JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN ALLIED SCIENCES

Contents available at: www.jusres.com

Overview of Common Excipients Used in Tablet Formulation

Akash Luniya* Mohammad Noman
SAM College of Pharmacy, SAM Global University, Bhopal

ARTICLE INFO

Article History
Received: January 2025
Accepted: March 2025
Keywords:
Pharmaceutical excipients, tablet formulation, fillers, binders, disintegrants, lubricants, coating materials, co-processed excipients, patient-centric design, continuous manufacturing

*Corresponding Author:
Ms. Akash Luniya

ABSTRACT

REVIEW ARTICLE

Excipients, once considered merely inert ingredients, are now recognized as critical functional components in tablet formulations, significantly influencing manufacturability, stability, bioavailability, and patient acceptability. This comprehensive review examines the diverse categories of excipients employed in tablet formulation, highlighting their multifunctional roles and selection criteria. Fillers such as microcrystalline cellulose, lactose, and mannitol provide bulk and improve compressibility, while binders including starches, cellulose derivatives, and synthetic polymers ensure tablet cohesion and integrity. Disintegrants facilitate tablet breakdown in physiological fluids, with superdisintegrants enabling rapid dissolution profiles essential for immediate-release formulations. Lubricants, glidants, and anti-adherents enhance manufacturing efficiency by improving powder flow and reducing friction during compression. Coating materials serve multiple functions, from taste-masking and aesthetic enhancement to controlled drug release and protection against environmental conditions. Recent advancements in co-processed and multifunctional excipients address limitations of traditional excipients, offering improved functionality and processing characteristics. The review further explores emerging technologies including continuous manufacturing and 3D printing, which create new demands and opportunities for excipient innovation. Patient-centric formulation approaches for pediatric and geriatric populations have driven development of specialized excipients addressing specific needs such as taste-masking, easy swallowing, and flexible dosing. Research gaps regarding excipient effects on gastrointestinal absorption, excipient variability, and sustainable alternatives present opportunities for further investigation. This review provides valuable insights for pharmaceutical scientists by emphasizing the strategic importance of excipient selection in achieving desired tablet characteristics and therapeutic outcomes.

2025, www.jusres.com

INTRODUCTION

Definition and Significance of Excipients

Excipients are pharmaceutical ingredients incorporated into drug formulations that serve purposes other than the therapeutic action of the active pharmaceutical ingredient (API). In tablet formulations, excipients constitute the majority of the dosage form,

comprising 1-99% of the total formulation mass [1]. These components are crucial for ensuring tablet manufacturability, stability, bioavailability, and acceptability to patients.

Although traditionally termed "inactive ingredients," modern pharmaceutical science recognizes excipients as functional components that significantly influence therapeutic outcomes. Excipients provide critical functionalities including improving API solubility, ensuring content uniformity, controlling drug release, masking unpleasant tastes, and enhancing patient compliance [2]. The selection of appropriate excipients directly impacts the physical characteristics, chemical stability, and biopharmaceutical properties of the final tablet formulation.

Historical Perspective

The evolution of pharmaceutical excipients parallels the development of modern pharmaceutical technology. Early medicinal preparations utilized natural substances such as honey, plant gums, and starches as primitive excipients [3]. The industrial revolution brought standardization to excipient production, while the 20th century saw the development of synthetic excipients with specialized functions [4].

Significant advancements occurred in the 1950s-1970s with the introduction of microcrystalline cellulose, modified starches, and synthetic polymers, revolutionizing tablet formulation capabilities [5]. The late 20th century witnessed a shift toward understanding excipient functionality at the molecular level, leading to improved control over drug release and bioavailability [6]. Recently, co-processed excipients have emerged, combining multiple functionalities to address complex formulation challenges [7].

Scope of the Review

This review provides a comprehensive examination of common excipients used in tablet formulation, focusing on their classification, physicochemical properties, functional roles, and selection criteria. The discussion encompasses traditional excipients with established applications and newer materials offering enhanced functionality for challenging APIs [8].

The review addresses critical considerations in excipient selection, including compatibility with APIs, impact on manufacturing processes, and influence on final product quality attributes. Special attention is given to excipient functions in improving bioavailability of poorly soluble drugs, which represent a significant portion of new chemical entities [9].

Additionally, this review examines regulatory perspectives on excipient quality and safety, highlighting the importance of excipient standardization in ensuring consistent product performance [10]. The growing emphasis on Quality by Design principles in pharmaceutical development underscores the need for thorough understanding of excipient functionality and variability [11].

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF EXCIPIENTS IN TABLET FORMULATION

Role in Drug Delivery

Excipients perform multiple roles in tablet formulations, critically influencing drug delivery processes from administration to absorption. Functional excipients facilitate tablet manufacturing by improving powder flow properties, compressibility, and lubrication during compression [12]. Fillers provide bulk and ensure uniformity in low-dose formulations, while binders confer mechanical strength to withstand handling and transportation stresses [13].

During drug release, disintegrants accelerate tablet breakdown in biological fluids by promoting water uptake and particle repulsion [14]. This process increases surface area available for dissolution, a rate-limiting step for many drugs. Specialized excipients can further modify drug release patterns, creating immediate, delayed, or extended-release profiles tailored to therapeutic needs [15].

The versatility of excipients in modifying drug delivery is evident in

technologies such as coprocessed excipients, which combine multiple functionalities in a single material. These multifunctional excipients address complex formulation challenges, particularly for drugs with poor flow properties or stability issues [16].

Impact on Bioavailability

Excipients significantly influence drug bioavailability through multiple mechanisms affecting dissolution, absorption, and metabolism. For poorly water-soluble drugs (BCS Class II and IV), excipients can enhance solubility and dissolution rate, critical determinants of bioavailability [17]. Surfactants reduce surface tension and improve wetting, while solubilizers like cyclodextrins create inclusion complexes that increase apparent solubility [18].

Some excipients modulate intestinal membrane permeability, enhancing transcellular or paracellular drug transport. For example, fatty acids and medium-chain glycerides can temporarily disrupt tight junctions, facilitating paracellular absorption [19]. Additionally, certain excipients inhibit efflux transporters like P-glycoprotein, reducing drug efflux back into the intestinal lumen [20].

Excipients can also influence pre-systemic metabolism by inhibiting intestinal or hepatic cytochrome P450 enzymes. This inhibition reduces first-pass metabolism, increasing systemic drug availability [21]. The interplay between excipients and physiological variables (pH, transit time, fluid volumes) further impacts bioavailability, particularly for modified-release formulations [22].

The deliberate selection of bioavailability-enhancing excipients requires careful consideration of potential food effects and patient variability. Lipid-based systems may show different performance in fed versus fasted states, while some excipients demonstrate age-dependent effects relevant for pediatric and geriatric formulations [23].

Quality by Design Considerations

Quality by Design (QbD) represents a systematic approach to pharmaceutical development where quality is built into the product through thorough understanding of formulation and process variables [24]. For excipients, QbD implementation begins with identifying critical material attributes (CMAs) that influence critical quality attributes (CQAs) of the final product [25].

Excipient variability presents significant challenges in pharmaceutical manufacturing. Sources of variability include differences between suppliers, batch-to-batch inconsistencies, and variations in raw material sources [26]. QbD approaches address these challenges through risk assessment tools that identify high-risk excipients requiring enhanced control strategies [27].

Design of Experiments (DoE) methodology enables systematic investigation of excipient effects on product performance, generating design spaces where quality is assured [28]. This approach supports rational selection of excipient grades and concentrations to achieve target product profiles while accommodating inherent variability [29].

Continuous manufacturing technologies benefit particularly from QbD principles applied to excipients. Process analytical technologies (PAT) enable real-time monitoring of excipient characteristics, allowing immediate adjustment of process parameters to maintain consistent product quality [30]. The integration of material science with pharmaceutical engineering through QbD facilitates robust formulation development, reducing development time and post-approval changes [31].

FILLERS/DILUENTS

Microcrystalline Cellulose

Microcrystalline cellulose (MCC) stands as one of the most versatile excipients in tablet formulation. Derived from partial acid hydrolysis of cellulose, MCC exists in various grades differentiated by particle size, moisture content, and flow properties [1]. Its popularity stems from excellent compressibility, compatibility with most APIs, and multifunctionality as both filler and dry binder [2].

MCC exhibits superior compaction properties through plastic deformation under compression, forming strong hydrogen bonds between adjacent particles [3]. This mechanism produces tablets with high tensile strength and low friability, even at relatively low compression forces. The porous nature of MCC particles further enhances its functionality by promoting capillary action during disintegration [4].

Different grades of MCC (e.g., Avicel® PH-101, PH-102, PH-105) offer tailored performance characteristics. For instance, Avicel® PH-102 provides enhanced flow properties for direct compression, while PH-105 offers higher surface area beneficial for low-dose formulations requiring uniform content distribution [5].

Lactose

Lactose remains a staple excipient available in various forms including spray-dried, anhydrous, and monohydrate versions, each with distinct properties [6]. Spray-dried lactose, characterized by spherical agglomerates of α-lactose monohydrate crystals in an amorphous lactose matrix, provides excellent flowability and moderate compressibility, making it suitable for direct compression [7].

Anhydrous lactose demonstrates higher compactibility than the monohydrate form due to fragmentation under compression, creating new surfaces for bond formation [8]. This fragmentation mechanism makes anhydrous lactose less lubricant-sensitive than plastically deforming excipients like MCC, maintaining tablet strength even with extended lubricant mixing times [9].

Despite its widespread use, lactose carries notable limitations: potential intolerance in some patients, reducing applicability in certain populations; incompatibility with APIs containing primary amine groups due to Maillard reaction potential; and relatively high moisture sensitivity affecting stability with hygroscopic or moisture-sensitive drugs [10].

Mannitol and Other Polyols

Mannitol has gained prominence, especially in orally disintegrating tablets and pediatric formulations, owing to its pleasant sweet taste, cooling sensation, and non-hygroscopic nature [11]. Its non-hygroscopicity provides exceptional stability in formulations containing moisture-sensitive APIs, while its negative heat of solution produces a cooling effect enhancing palatability [12].

Compared to other sugar alcohols, mannitol exhibits lower hygroscopicity than sorbitol and xylitol, making it preferable for moisture-sensitive formulations [13]. Specialized grades like Pearlitol® 200 SD (spray-dried mannitol) offer improved flow and compaction properties, enabling direct compression manufacturing [14].

Other polyols including sorbitol, xylitol, and isomalt serve specific formulation needs. Sorbitol, more hygroscopic but more soluble than mannitol, finds application in chewable tablets where rapid dissolution is desired [15]. Xylitol, with approximately the same sweetness as sucrose, provides excellent taste-masking properties particularly valuable in pediatric formulations [16].

Selection Criteria and Impact on Tablet Properties

Filler selection significantly influences critical tablet properties including hardness, disintegration time, and dissolution profile [17]. Key selection criteria encompass:

1. **Compatibility with API**: Chemical compatibility must be assessed through stability studies to prevent degradation reactions [18].
2. **Manufacturing process compatibility**: Direct compression requires excipients with superior flow and compressibility (e.g., silicified MCC, spray-dried lactose), while wet granulation processes can accommodate less compressible materials [19].
3. **Moisture content and hygroscopicity**: Critical for moisture-sensitive APIs, where low-moisture, non-hygroscopic

fillers like anhydrous calcium phosphate or mannitol are preferred [20].

4. **Compaction mechanism**: Plastically deforming materials (MCC) generally provide higher tensile strength but are more lubricant-sensitive than fragmenting materials (dicalcium phosphate, lactose) [21].
5. **Cost considerations**: Economic factors often influence selection, with cellulose-based excipients typically costing more than lactose or starch [22].

The quantitative and qualitative aspects of fillers directly impact tablet properties. Higher proportions of superdisintegrants with mannitol can enhance the dissolution profile of immediate-release formulations [23]. Conversely, higher percentages of MCC can increase tablet hardness while potentially extending disintegration time if not balanced with appropriate disintegrants [24].

BINDERS

Starch and Derivatives

Starch remains one of the oldest and most widely used binders in pharmaceutical formulations, traditionally employed in wet granulation processes as paste concentrations of 5-10% [25]. Its binding mechanism involves gelatinization when heated in water, forming a viscous dispersion that creates solid bridges between particles upon drying [26].

Pregelatinized starch represents a modified form processed to rupture starch granules, improving cold water solubility and enabling its use in direct compression formulations [27]. This modification enhances binding capacity while retaining disintegration properties, making it multifunctional in tablet formulations [28].

Starch derivatives like sodium starch glycolate and starch acetate offer enhanced functionality compared to native starch. While sodium starch glycolate primarily functions as a superdisintegrant, partially pregelatinized maize starch (Starch 1500®) provides balanced binding and disintegration properties in direct compression formulations [29].

Cellulose Derivatives

Hydroxypropyl methylcellulose (HYPROMELLOSE or HPMC) stands as one of the most versatile cellulose derivatives, available in various viscosity grades that determine binding strength [30]. Low-viscosity grades (3-6 mPa·s) work effectively as binders in wet granulation at 2-5% concentration, while higher viscosity grades serve in controlled-release matrix systems [31].

Hydroxypropyl cellulose (HPC) provides binding functionality in both aqueous and alcoholic systems, making it valuable for moisture-sensitive APIs [32]. Its solubility in ethanol enables wet granulation without water exposure, while its thermoplastic properties facilitate direct compression and hot-melt extrusion processing [33].

Methylcellulose and sodium carboxymethylcellulose offer additional options with specific advantages. Methylcellulose provides good binding at low concentrations (1-5%), while sodium carboxymethylcellulose combines binding capacity with extended release functionality in matrix systems [34].

Synthetic Polymers

Polyvinylpyrrolidone (PVP, povidone) represents a significant advancement in binding technology, offering excellent binding capacity at low concentrations (2-5%) [35]. Available in different molecular weight grades (K-values), lower K-values (K-12 to K-30) are preferred for binding functionality due to their lower viscosity and adequate cohesive strength [36].

Copolyvidone (copovidone), a copolymer of vinylpyrrolidone and vinyl acetate, provides enhanced binding with lower hygroscopicity compared to PVP, making it suitable for moisture-sensitive formulations [37]. Its excellent film-forming properties also enable its use in coating applications [38].

Polyethylene glycols (PEGs) function as binders primarily in melt granulation processes, where low molecular weight grades (PEG 4000-8000) melt at processing temperatures to bind particles [39]. Their water solubility and semi-

synthetic nature make them widely accepted in pharmaceutical applications [40].

Mechanisms of Binding Action

Binders strengthen tablets through several mechanisms depending on the manufacturing process:

1. **Solid bridge formation**: In wet granulation, dissolved binders recrystallize upon drying, forming solid bridges between particles [41].
2. **Hydrogen bonding**: Cellulosic binders and PVP form hydrogen bonds with adjacent particles and APIs, enhancing tablet strength [42].
3. **Mechanical interlocking**: Film-forming binders create a mechanical interlocking network that resists particle separation under stress [43].
4. **Van der Waals forces**: These short-range attractive forces contribute to binding strength, particularly in direct compression with dry binders [44].

Binder concentration significantly impacts tablet properties, with higher concentrations generally increasing hardness and reducing friability, but potentially extending disintegration time [45]. Optimal binder selection balances cohesive strength with appropriate disintegration characteristics based on target release profile [46].

DISINTEGRANTS

Conventional Disintegrants

Starch represents the oldest disintegrant, functioning primarily through swelling when exposed to water [47]. Native corn, potato, and wheat starches typically require higher concentrations (5-15%) compared to modified starches or superdisintegrants [48]. While effective, native starches demonstrate relatively slow disintegration action and limited efficiency, leading to the development of modified alternatives [49].

Low-substituted hydroxypropyl cellulose (L-HPC) functions through pronounced swelling perpendicular to the fibrous structure, creating substantial disruptive force within tablets [50]. Available in different grades varying in substitution degree and particle size, L-HPC combines disintegrant functionality with binding properties, particularly useful in direct compression formulations [51].

Alginic acid and sodium alginate utilize swelling mechanisms, with alginic acid exhibiting rapid volume expansion in contact with water [52]. Their natural origin and safety profile make them particularly useful in formulations requiring natural excipients, though their disintegration efficiency is typically lower than synthetic alternatives [53].

Superdisintegrants

Croscarmellose sodium (cross-linked carboxymethylcellulose, Ac-Di-Sol®) exhibits rapid swelling with minimal gelling, even at low concentrations (1-4%) [54]. Its fibrous structure provides efficient wicking action in addition to swelling, promoting rapid disintegration through dual mechanisms [55]. Research demonstrates that croscarmellose effectively performs across a wide pH range, maintaining functionality in both gastric and intestinal environments [56].

Sodium starch glycolate (Primojel®, Explotab®) provides exceptional swelling capacity, expanding up to 300% in volume when hydrated [57]. This pronounced swelling creates significant disruptive force within tablet matrices, though the formation of a viscous layer can sometimes impede complete disintegration at higher concentrations [58]. Optimization typically involves concentrations of 2-8%, with diminishing returns observed above this range [59].

Crospovidone (cross-linked polyvinylpyrrolidone, Polyplasdone®) functions through a unique combination of swelling and wicking mechanisms with minimal gel formation [60]. Its high capillary activity promotes rapid water penetration into tablets, while its porous particle morphology enhances water absorption [61]. Unlike other superdisintegrants, crospovidone exhibits limited swelling but high recovery after compression, providing efficient disintegration without viscous gel formation [62].

Factors Affecting Disintegration Efficiency

Particle size significantly impacts disintegration performance, with smaller particles generally providing larger surface area for faster water uptake but potentially lower swelling force [63]. Superdisintegrants typically perform optimally within specific size ranges: croscarmellose sodium (20-150 μm), sodium starch glycolate (20-100 μm), and crospovidone (20-400 μm, with coarser grades showing superior disintegration) [64].

Concentration effects vary among disintegrants, with most superdisintegrants showing optimal performance at 2-8% [65]. Beyond certain concentrations, diminishing returns or even negative effects may occur; for example, excessive sodium starch glycolate can form a viscous barrier impeding further disintegration and dissolution [66].

The positioning of disintegrants within tablet formulations influences performance:

1. **Intragranular addition**: Ensures disintegration begins at granule level but may reduce efficiency due to binding agent coverage during granulation [67].
2. **Extragranular addition**: Promotes initial tablet breakage into granules but may not effectively disintegrate individual granules [68].
3. **Dual addition (both intra- and extragranular)**: Generally provides optimal disintegration by addressing both initial tablet breakage and subsequent granule disintegration [69].

Manufacturing process significantly impacts disintegration performance. Wet granulation may reduce disintegrant efficiency, particularly for intragranular portions, necessitating higher concentrations or extragranular addition [70]. Direct compression typically preserves disintegrant functionality better than wet processes but requires careful distribution within the formulation [71].

LUBRICANTS, GLIDANTS, AND ANTI-ADHERENTS

Magnesium Stearate and Alternatives

Magnesium stearate remains the pharmaceutical industry's most widely used lubricant, effective at low concentrations (0.25-2.0%) [72]. Its mechanism involves forming a hydrophobic film on particle surfaces, reducing interparticle friction and preventing adhesion to equipment surfaces [73]. This film formation occurs through mechanical stress during blending, with effectiveness dependent on mixing time and intensity [74].

Despite its prevalence, magnesium stearate presents notable limitations: its hydrophobic nature can delay tablet disintegration and dissolution, particularly with extended mixing times; it demonstrates incompatibility with certain APIs (e.g., aspirin, some vitamins); and its performance varies between suppliers and batches due to differences in crystalline form, particle size, and fatty acid composition [75].

Alternative lubricants addressing these limitations include:

1. **Sodium stearyl fumarate (Pruv®)**: Less hydrophobic than magnesium stearate, minimizing negative impacts on dissolution while providing effective lubrication at 0.5-2.0% concentration [76].
2. **Stearic acid**: Requires higher concentrations (1-3%) but causes less dissolution retardation than magnesium stearate for some formulations [77].
3. **Glyceryl behenate (Compritol® 888 ATO)**: Offers effective lubrication with lower hygroscopicity, particularly valuable for moisture-sensitive formulations [78].
4. **Hydrogenated vegetable oil**: Provides natural origin alternative for clean-label formulations, though typically requires higher concentrations (2-5%) [79].

Glidants and Their Functions

Glidants improve powder flow by reducing interparticle friction and breaking electrostatic charges that cause cohesion [80]. Colloidal silicon dioxide (Aerosil®, Cab-O-Sil®) represents the most widely used glidant,

effective at low concentrations (0.1-0.5%) [81]. Its mechanism involves small particles (7-40 nm) adhering to larger excipient and API particles, reducing surface irregularities and creating ball-bearing effects that enhance flow [82].

Talc functions as both glidant and anti-adherent at 1-2% concentration, though its effectiveness as a glidant is typically lower than colloidal silicon dioxide [83]. Other glidants include syloid (porous silicon dioxide), which offers combined moisture control and flow enhancement, and starch derivatives that provide milder glidant properties with minimal impact on disintegration [84].

The efficacy of glidants depends significantly on particle size, surface area, and concentration, with excessive amounts potentially causing agglomeration and reduced flow [85]. Optimal glidant selection considers the cohesivity of the powder blend, required flow improvements, and potential interactions with other formulation components [86].

Anti-adherents in Tablet Manufacturing

Anti-adherents prevent sticking of tablet material to punch faces and die walls during compression [87]. While lubricants like magnesium stearate provide primary anti-adherent functionality, specific anti-adherents may be needed for challenging formulations [88].

Talc serves effectively as an anti-adherent at 1-5% concentration, creating a physical barrier between tablet material and metal surfaces [89]. Colloidal silicon dioxide provides dual glidant and anti-adherent functionality, particularly useful in preventing picker defects in film-coated tablets [90].

For particularly challenging sticking problems, formulation approaches include:

1. **Modifying environmental conditions**: Controlling humidity in the compression area to reduce moisture-induced sticking [91].
2. **Adjusting formulation components**: Incorporating more brittle excipients that produce less plastic deformation and reduced adhesion to metal surfaces [92].
3. **Using specialized equipment coatings**: Employing punch faces with specialized coatings (e.g., chromium-plating) that reduce adhesion [93].

The balance between adequate anti-adherent functionality and potential negative effects on tablet properties (particularly dissolution) requires careful optimization, with minimal effective concentrations typically determined through compression trials [94].

Impact on Dissolution and Bioavailability

Lubricants, particularly hydrophobic types like magnesium stearate, can significantly impact dissolution and subsequent bioavailability [95]. The hydrophobic film formed on particle surfaces impedes water penetration, potentially delaying disintegration and dissolution [96]. This effect intensifies with:

1. **Extended mixing times**: Longer blending creates more complete particle coating, increasing hydrophobicity [97].
2. **Higher lubricant concentrations**: Greater amounts create thicker hydrophobic films [98].
3. **Smaller particle size excipients**: Larger surface area requires more lubricant coverage, intensifying hydrophobic effects [99].

Strategies to mitigate negative dissolution impacts include:

1. **Optimized mixing protocols**: Minimizing mixing time while maintaining lubrication efficiency [100].
2. **Using more hydrophilic lubricants**: Sodium stearyl fumarate or stearic acid may provide less dissolution retardation [101].
3. **Including surfactants or hydrophilic excipients**: Offsetting hydrophobic effects through enhanced wettability [102].
4. **Adding superdisintegrants**: Counteracting delayed disintegration through powerful disruptive forces [103].

For BCS Class II drugs (low solubility, high permeability), lubricant selection and optimization become particularly critical since dissolution often represents the rate-limiting step for bioavailability [104].

COATING MATERIALS

Film-Forming Polymers

Hydroxypropyl methylcellulose (HPMC) represents the most widely used film-coating polymer, offering excellent film-forming properties, good solubility in aqueous and hydroalcoholic systems, and broad regulatory acceptance [105]. Available in different viscosity grades, lower viscosity types (3-6 mPa·s) are preferred for film coating to facilitate spraying while maintaining adequate film strength [106]. HPMC films provide good barrier properties against moisture while allowing immediate release through rapid dissolution in gastrointestinal fluids [107].

Polyvinyl alcohol (PVA) offers superior moisture barrier properties compared to HPMC, making it valuable for moisture-sensitive formulations [108]. PVA-based coating systems typically require fewer coating application passes to achieve required protection, reducing processing time [109]. Modern PVA-based systems often incorporate PEG as a plasticizer and talc as an anti-tacking agent to optimize film performance [110].

Ethylcellulose provides water-insoluble films primarily used for modified-release applications [111]. When used alone, it creates diffusion-controlled release systems, while combinations with water-soluble polymers like HPMC or PVA can modulate release rates [112]. Ethylcellulose coatings require plasticizers (typically 10-25% w/w of polymer) such as dibutyl sebacate or triethyl citrate to reduce film brittleness and enhance flexibility [113].

Functional Coatings

Enteric coatings protect APIs from gastric degradation and prevent stomach irritation through pH-dependent dissolution [114]. Primary enteric polymers include:

1. **Methacrylic acid copolymers (Eudragit® L and S series)**: Offer dissolution above specific pH thresholds (5.5 for L, 7.0 for S), enabling targeted intestinal delivery [115].
2. **Hydroxypropyl methylcellulose acetate succinate (HPMCAS)**: Provides pH-dependent dissolution with different grades dissolving at various pH thresholds (LF: pH 5.5, MF: pH 6.0, HF: pH 6.8) [116].
3. **Cellulose acetate phthalate (CAP)**: Traditional enteric polymer dissolving above pH 6.0, though more sensitive to hydrolysis during storage than newer alternatives [117].

Extended-release coatings control drug release over prolonged periods through various mechanisms:

1. **Diffusion-controlled systems**: Water-insoluble, permeable films (ethylcellulose, methacrylate copolymers) allow controlled drug diffusion [118].
2. **Erosion-controlled systems**: Gradually eroding polymers (HPMC, PVA) release drug as the coating dissolves or erodes [119].
3. **Osmotic systems**: Semi-permeable membranes (typically cellulose acetate) control water influx and subsequent drug release in osmotic pump formulations [120].

Taste-masking coatings address palatability issues, particularly critical for pediatric and geriatric formulations [121]. Effective taste-masking systems balance complete coverage of bitter-tasting APIs while maintaining immediate release in gastric fluid [122]. Common approaches include:

1. **pH-dependent polymers**: For basic bitter drugs, weakly acidic polymers like Eudragit® E PO dissolve only in gastric fluid, preventing dissolution in the oral cavity [123].
2. **Lipid-based coatings**: Materials like glyceryl monostearate provide effective

taste barriers with minimal dissolution delay [124].

3. **Sweetener/flavor combinations with partial coatings**: Sensory modification approach combined with physical barriers [125].

Aesthetic and Stability Considerations

Color in pharmaceutical coatings serves critical identification and differentiation functions for healthcare professionals and patients [126]. Colorants in tablet coatings include:

1. **Iron oxide pigments**: Provide yellow, red, and black colors with excellent stability and regulatory acceptance [127].
2. **Titanium dioxide**: Offers opacity and whiteness, often combined with colored pigments to achieve pastel shades [128].
3. **Aluminum lakes**: Provide vibrant colors but may show reduced stability compared to inorganic pigments [129].

Color uniformity across production batches requires standardized coating processes, consistent colorant dispersion, and appropriate quality control measures [130].

Coating process parameters significantly influence coating quality and performance:

1. **Spray rate**: Excessive rates cause over-wetting and tackiness; insufficient rates lead to premature droplet drying and roughness [131].
2. **Atomization air pressure**: Higher pressure creates smaller droplets for smoother films but increases spray drying losses [132].
3. **Pan speed**: Optimized to ensure proper tablet mixing without excessive attrition [133].
4. **Inlet air temperature and volume**: Balanced to provide adequate drying without thermal stress to APIs [134].
5. **Polymer concentration**: Higher solids content reduces processing time but increases solution viscosity, affecting atomization [135].

Modern coating technology trends include:

1. **Continuous coating processes**: Moving from batch to continuous operations for improved efficiency and consistency [136].
2. **Solventless coating technologies**: Hot-melt coatings and dry powder coating reducing environmental impact and eliminating solvent recovery requirements [137].
3. **QbD approaches to coating**: Systematic evaluation of critical process parameters and material attributes affecting coating quality [138].

NOVEL AND CO-PROCESSED EXCIPIENTS

Development Trends

Co-processed excipients represent a significant innovation, created by incorporating one excipient into another's particle structure through physical processes without chemical change [139]. This approach yields materials with superior functionality compared to physical mixtures or individual components [140]. Common manufacturing methods include spray drying, co-drying, co-grinding, and melt extrusion, each producing co-processed materials with distinct characteristics [141].

Commercially successful examples include:

1. **Silicified microcrystalline cellulose (Prosolv®)**: MCC co-processed with colloidal silicon dioxide, offering improved flow, higher dilution potential, and reduced lubricant sensitivity compared to conventional MCC [142].
2. **Cellactose® (75% lactose monohydrate, 25% cellulose)**: Combines plastic deformation of cellulose with brittle fragmentation of lactose, providing good flowability and compactibility [143].
3. **StarLac® (85% α-lactose monohydrate, 15% maize starch)**: Offers improved flow properties with rapid disintegration, particularly valuable for direct compression formulations [144].

The development of these materials addresses key tableting challenges including poor flow, low compressibility, lubricant sensitivity, and stability issues [145].

Multifunctional Excipients

Multifunctional excipients provide multiple roles within a formulation, streamlining composition and manufacturing processes [146]. This functionality convergence offers several advantages:

1. **Simplified formulations** with fewer components, reducing interaction potential and compatibility testing requirements [147].
2. **Improved manufacturing efficiency** through reduced processing steps and simplified inventory management [148].
3. **Enhanced performance consistency** by eliminating variability introduced through multiple excipients [149].

Notable examples include:

1. **Lubri-pres® (microcrystalline cellulose, calcium phosphate, and sodium starch glycolate)**: Combines filler, binder, and disintegrant functions with low lubricant requirement [150].
2. **SmartEx™ (QbD-optimized co-processed excipient)**: Engineered specifically for orally disintegrating tablets, providing mechanical strength with rapid disintegration [151].
3. **RetaLac® (hypromellose and lactose)**: Developed for direct compression of extended-release matrix tablets, eliminating the need for separate matrix-forming polymers [152].

These materials reflect a paradigm shift from single-function excipients to engineered materials with targeted performance profiles [153].

Patent Considerations and Regulatory Aspects

Novel excipients face significant regulatory challenges as they lack established safety profiles and monograph standards [154]. While traditional excipients benefit from established safety through historical use, new excipients must undergo extensive toxicological evaluation before commercial application [155]. Historically, this has created a "chicken and egg" dilemma: formulators hesitate to use novel excipients without regulatory precedent, but regulatory approval typically requires formulation use [156].

Co-processed excipients navigate this challenge by combining existing GRAS (Generally Recognized As Safe) excipients through physical rather than chemical processes [157]. While they retain the chemical identity of their components, co-processed excipients require thorough characterization of their:

1. **Physical properties**: Particle size distribution, surface area, morphology, and flow characteristics [158].
2. **Functional performance**: Compressibility, disintegration behavior, and stability under various conditions [159].
3. **Manufacturing consistency**: Batch-to-batch reproducibility and impact of process parameters on critical quality attributes [160].

Recent regulatory developments show increased receptiveness to novel excipients, with the FDA's Novel Excipient Review Program providing a pathway for safety evaluation independent of drug product applications [161]. This program addresses the historical regulatory barrier by allowing excipient manufacturers to obtain preliminary approval before drug product incorporation [162].

Patent protection strategies for novel excipients typically focus on:

1. **Composition of matter**: Particularly for new chemical entities or specific co-processing ratios [163].
2. **Manufacturing process**: Unique processing methods yielding materials with enhanced functionality [164].
3. **Application patents**: Specific uses in pharmaceutical formulations addressing particular challenges [165].

The patent landscape requires careful navigation as many co-processing techniques utilize

established technologies, potentially limiting protection scope [166].

FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND CHALLENGES

Emerging Technologies

Continuous manufacturing represents a paradigm shift in pharmaceutical production, requiring excipients with consistent performance under continuous processing conditions [167]. Unlike batch processes, continuous manufacturing exposes excipients to different stress conditions and residence times, necessitating enhanced understanding of excipient behavior under these conditions [168]. Ideal excipients for continuous processing exhibit robust flow properties, minimal segregation tendency, and consistent compaction behavior across processing speeds and conditions [169].

Advanced characterization technologies provide unprecedented insights into excipient functionality at molecular and microstructural levels [170]. Techniques including:

1. **Terahertz spectroscopy**: Analyzes tablet microstructure and coating thickness non-destructively, providing critical information about excipient distribution [171].
2. **Nano-indentation**: Measures mechanical properties at microscopic scales, revealing heterogeneity within excipient particles [172].
3. **Advanced computational modeling**: Predicts excipient functionality through molecular dynamics and discrete element modeling, reducing empirical testing requirements [173].

These technologies enable rational excipient design rather than traditional empirical approaches, accelerating development of specialized excipients [174].

3D printing (additive manufacturing) creates new possibilities for tablet formulation while placing specific demands on excipients [175]. Key considerations include:

1. **Printability**: Excipients must maintain appropriate rheological properties for specific printing technologies (e.g., thermoplastic behavior for fused deposition modeling, appropriate viscosity for inkjet printing) [176].
2. **Post-printing performance**: Maintaining critical quality attributes (dissolution, stability) after printing processes that may involve heat, solvents, or UV exposure [177].
3. **Excipient combinations**: Development of specialized excipient mixtures pre-optimized for specific 3D printing technologies [178].

Early commercial applications have emerged, including FDA-approved 3D-printed tablets utilizing specialized excipient formulations [179].

Personalized Medicine Applications

Patient-centric formulations tailored to specific populations present significant opportunities for excipient innovation [180]. Pediatric formulations require excipients addressing taste masking, ease of administration, and age-appropriate dosing flexibility [181]. Recent advances include:

1. **Taste-masked dispersible tablet platforms**: Combining specialized co-processed excipients with high palatability and rapid dispersion properties [182].
2. **Multi-particulate systems**: Utilizing functional excipients enabling flexible dosing through sprinkles or suspensions while maintaining bioequivalence [183].
3. **Orally disintegrating mini-tablets (ODMTs)**: Small-sized tablets combining advantages of ODTs with flexible dosing capability through multiple unit administration [184].

These developments directly address challenges identified in the FDA's Pediatric Formulation Initiative [185].

Geriatric-focused formulations address swallowing difficulties, polypharmacy, and cognitive impairment challenges [186]. Innovations include:

1. **Fixed-dose combination platforms**: Co-processed excipients enabling incorporation of multiple APIs while maintaining appropriate release profiles for each [187].
2. **Easy-swallow technologies**: Specialized coating excipients providing slip effect while rapidly dissolving in gastric fluid [188].
3. **Modified-texture formulations**: Gelling excipients creating swallowing-friendly consistencies upon contact with saliva [189].

The aging global population makes these developments increasingly significant from public health and commercial perspectives [190].

Patient-specific manufacturing enabled by advanced technologies creates unprecedented excipient requirements [191]. For hospital or pharmacy-based production of personalized dosages, excipients must provide:

1. **Robust processing in small-scale equipment**: Maintaining performance at quantities significantly below traditional manufacturing scales [192].
2. **Simplified processing**: Reducing complex multi-step operations to accommodate limited manufacturing capabilities [193].
3. **Stability at accelerated timescales**: Ensuring product quality for immediate use rather than extended shelf life [194].

These requirements fundamentally differ from traditional excipient functionality parameters, creating opportunities for specialized excipient development [195].

Research Gaps and Opportunities

Biopharmaceutical aspects of excipients remain incompletely understood, particularly regarding impact on oral absorption and bioavailability [196]. Critical research needs include:

1. **Food-excipient interactions**: Systematic evaluation of how food components alter excipient functionality and subsequent drug absorption [197].
2. **Regional gastrointestinal effects**: Understanding how excipients perform differently across intestinal regions with varying pH, transit time, and fluid composition [198].
3. **Transporter interactions**: Characterizing excipient effects on drug transporters (both uptake and efflux), particularly for BCS Class III and IV compounds [199].

The UNGAP (European Network on Understanding Gastrointestinal Absorption-related Processes) initiative identifies these as priority research areas requiring collaborative investigation [200].

Excipient variability continues challenging pharmaceutical development despite advances in manufacturing consistency [201]. Opportunities include:

1. **Functional excipient specifications**: Moving beyond physical property specifications to functionality-based standards correlating with performance [202].
2. **Advanced processing technologies**: Developing post-manufacturing modifications that reduce variability in critical functional attributes [203].
3. **Predictive characterization methods**: Creating rapid testing protocols identifying performance-critical excipient attributes early in development [204].

These approaches require collaborative efforts between excipient manufacturers, pharmaceutical companies, and regulatory bodies to establish standardized methodologies [205].

Sustainable and "green" excipient technologies address growing environmental concerns while meeting technical and regulatory requirements [206]. Promising directions include:

1. **Bio-based alternatives to synthetic polymers**: Developing modified natural polymers with functionality comparable to synthetic materials [207].

2. **Waste stream utilization**: Converting agricultural and food processing by-products into pharmaceutical-grade excipients [208].
3. **Process intensification**: Reducing energy, solvent, and water consumption in excipient manufacturing through innovative technologies [209].

These developments align with broader pharmaceutical industry sustainability initiatives while potentially providing cost advantages through simplified supply chains and manufacturing processes [210].

CONCLUSION

Excipients have evolved from simple inactive ingredients to sophisticated functional components critical to pharmaceutical performance. This comprehensive review has highlighted the diverse categories and functionality of common excipients used in tablet formulations, demonstrating their fundamental importance in modern drug delivery systems.

The selection of appropriate fillers, binders, disintegrants, lubricants, and coating materials requires careful consideration of physiochemical properties, compatibility with active pharmaceutical ingredients, manufacturing process requirements, and target patient population needs. As pharmaceutical development advances toward complex delivery systems and personalized medicine approaches, excipient functionality becomes increasingly critical to therapeutic success.

Co-processed and novel excipients represent significant innovations addressing limitations of traditional single-component excipients. These engineered materials provide enhanced functionality while navigating regulatory pathways by building upon established safety profiles. The continued development of specialized excipients will accelerate alongside emerging manufacturing technologies like continuous processing and 3D printing.

Future research opportunities include deeper understanding of excipient effects on drug bioavailability, mechanisms to address excipient variability, and sustainable alternatives meeting both technical and environmental requirements. The evolution of regulatory frameworks for novel excipients will substantially influence innovation pace in this field.

Ultimately, excipients represent a critical yet often underappreciated component of pharmaceutical formulations. Their thoughtful selection and application directly impact manufacturing efficiency, product quality, and patient outcomes. As pharmaceutical science advances, the strategic importance of excipients in enabling innovative drug delivery solutions will continue to grow, making ongoing research and development in this field essential to therapeutic progress.

REFERENCES

1. Abdassah M, Chaerunisaa AY, Sriwidodo S. Microcrystalline cellulose as pharmaceutical excipient. IntechOpen. 2019.
2. Adepu S, Ramakrishna S. Controlled drug delivery systems: Current status and future directions. Molecules. 2021;26:5905.
3. Adetunji OA. Chemically modified starches as excipients in pharmaceutical dosage forms. IntechOpen. 2019.
4. AGIBA AM, ELDIN AB. Insights into formulation technologies and novel strategies for the design of orally disintegrating dosage forms: A comprehensive industrial review. Innovare Academic Sciences Pvt Ltd. 2019.
5. Ahmad Z, AlAsiri A, Ali Elkordy A, et al. A review of emerging technologies enabling improved solid oral dosage form manufacturing and processing. Elsevier BV. 2021.
6. Alebiowu G, Ogunjimi AT. Excipients coprocessing influence on the interacting variables that affect the disintegration properties of a paracetamol tablet formulation. Innovare Academic Sciences Pvt Ltd. 2016.

7. Alfei S, Barabino P, Iurilli V, et al. Mini-tablets: A valid strategy to combine efficacy and safety in pediatrics. MDPI AG. 2022.
8. Alvarez-Lorenzo C, Awad A, Basit AW, Goyanes A, et al. Innovations in chewable formulations: The novelty and applications of 3D printing in drug product design. MDPI AG. 2022.
9. Alvarez-Lorenzo C, Basit AW, Goyanes A, Januskaite P, et al. Semi-solid extrusion 3D printing in drug delivery and biomedicine: Personalised solutions for healthcare challenges. 2021.
10. Amidon GE, Hoag SW, Khan MA, et al. Understanding pharmaceutical quality by design. American Association of Pharmaceutical Scientists (AAPS). 2016.
11. Ariën T, Cheng Thiam Tan D, Harris D, Klein S, et al. Oral drug delivery strategies for development of poorly water soluble drugs in paediatric patient population. Elsevier BV. 2022.
12. B, Saudagar R, S, Aher SS, S, Shinde MS. Review: Fast dissolving tablet. Innovare Academic Sciences Pvt Ltd. 2018.
13. Baghdadi H. Development of paediatric dosage forms of furosemide using the problem structuring method of morphological analysis. 2016.
14. Ballet S, De Baerdemaeker A, Hoogenboom R, et al. Controlled-release of opioids for improved pain management. Elsevier BV. 2016.
15. Beasley E, Coleman T, Suman M. The use of high performance anion exchange chromatography for the detection of counterfeit pharmaceutical products using the excipient content as a marker. University of Huddersfield Press. 2015.
16. Benvenga S, Centanni M, Sachmechi I. Diagnosis and management of treatment-refractory hypothyroidism: an expert consensus report. Springer Science and Business Media LLC. 2017.
17. Best R, Hutchinson D, Liou Y, et al. Stability of extemporaneously prepared rufinamide oral suspensions. Fisher Digital Publications. 2010.
18. Bin LK, Anand G, Mandal UK. A review on co-processed excipients: Current and future trend of excipient technology. Innovare Academic Sciences Pvt Ltd. 2019.
19. Böhling L. Apuaineiden ja niiden binääriseosten tabletointiominaisuuksien tutkiminen kahdella eri tabletointilaitteella. Helsingfors universitet. 2021.
20. Bordas Pérez I. Metoprolol succinate 95mg extended-release tablets. 2018.
21. Boyd BJ, Bergström CAS, Vinarov Z, Kuentz M, Brouwers J, Augustijns P, Brandl M, et al. Successful oral delivery of poorly water-soluble drugs both depends on the intraluminal behavior of drugs and of appropriate advanced drug delivery systems. Eur J Pharm Sci. 2019;137:104967.
22. Bunaciu AA, Udriştioiu EG, Aboul-Enein HY. X-Ray diffraction: Instrumentation and applications. Crit Rev Anal Chem. 2015;45:289-299.
23. Buya AB, Beloqui A, Memvanga PB, Préat V. Self-nano-emulsifying drug-delivery systems: From the development to the current applications and challenges in oral drug delivery. Pharmaceutics. 2020;12:1194.
24. Chiclana Rodríguez B, García Montoya E, Mercadé Frutos D, et al. Excipients in the paediatric population: A review. MDPI AG. 2021.
25. Chougule MB, Dave VS, Haware RV, et al. Emerging technologies for the non-invasive characterization of physical-mechanical properties of tablets. Fisher Digital Publications. 2017.
26. Chu Z, Ingram A, Jones-Salkey O, et al. Reviewing the impact of powder cohesion on continuous direct compression (CDC) performance. 2023.
27. D'Souza A, Shegokar R. Polyethylene glycol (PEG): a versatile polymer for pharmaceutical applications. Expert Opin Drug Deliv. 2016;13:1257-1275.

28. Daraghmeh NH. Modification of natural hydrophilic polymers for use in pharmaceutical formulations. 2012.
29. Dave VS, Haware RV, Popielarczyk M, et al. Drug-excipient compatibility studies in formulation development: Current trends and techniques. Fisher Digital Publications. 2015.
30. De Beer T, Remon JP, Szepes A, et al. A novel approach to support formulation design on twin screw wet granulation technology: Understanding the impact of overarching excipient properties on drug product quality attributes. Elsevier BV. 2018.
31. Durán-Lobato M, Niu Z, Alonso MJ. Oral delivery of biologics for precision medicine. Adv Mater. 2019;32.
32. Ernest TB, Liu F, Ranmal SR, et al. Patient acceptability, safety and access: A balancing act for selecting age-appropriate oral dosage forms for paediatric and geriatric populations. Elsevier BV. 2019.
33. Garg SK, Kumar S. Fast dissolving tablets (FDTs): Current status, new market opportunities, recent advances in manufacturing technologies and future prospects. Innovare Academic Sciences Pvt Ltd. 2014.
34. Gheorghiță R, Lobiuc A, Dimian M, Covașă M. Alginate: From food industry to biomedical applications and management of metabolic disorders. Polymers. 2020;12:2417.
35. Govender R, Kissi EO, Larsson A, Tho I. Polymers in pharmaceutical additive manufacturing: A balancing act between printability and product performance. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2021;177:113923.
36. Gueche YA, Sanchez-Ballester NM, Cailleaux S, Bataille B, Soulairol I. Selective laser sintering (SLS), a new chapter in the production of solid oral forms (SOFs) by 3D printing. Pharmaceutics. 2021;13:1212.
37. Haywood A, Glass B. Quality assurance of medicines in practice. IntechOpen. 2012.
38. Hewlings S, Kalman D. Curcumin: A review of its effects on human health. Foods. 2017;6:92.
39. Humphrey S. Revolutionizing drugs administration: Techniques in drug delivery and development. Int J Biochem Physiol. 2023;8.
40. Ianno V, Vurpillot S, Prillieux S, Espeau P. Pediatric formulations developed by extrusion-based 3D printing: From past discoveries to future prospects. Pharmaceutics. 2024;16:441.
41. Izzalddin R, Hussein NR. Effect of kyron T-134 and crospovidone as a fast disintegrating agent on formulation properties of fast dissolving tablet containing ketorolac and rizatriptan using direct compression method. Zanco Journal of Medical Sciences. 2024.
42. Jacob S, Kather FS, Boddu SHS, Attimarad M, Nair AB. Nanosuspension innovations: Expanding horizons in drug delivery techniques. Pharmaceutics. 2025;17.
43. Ji O, Onyemelukwe Ji. Comparative assessment of ginger and cassava starch as a binder on ibuprofen tablet formulation. Int J Life Sci Sci Res. 2018;4.
44. Joshi AB, Patel NG, Patel SA. Multiple unit pellet system (MUPS) based fast disintegrating delayed-release tablets for pantoprazole delivery. Innovare Academic Sciences Pvt Ltd. 2018.
45. Kadajji VG, Betageri GV. Water soluble polymers for pharmaceutical applications. Polymers. 2011;3:1972-2009.
46. Kader M. Mitigating the risks of generic drug product development: An application of quality by design (QbD) and question based review (QbR) approaches. International Pharmaceutical Excipients Council. 2016.
47. Kalepu S, Manthina M, Padavala V. Oral lipid-based drug delivery systems - an overview. Acta Pharm Sin B. 2013;3:361-372.
48. Kasgavade P, Swapnil M. Formulation and evaluation of fast dissolving tablet of

ciprofloxacin. Scholar Science Journals. 2016.
49. Kazi M. Lipid-based nano-delivery for oral administration of poorly water soluble drugs (PWSDs): Design, optimization and in vitro assessment. IntechOpen. 2017.
50. Khutoryanskiy VV. Advances in mucoadhesion and mucoadhesive polymers. Macromol Biosci. 2010;11:748-764.
51. Kumar A, Masih A, Singh S, Tiwari AK, et al. Fast dissolving tablets: A review. Innovare Academic Sciences Pvt Ltd. 2017.
52. Leopold CS, Sakmann A, Saniocki I. Evaluation of the suitability of various lubricants for direct compaction of sorbitol tablet formulations. International Pharmaceutical Excipients Council. 2013.
53. Liaw CY, Güvendiren M. Current and emerging applications of 3D printing in medicine. Biofabrication. 2017;9:024102.
54. Lingayat A, Mohite M, Sarnaik S. Co-processed excipients - A review. Longman Publishers. 2024.
55. Liu Y, Hu X, Chen S. Multi-material 3D printing and computational design in pharmaceutical tablet manufacturing. J Comput Sci Artif Intell. 2024.
56. Markl D, Zeitler JA. A review of disintegration mechanisms and measurement techniques. Pharm Res. 2017;34:890-917.
57. Moulesswaran S. Formulation, evaluation of candesartan cileexitil fast disintegrating immediate release tablets. 2021.
58. Ms. Shinde Sneha. Review Article A detailed study on disintegrating agents and an overview on oral disintegration tablet. Int J Sci Res Eng Manag. 2024.
59. Munar M. Melatonin dosage forms with an emphasis on modified release dosage forms. 2022.
60. Nawwaruddin HH, Rohman A, Laksitorini MD. Porcine derived ingredients in cosmetic products and its halal authentication method within complex matrices. J Food Pharm Sci. 2024;241-265.
61. Nithiyanandam RK. Pharmaceutical composition comprising rimegepant. Technical Disclosure Commons. 2024.
62. Noutchang YR. Design and evaluation of fast dispersible tablets of lamivudine using selected natural superdisintegrants. University of the Western Cape Library Service. 2018.
63. Novak M, Stepanek F. Additive manufacturing in pharmaceutical formulation - Development of biodegradable printed dosage forms for oral drug delivery. ECI Digital Archives. 2020.
64. Pasic M. Study to design stable lansoprazole pellets. 2008.
65. Rajab N, Jawad M. Preparation and evaluation of rizatriptan benzoate loaded nanostructured lipid carrier using different surfactant/co-surfactant systems. Int J Drug Deliv Technol. 2023.
66. Rantanen J, Khinast J. The future of pharmaceutical manufacturing sciences. J Pharm Sci. 2015;104:3612-3638.
67. Roy A. Orodispersible tablets: A review. Innovare Academic Sciences Pvt Ltd. 2016.
68. Sanpere Amat E. Cyclophosphamide sugar-coated tablets. 2015.
69. Saudagar RB, Shinde MS, Aher SS. Review: Fast dissolving tablet. Innovare Academic Sciences Pvt Ltd. 2018.
70. Shinde MS. Review Article A detailed study on disintegrating agents and an overview on oral disintegration tablet. Int J Sci Res Eng Manag. 2024.
71. Singh S, Verma N. Taste masked orodispersible tablets: A highly patient complaint dosage form. Innovare Academic Sciences Pvt Ltd. 2016.
72. Sruthi S. Formulation development and invitro evaluation of mouth dissolving tablets of sertraline HCl by direct compression method. 2020.
73. Vinarov Z, Abdallah M, Agúndez JAG, Allegaert K, Basit AW, Braeckmans M, Ceulemans J, et al. Impact of gastrointestinal tract variability on oral drug absorption and pharmacokinetics: An

UNGAP review. Eur J Pharm Sci. 2021;162:105812.
74. Wada de Carvalho AC, Paiva NF, Demonari IK, Ferreira MP, do Couto RO, de Freitas O, Vicentini FTMC. The potential of films as transmucosal drug delivery systems. Pharmaceutics. 2023;15:2583.
75. Zhang H, Hua D, Huang C, Samal SK, Xiong R, Sauvage F, Braeckmans K, et al. Materials and technologies to combat counterfeiting of pharmaceuticals: Current and future problem tackling. Adv Mater. 2020;32.
76. Zhang X, Xing H, Zhao Y, Ma Z. Pharmaceutical dispersion techniques for dissolution and bioavailability enhancement of poorly water-soluble drugs. Pharmaceutics. 2018;10:74.