Williams RO. Pharmaceutical cryogenic technologies. In: Williams RO, Watts AB, Miller DA, editors. *Formulating poorly water soluble drugs*. New York City: Springer; 2012. p. 443–500.

208. Tabbakhian M, Hasanzadeh F, Tavakoli N, Jamshidian Z. Dissolution enhancement of gliclazide by solid dispersion: solvent evaporation versus a supercritical fluid-based solvent-antisolvent technique. *Res Pharm Sci* 2014;9:337.

209. Yin X, Daintree LS, Ding S, Ledger DM, Wang B, Zhao W, et al. Intracanule solid dispersion prepared by a supercritical fluid technique: preparation, *in vitro* characterization, and bioavailability in beagle dogs. *Drug Des Dev Ther* 2015;9:2801.

210. Girotra P, Singh SK, Nagpal K. Supercritical fluid technology: a promising approach in pharmaceutical research. *Pharm Dev Technol* 2013;18:22–38.

211. Sanganwar GP, Gupta RB. Dissolution-rate enhancement of fenofibrate by adsorption onto silica using supercritical carbon dioxide. *Int J Pharm* 2008;360:213–8.
212. Mishima K, Honjo M, Sharmin T, Ito S, Kawakami R, Kato T, et al. Gas-saturated solution process to obtain microcomposite particles of alpha lipioic acid/hydrogenolized colza oil in supercritical carbon dioxide. 

Pharm Dev Technol 2016;21:737–48.

213. Jiang Q, Li Y, Fu G, Geng Y, Zhao J, Ma P, et al. In-vitro and in-vivo study of amorphous spironolactone prepared by adsorption method using supercritical CO2. 

Drug Dev Ind Pharm 2015;41:201–6.

214. Dixon DJ, Johnston KP, Bodmeier RA. Polymeric materials formed by precipitation with a compressed fluid solvent. 

AICHE J 1993;39:127–39.

215. Reverchon E. Supercritical antisolvent precipitation of micro-and nano-particles. 

J Supercrit Fluids 1999;15:1–21.

216. York P, Kompella UB, Shekunov BY. Supercritical fluid technology for drug product development. 

Boca Raton, US: CRC Press; 2004.

217. Gram to kilogram scale-up of supercritical anti-solvent process. In: 

Jung J, Clavier JY, Perrut M, editors. Proceedings of the 6th International Symposium on supercritical fluids at Versailles, on 2003 Apr 28; Champigny, France; 2003. p. 1683–8.

218. Kim MS, Jin SJ, Kim JS, Park HJ, Song HS, Neubert RH, et al. Preparation, characterization and in vivo evaluation of amorphous atorvastatin calcium nanoparticles using supercritical antisolvent (SAS) process. 

Eur J Pharm Biopharm 2008;69:454–65.

219. Ha ES, Kim JS, Baek IH, Yoo JW, Jung Y, Moon HR, et al. Development of megestrol acetate solid dispersion nanoparticles for enhanced oral delivery by using a supercritical antisolvent process. 

Drug Dev Del Ther 2015;9:4269.

220. Kim MS, Baek IH. Fabrication and evaluation of valsartan–polymer–surfactant composite nanoparticles by using the supercritical antisolvent process. 

Int J Nanomed 2014;9:5167.

221. Gong K, Vihokontaki R, Rehman I, Buckton G, Dar J. Formation and characterization of porous indomethacin-PVP coprecipitates prepared using solvent-free supercritical fluid processing. 

J Pharm Sci 2005;94:2583–90.

222. Park J, Park HJ, Cho W, Cha KH, Kang YS, Hwang SJ. Preparation and pharmaceutical characterization of amorphous cefdinir using spray-drying and SAS-process. 

Int J Pharm 2010;396:239–45.

223. Sui X, Wei W, Yang L, Zu Y, Zhao C, Zhang L, et al. Preparation, characterization and in vivo assessment of the bioavailability of glyceryl trinitrate microcrystals by supercritical anti-solvent process. 

Int J Pharm 2012;425:471–9.

224. Yoshida VM, Balcan VM, Vila MM, Júnior JMO, Aranha N, Chaud MV, et al. Zidovudine-poly (L-lactic acid) solid dispersions with improved intestinal permeability prepared by supercritical antisolvent and spray-drying and SAS-process. 

J Pharm Sci 2015;104:1691–700.

225. Lee S, Nam K, Kim MS, Jun SW, Park J-S, Woo JS, et al. Preparation, characterization and solid dispersions of itraconazole by using aerosol extraction system for improvement in drug solubility and bioavailability. 

Arch Pharm Res 2005;28:866–74.

226. Muhrer G, Meier U, Fusaro F, Albano S, Mazzotti M. Use of compressed gas precipitation to enhance the dissolution behavior of a poorly water-soluble drug: preparation of drug microcrystals and drug–polymer solid dispersions. 

Int J Pharm 2006;308:69–83.

227. Hanna M, York P; inventors; University of Bradford, assignee. Method and apparatus for the formation of particles. 

United States patent US No. 5,831,453. 1998 Dec 22.

228. Ghaderi R, Artursson P, Carlfs J. A new method for preparing biodegradable microcrystals and entrainment of hydrocortisone in DL-PLG microcrystals using supercritical fluids. 

Eur J Pharm Sci 2000;10:1–9.

229. Beach S, Latham D, Sidgwick C, Hanna M, York P. Control of the physical form of salmeterol xinafoate. 

Org Process Res Dev 1999;3:370–6.

230. Li Y, Yang DJ, Chen SL, Chen SB, Chan ASC. Process parameters and morphology in puarin, phospholipids and their complex microcrystals generation by supercritical antisolvent precipitation. 

Int J Pharm 2008;359:35–45.

231. Pesteau A, Krier F, Lebrun P, Evrard B. Optimization of a PGSS process for a fenofibrate lipid-based solid dispersion formulation. 

2015.
331. Martinez PR, Goyanes A, Basit AW, Gaisford S. Influence of geometry on the drug release profiles of stereolithographic (SLA) 3D-printed tablets. AAPS PharmTech 2018;19:3355–61.

332. Madla CM, Trenfield SJ, Goyanes A, Gaisford S, Basit AW. 3D printing technologies, implementation and regulation: an overview. In: Basit A, Gaisford S, editors. 3D printing of pharmaceuticals. New York City, US: Springer; 2018. p. 21–40.

333. Goyanes A, Martinez PR, Buanz A, Basit AW, Gaisford S. Effect of geometry on drug release from 3D printed tablets. Int J Pharm 2015;494:657–63.

334. Awad A, Trenfield SJ, Goyanes A, Gaisford S, Basit AW. Reshaping drug development using 3D printing. Drug Discov Today 2018;23:1547–55.

335. Goyanes A, Fernández-Ferreiro A, Majeed A, Gomez-Lado N, Awad A, Luaces-Rodríguez A, et al. PET/CT imaging of 3D printed geometry on drug release from 3D printed tablets. Int J Pharm 2017;527:21–30.

336. Guinna N, Boetker JP, Colombo S, Harmankaya N, Rantanen J, Bohr A. Anti-tuberculosis drug combination for controlled oral delivery using 3D printed compartmental dosage forms: from drug product design to in vivo testing. J Control Release 2017;268:40–8.

337. Arafat B, Qinna N, Cieszynska M, Forbes RT, Alhnan MA. Tailored in vivo livery using 3D printed compartmental dosage forms: from drug development using 3D printing. AAPS PharmSciTech 2018;19:536:158–64.

338. Alhijjaj M, Belton P, Qi S. An investigation into the use of polymer blends to improve the printability of and regulate drug release from 3D printed tablets. Eur J Pharm Biopharm 2018;128:282–9.

339. Tan DK, Maniruzzaman M, Nokhoodchi A. Advanced pharmaceutical applications of hot-melt extrusion coupled with fused deposition modelling (FDM) 3D printing for personalised drug delivery. Pharmaceutics 2018;10:203.

340. Vithani K, Goyanes A, Jannin V, Basit AW, Gaisford S, Boyd BJ. An overview of 3D printing technologies for soft materials and potential opportunities for lipid-based drug delivery systems. Pharm Res 2019;36:4.

341. Alhijjaj M, Belton P, Qi S. An investigation into the use of polymer blends to improve the printability of and regulate drug release from pharmaceutical solid dispersions prepared via fused deposition modeling (FDM) 3D printing. Eur J Pharm Biopharm 2016;108:111–25.

342. Moneghini M, Bellich B, Baxa P, Brincivalle F. Microwave generated solid dispersions containing ibuprofen. Int J Pharm 2008;361:25–30.

343. Doreh M, Hussein MA, Priemel PA, Grohghanz H, Holm R, de Diego HL, et al. Amorphization within the tablet: using microwave irradiation to form a glass solution. In situ. Int J Pharm 2017;519:343–51.

344. Kolakovic R, Viitala T, Ihalainen P, Genina N, Peltonen J, Sandler N. Infanger S, Haemmerli A, Iliev S, Baier A, Stoyanov E, Quodbach J. Microwave generated solid dispersions of itraconazole and vitamin E enhancer of poorly water soluble atorvastatin calcium. Eur J Pharm Biopharm 2016;109:509–18.

345. Davis Jr DA, Thakkar R, Su Y, Williams III RO, Maniruzzaman M. Selective laser sintering 3-dimensional printing as a single step process to prepare amorphous solid dispersion dosage forms for improved solubility and dissolution rate. J Pharm Sci 2020;109:1452–43.

346. Moneghini M, Bellich B, Baxa P, Brincivalle F. Microwave generated solid dispersions containing ibuprofen. Int J Pharm 2008;361:25–30.

347. Doreh M, Hussein MA, Priemel PA, Grohghanz H, Holm R, de Diego HL, et al. Amorphization within the tablet: using microwave irradiation to form a glass solution. In situ. Int J Pharm 2017;519:343–51.

348. Gong N, Ciezyńska M, Forbes RT, Alhnan MA. Tailored in vivo livery using 3D printed compartmental dosage forms: from drug development using 3D printing. AAPS PharmSciTech 2018;19:536:158–64.

349. Alhijjaj M, Belton P, Qi S. An investigation into the use of polymer blends to improve the printability of and regulate drug release from pharmaceutical solid dispersions prepared via fused deposition modeling (FDM) 3D printing. Eur J Pharm Biopharm 2016;108:111–25.

350. Moneghini M, Zingone G, De Zordi N. Influence of the microwave technology on the physical—chemical properties of solid dispersion with Nimesulide. Powder Technol 2009;195:259–63.

351. Moneghini M, Zingone G, De Zordi N. Influence of the microwave technology on the physical—chemical properties of solid dispersion with Nimesulide. Powder Technol 2009;195:259–63.

352. Davis Jr DA, Thakkar R, Su Y, Williams III RO, Maniruzzaman M. Selective laser sintering 3-dimensional printing as a single step process to prepare amorphous solid dispersion dosage forms for improved solubility and dissolution rate. J Pharm Sci 2020;109:1452–43.

353. Moneghini M, Bellich B, Baxa P, Brincivalle F. Microwave generated solid dispersions containing ibuprofen. Int J Pharm 2008;361:25–30.

354. Doreh M, Hussein MA, Priemel PA, Grohghanz H, Holm R, de Diego HL, et al. Amorphization within the tablet: using microwave irradiation to form a glass solution. In situ. Int J Pharm 2017;519:343–51.

355. Hempel NJ, Knopp MM, Berthelsen R, Löbbmann K. Convection-induced vs. microwave radiation-induced in situ drug amorphization. Molecules 2020;25:1068.

356. Bergese P, Colombo I, Gervasoni D, Depero L. Microwave generated nanocomposites for making insoluble drugs soluble. Mater Sci Eng C 2003;23:791–5.

357. Wong T. Use of microwave in processing of drug delivery systems. Curr Drug Deliv 2008;5:77–84.

358. Waters LJ, Bedford S, Parkes GM. Controlled microwave processing applied to the pharmaceutical formulation of ibuprofen. AAPS PharmTech 2011;12:1038–43.

359. Moneghini M, Zingone G, De Zordi N. Influence of the microwave technology on the physical—chemical properties of solid dispersion with Nimesulide. Powder Technol 2009;195:259–63.

360. Moneghini M, Zingone G, De Zordi N. Influence of the microwave technology on the physical—chemical properties of solid dispersion with Nimesulide. Powder Technol 2009;195:259–63.

361. Moneghini M, Zingone G, De Zordi N. Influence of the microwave technology on the physical—chemical properties of solid dispersion with Nimesulide. Powder Technol 2009;195:259–63.

362. Moneghini M, Zingone G, De Zordi N. Influence of the microwave technology on the physical—chemical properties of solid dispersion with Nimesulide. Powder Technol 2009;195:259–63.

363. Moneghini M, Zingone G, De Zordi N. Influence of the microwave technology on the physical—chemical properties of solid dispersion with Nimesulide. Powder Technol 2009;195:259–63.
369. Alshehri S, Shakeel F, Ibrahim M, Elzayat E, Altamimi M, Shazly G, et al. Influence of the microwave technology on solid dispersions of meso-saccharide and flufenamic acid. PLoS One 2017; 12: e0182111.

370. Alshehri S, Imam SS, Altamimi MA, Hussain A, Shakeel F, Elzayat E, et al. Enhanced dissolution of luteolin by solid dispersion prepared by different methods: physicochemical characterization and antioxidiant activity. ACS Omega 2020;5:6461−71.

371. Radacsi N, Stefanidis GD, Szabó-Révész P, Ambrus R. Analysis of niflumic acid prepared by rapid microwave-assisted evaporation. J Pharm Biomed Anal 2014;98:16−21.

372. Abreu-Villela R, Adler C, Caraballo I, Kuentz M. Electron microscopy/energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy of drug distribution in solid dispersions and interpretation by multifractal geometry. J Pharm Biomed Anal 2018;150:241−7.

373. Otsuka M, Maeno Y, Fukami T, Inoue M, Tagami T, Otsuki T. Solid dispersions of efodiripide hydrochloride ethanolate with improved physicochemical and pharmaco kinetic properties prepared with microwaves treatment. Eur J Pharm Biopharm 2016;108:25−31.

374. Papadimitriou SA, Bikariis D, Avgoustakis K. Microwave-induced enhancement of the dissolution rate of poorly water-soluble tibolone from poly (ethylene glycol) solid dispersions. J Appl Polym Sci 2008; 108:1249−58.

375. Barba AA, Dalmore A. d’Amore M. Microwave assisted drying of cellulose derivative (HPMC) granular solids. Powder Technol 2013; 237:581−5.

376. Sridhar I, Doshi A, Joshi B, Wankhede V, Doshi J. Solid dispersions: an approach to enhance solubility of poorly water soluble drug. J Sci Innov Res 2013;2:685−94.

377. Zhang J, Thakkar P, Zhang Y, Maniruzzaman M. Microwave induced dielectric heating for the on-demand development of indomethacin amorphous solid dispersion tablets. J Drug Deliv Sci Technol 2020: 102109.

378. Edinger M, Knopp MM, Kerdoncuff H, Rantanen J, Rades T, Löbmann K. Quantification of microwave-induced amorphization of celecoxib in PVP tablets using transmission Raman spectroscopy. Eur J Pharm Sci 2018;117:62−7.

379. Doreth M, Löbmann K, Priemel P, Grohganz H, Taylor R, Holm R, et al. Influence of PVP molecular weight on the microwave assisted in situ amorphization of indomethacin. Eur J Pharm Biopharm 2018; 122:62−9.

380. Shalaev EY, Lu Q, Shalaeva M, Zografi G. Acid-catalyzed inversion of sucrose in the amorphous state at very low levels of residual water. Pharm Res 2000; 17:366−70.

381. Vasoncelos T, Costa P. Development of a rapid dissolving ibuprofen solid dispersion. Pharm Res 2007;16:676−81.

382. Shergill M, Patel M, Khan S, Bashir A, McConville C. Development and characterisation of sustained release solid dispersion of tablets containing the poorly water soluble drug diazepam. Int J Pharm 2016;497:3−11.

383. Chiu WL, Riegelman S. Preparation and dissolution characteristics of several fast-release solid dispersions of ginsenoside. J Pharm Sci 1969;58:1505−10.

384. Vippagunta SR, Wang Z, Hornung S, Krill SL. Effects of ultrasound on the formation of eutectic solid dispersions and their dissolution behavior. J Pharm Sci 2007;96:294−304.

385. Gunawan L, Johari G, Shanker RM. Structural relaxation of acetaminophen glass. Pharm Res 2006;23:967−79.

386. Pokharkar VB, Mandpe LP, Padamwar MN, Ambike AA, Mahadik KR, Paradkar A. Development, characterization and stabilization of amorphous form of a low Tg drug. Powder Technol 2006; 167:20−5.

387. Sekiguchi K, Obi N, Ueda Y. Studies on absorption of eutectic mixture. II. Absorption of fused conglomerates of chlophencol and urea in rabbits. Chem Pharm Bull 1964;12:134−44.

388. Timko RJ, Lordi NG. Thermal characterization of citric acid solid dispersions with benzoic acid and phenobarbital. J Pharm Sci 1979; 68:601−5.

389. Nagapudi K, Jona J. Amorphous active pharmaceutical ingredients in preclinical studies: preparation, characterization, and formulation. Curr Bioact Compd 2008;4:213−24.

390. Guo Z, Boyce C, Rhodes T, Liu L, Salituro GM, Lee KJ, et al. A novel method for preparing stabilized amorphous solid dispersion formulations using acoustic fusion. Int J Pharm 2020;120026.

391. Ueda H, Kawai A, Hayashi T, Ida Y, Kakemi M, Tozuka Y. Process monitoring of ultrasound compaction as a small-scale heating process. Eur J Pharm Sci 2013;49:829−35.

392. Fini A, Rodriguez L, Cavallari C, Albertini B, Passerini N. Ultra- sound-compacted and spray-congealed indomethacin/polyethylene-glycol systems. Int J Pharm 2002;247:11−22.

393. Sancin P, Caputo O, Cavallari C, Passerini N, Rodriguez L, Cini M, et al. Effects of ultrasound-assisted compaction on ketoprofen/eudragit® S100 mixtures. Eur J Pharm Sci 1999;7:207−13.

394. Fini A, Holgado MA, Rodriguez L, Cavallari C. Ultrasound-com- pacted indomethacin/polyvinylpyrrolidone systems: effect of compaction process on particle morphology and dissolution behavior. J Pharm Sci 2002;91:1880−90.

395. Fini A, Fernández-Hervás M, Holgado M, Rodriguez L, Cavallari C, Passerini N, et al. Fractal analysis of β-cyclodextrin−indomethacin particles compacted by ultrasound. J Pharm Sci 1997;86:1303−9.

396. Caraballo I, Millán M, Fini A, Rodriguez L, Cavallari C. Percollation thresholds in ultrasound compacted tablets. J Control Release 2000; 69:345−55.

397. Rodriguez L, Cini M, Cavallari C, Passerini N, Saettone MF, Fini A, et al. Evaluation of theophylline tablets compacted by means of a novel ultrasound-assisted apparatus. Int J Pharm 1998;170:201−8.

398. Matsuoka S-I. Effects of ultrasonic vibration on the compaction molding of polymeric powders. J Mater Process Technol 1994;40:443−50.

399. Hughley JR, McGinity JW. Emerging technologies to increase the bioavailability of poorly water-soluble drugs. In: Williams III RO, Watts AB, Miller DA, editors. Formulating poorly water soluble drugs. New York City, US: Springer; 2012. p. 569−602.

400. Parikh DM. Handbook of pharmaceutical granulation technology: CRC Press; 2016.

401. Hirai N, Ishikawa K, Takahashi K. Improvement of the agitation granulation method to prepare granules containing a high content of a very hygroscopic drug. J Pharm Pharmacol 2006;58:1437−41.

402. Cho CS, Shin TH, Lim JL, Moon KY, Kim DK, Choi YW. Stability-enhanced solid dispersion formulation of amorphous raloxifene hydrochloride. Int J Pharm 2010;399:27−36.

403. Jang DJ, Kim ST, Lee K, Oh E. Improved bioavailability and anti-asthmatic efficacy of poorly soluble curcumin-solid dispersion granules obtained using fluid bed granulation. Bio Med Mater Eng 2014;24:413−29.

404. Chen YC, Ho HO, Chiou JD, Sheu MT. Physical and dissolution characterization of cilostazol solid dispersions prepared by hot melt granulation (HMG) and thermal adhesion granulation (TAG) methods. Int J Pharm 2014;473:458−68.

405. Shammugam S. Granulation technologies and techniques: recent biosimilars: BI 2015;5:55.

406. Fujimoto Y, Hirai N, Takatani-Nakase T, Takahashi K. Novel tablet formulation of amorphous indomethacin using wet granulation with a high-speed mixer granulator combined with porous calcium silicate. J Drug Deliv Sci Technol 2016;33:51−7.

407. Hanseld E, Briens L. A review of monitoring methods for pharma- ceutical wet granulation. Int J Pharm 2014;472:192−201.

408. Trasi NS, Bhujbal SV, Zemlyanov DY, Zhou QT, Taylor LS. Physical stability and release properties of luteofenamine amorphous solid dispersion granules prepared by a simple solvent evaporation approach. Int J Pharm 2020;590:108052.

409. Trasi NS, Bhujbal SV, Zhou QT, Taylor LS. Amorphous solid dispersion formulation via solvent granulation—A case study with ritonavir and lopinavir. Int J Pharm 2019;587:109289.
410. Kowalski J, Kalb O, Joshi YM, Serajuddin AT. Application of melt granulation technology to enhance stability of a moisture sensitive immediate-release drug product. *Int J Pharm* 2009;381:56–61.

411. Seo A, Holm P, Kristensen HG, Schærfer T. The preparation of agglomerates containing solid dispersions of diazepam by melt agglomeration in a high shear mixer. *Int J Pharm* 2003;259:161–71.

412. Vilhelmsen T, Eliasen H, Schæfer T. Effect of a melt agglomeration process on agglomerates containing solid dispersions. *Int J Pharm* 2005;303:132–42.

413. Aleksić I, Duris J, Ilić I, Ibrić S, Parojić J, Šrcić S. In silico modeling of *in situ* fluidized bed melt granulation. *Int J Pharm* 2014;466:21–30.

414. Gupta MK, Goldman D, Bognor RH, Tseng Y-C. Enhanced drug dissolution and bulk properties of solid dispersions granulated with a surface adsorbent. *Pharm Dev Technol* 2001;6:563–72.

415. Passerini N, Albertini B, Gonzalez-Rodrıguez ML, Cavallari C, Rodriguez L. Preparation and characterisation of ibuprofen–poloxamer 188 granules obtained by melt granulation. *Eur J Pharm Sci* 2002;15:71–8.

416. Yeh TS, Yeh DH, inventors; Wei Ming Pharmaceutical Mfg Co., Ltd., assignee. Process for the preparation of direct tabletting formulations and aids. United States patent US No. 6,761,905. 2004 Jul 13.

417. Lin HL, Ho HO, Chen CC, Yeh TS, Sheu MT. Process and formulation characterizations of the thermal adhesion granulation (TAG) process for improving granular properties. *Int J Pharm* 2008;357:206–12.

418. S-i Kimura, Uchida S, Kanada K, Namiki N. Effect of granule properties on rough mouth feel and palatability of orally disintegrating tablets. *Int J Pharm* 2015;484:156–62.

419. Theissmann E-M, Keppler I.K., Owen M, Schwarz K, Schöldwein W. Modelling the effect of process parameters on the wet extrusion and spherisation of high-loaded nicotinamide pellets using a quality by design approach. *Pharmaceutics* 2019;11:154.

420. Tanaka R, Hattori Y, Horie Y, Kamada H, Nagato T, Osuka M. Characterization of amorphous solid dispersion of pharmaceutical compound with pH-dependent solubility prepared by continuous spray granulator. *Pharmaceutics* 2019;11:159.

421. Sekikawa H, Fujiwara J, Naganuma T, Nakano M, Arita T. Dissolution behaviors and gastrointestinal absorption of phenytoin in phenytoin-polyvinylpyrrolidone coprecipitate. *Chem Pharm Bull* 1987;26:3033–9.

422. Schenck L, Lowinger M, Troup GM, Li L, McKelvey C. Achieving a hot melt extrusion design space for the production of solid solutions. In: am Ende MT, am Ende DJ, editors. *Chemical engineering in the pharmaceutical industry: drug product design, development, and modeling*. Hoboken, US: Wiley; 2019. p. 469–87.

423. Sertsoiu G, Butler J, Scott A, Hempenstall J, Rades T. Factors affecting incorporation of drug into solid solution with HPMCP during solvent change co-precipitation. *Int J Pharm* 2002;245:99–108.

424. Hu Q, Choi DS, Chokshi H, Shah N, Sandhu H. Highly efficient miniaturized coprecipitation screening (MiCoS) for amorphous solid dispersion formulation development. *Int J Pharm* 2013;450:53–62.

425. Dong Z, Chatterji A, Sandhu H, Choi DS, Chokshi H, Shah N. Evaluation of solid state properties of solid dispersions prepared by hot-melt extrusion and solvent co-precipitation. *Int J Pharm* 2008;355:141–9.

426. Sertsoiu G, Butler J, Hempenstall J, Rades T. Solvent change co-precipitation with hydroxypropyl methylcellulose phthalate to improve dissolution characteristics of a poorly water-soluble drug. *J Pharm Pharmacol* 2002;54:1041–7.

427. Zhou H, Wang W, Hu H, Ni X, Ni S, Xu Y, et al. Co-precipitation of calcium carbonate and curcumin in an ethanol medium as a novel approach for curcumin dissolution enhancement. *J Drug Deliv Sci Technol* 2019;51:397–402.

428. Bhujbal SV, Pathak V, Zemlyanov DY, Taylor LS, Zhou QT. Physical stability and dissolution of lumefantrine amorphous solid dispersions produced by spray anti-solvent precipitation. *J Pharm Sci* 2021;110:2423–31.

429. D’Addio SM, Pud’homme RK. Controlling drug nanoparticle formation by rapid precipitation. *Adv Drug Deliv Rev* 2011;63:417–26.

430. Vaughn JM, Gao X, Yacaman M-J, Johnston KP, Williams III RO. Comparison of powder produced by evaporative precipitation into aqueous solution (EPAS) and spray freezing into liquid (SFL) technologies using novel Z-contrast STEM and complimentary techniques. *Eur J Pharm Biopharm* 2005;60:81–9.

431. Meng F, Meckel J, Zhang F. Investigation of itraconazole ternary amorphous solid dispersions based on povidone and Carbopol. *Eur J Pharm Sci* 2017;106:413–21.

432. Mann AK, Schenck L, Koynov A, Ramondor AC, Jin X, Marota M, et al. Producing amorphous solid dispersions via co-precipitation and spray drying: impact to physicochemical and biopharmaceutical properties. *J Pharm Sci* 2018;107:183–91.

433. Dedroog S, Huygens C, Van den Moor G. Chemically identical but physically different: a comparison of spray drying, hot melt extrusion and cryo-milling for the formulation of high drug loaded solid amorphous dispersions of naproxen. *Eur J Pharm Biopharm* 2019;135:1–12.

434. Caron V, Yu H, Tajber L, Erxleben A, Corrigan OI, McArtrade P, et al. Amorphous solid dispersions of sulfonamide/Soluplus® and sulfonamide/PVP prepared by ball milling. *AAPS PharmSciTech* 2013;14:464–74.

435. Nowak P, Krupa A, Kubat K, Wegrzyn A, Haranieczk Y, Ciełkówksa A, et al. Water vapour sorption in tadalafil-Soluplus®-co-milled amorphous solid dispersions. *Powder Technol* 2019;346:373–84.

436. Descamps M, Willart J. Perspectives on the amorphisation/milling relationship in pharmaceutical materials. *Adv Drug Deliv Rev* 2016;100:51–66.

437. Krupa A, Descamps M, Willart JF, Jachowicz R, Danède F. High energy ball milling and supercritical carbon dioxide impregnation as co-processing methods to improve dissolution of tadalafil. *Eur J Pharm Sci* 2016;95:130–7.

438. Willart J, Descamps M. Solid state amorphization of pharmaceuticals. *Mol Pharm* 2008;5:905–20.

439. Willart JF, Carpenter L, Danède F, Descamps M. Solid-state vitrification of crystalline griseofulvin by mechanical milling. *J Pharm Sci* 2012;101:1570–4.

440. Mura P, Cirri M, Faucci M, Gines-Dorado J, Bettinetti G. Investigation of the effects of grinding and co-grinding on physico-chemical properties of gisentide. *J Pharm Biomed Anal* 2002;30:227–37.

441. Gupta MK, Vanwert A, Bognor RH. Formation of physically stable amorphous drugs by milling with Neusilin. *J Pharm Sci* 2003;92:536–51.

442. Gupta MK, Tseng YC, Goldman D, Bognor RH. Hydrogen bonding with adsorbent during storage governs drug dissolution from solid-dispersion granules. *Pharm Res* 2002;19:1663–72.

443. iCeutica’s SoluMatrix Technology. SoluMatrix™ Technology. Available from: http://www.iceutica.com/products/products.php?page=pain-inflammation [Accessed on 7 December 2020].

444. Leane MM, Sinclair W, Qian F, Haddadin R, Brown A, Tobyn M, et al. Modelling the effect of process parameters on the wet extrusion and spheronisation of high-loaded nicotinamide pellets using a quality by design approach. *Pharmaceutics* 2019;11:159.

445. Meng F, Meckel J, Zhang F. Investigation of itraconazole ternary amorphous solid dispersions based on povidone and Carbopol. *Eur J Pharm Sci* 2017;106:413–21.

446. Mitchell SA, Reynolds TD, Dasbach TP. A compaction process to improve dissolution of poorly water-soluble drugs using hydroxypropyl methylcellulose. *Int J Pharm* 2003;250:3–11.
447. Giri TK, Jana P, Sa B. Rapidly disintegrating fast release tablets of diazepam using solid dispersion: development and evaluation. J Sci Ind Res 2008;67:436–9.

448. Kiran T, Shastri N, Ramakrishna S, Sadanandam M. Surface solid dispersion of glimepiride for enhancement of dissolution rate. Int J Pharm Tech Res 2009;1:822–31.

449. Fu J, Xu L, Wang X, Zhang S, Tao X, Zhao X, et al. Nimodipine (NM) tablets with high dissolution containing NM solid dispersions prepared by hot-melt extrusion. Drug Dev Ind Pharm 2011;37:934–44.

450. Démueth B, Nagy ZK, Balogh A, Vigh T, Marosi G, Verreck G, et al. Downstream processing of polymer-based amorphous solid dispersions to generate tablet formulations. Int J Pharm 2015;486:268–86.

451. Shimpi S, Mahadik K, Takada K, Paradkar A. Application of polyglycolized glycerides in protection of amorphous form of etoricoxib during compression. Chem Pharm Bull 2007;55:1448–51.

452. Sharp J, Forrest JA. Free surfaces cause reductions in the glass transition temperature of thin polystyrene films. Phys Rev Lett 2003;91:235701.

453. Tisato K, Keiji T, Atsushi T. Study of the surface glass transition behaviour of amorphous polymer film by scanning-force microscopy and surface spectroscopy. Polymer 1998;39:4665–73.

454. Jukes PC, Das A, Durell M, Trolley D, Higgins AM, Geoghegan M, et al. Kinetics of surface crystallization in thin films of poly (ethylene terephthalate). Macromolecules 2005;38:2315–20.

455. Puri V, Dantuluri AK, Bansal AK. Barrier coated drug layered particles for enhanced performance of amorphous solid dispersion dosage form. J Pharm Sci 2012;101:342–53.