

The Effect of Tamping Force and Tablet Mass Plasticity on Bi-Layer Tablet Robustness

Introduction

Bi-layer tablets enable the combination of chemically incompatible Active Pharmaceutical Ingredients (API) in a single dosage form due to physical separation. They also offer the possibility to combine layers with different drug release profiles^{1,2}. The adherence between the tablet layers influences the bi-layer tablets' quality. A common problem is layer-separation. Insufficient bonding capacity between the tablet layers leads to delamination². Appropriate compression forces for the first and second layer during tableting are crucial in order to avoid separation of the two layers and to enable a high tablet quality^{3,4}.

Aim of the Study

The aim of this study was to analyze the effect of tamping force and the plasticity of the tablet masses on the bi-layer tablet robustness. Appropriate tamping forces of < 1 kN and excessive tamping forces of 2 and 4 kN were chosen. Flat faced bi-layer tablets were compared in terms of adherence between the two layers and crushing strength. In addition, the difference of appropriate and excessive tamping force was visualized by preparing cross sections of convex bi-layer tablets.

Material and Methods

Dibasic calcium phosphate dihydrate (**EMCOMPRESS®**) as a brittle filler-binder, silicified microcrystalline cellulose (**PROSOLV® SMCC 90**) as a plastically deforming filler-binder and sodium stearyl fumarate (**PRUV®**) as a lubricant were provided by JRS PHARMA GmbH & CO. KG (Rosenberg, Germany). Iron oxide, black, with a particle size < 150 µm was purchased from Merck KGaA (Darmstadt, Germany).

Formulations

The quantitative composition of the two formulations used for the production of the bi-layer tablets is shown in Table 1. Both formulations were blended for 3 min at 24 rpm using a freefall blender Brunimat Type Porta (Brunitec Suisse, Ermatingen, Switzerland). Flat faced bi-layer tablets consisted of 450 mg of formulation S and 600 mg of formulation D. For convex bi-layer tablets, 500 mg of formulation S and 700 mg of formulation D were used.

Ingredient	Formulation	
	S	D
Dibasic Calcium Phosphate Dihydrate	-	99 %
Silicified Microcrystalline Cellulose	94 %	-
Iron Oxide, Black	5 %	-
Sodium Stearyl Fumarate	1 %	1 %

Tab. 1 Tested Formulations


Tableting

Both formulations were compacted into flat faced bi-layer tablets with a diameter of 13 mm using a Fette 1200i tablet press (Fette Compacting GmbH, Schwarzenbek, Germany). Tamping forces for the first layer were < 1 kN, 2 kN and 4 kN and compaction force for the second layer was 5 kN.

Additionally, convex bi-layer tablets with a diameter of 14 mm and a curvature radius of 14 mm were compressed using a Korsch EKO tablet press (Korsch AG, Berlin, Germany). An appropriate tamping force and an excessive tamping force were applied to the first layer.

Functional Tablet Characteristics

Crushing strength was measured using a TBH 425 TD hardness tester (Erweka GmbH, Langen, Germany). The force to separate the two tablet layers was analyzed using a Texture Analyser TA.TXplus from Winopal Forschungsbedarf GmbH (Elze, Germany). Flat face bi-layer tablets were fixed using superglue (Sekundenkleber blitzschnell PIPETTE was purchased from UHU GmbH & Co. KG, Bühl, Germany) both on upper and lower tablet surface. 4900 g were applied for 60 s with the upper punch, which was then lifted with a speed of 10 mm/s tearing the two layers apart (Picture 1).



Pic 1 Texture Analyser TA.TX from Winopal (A)
Flat faced Bi-Layer Tablet with Superglue on the Tablet's Surface Placed under the Upper Punch (B)

Results

Results and Discussion

Flat faced Bi-Layer Tablets

Tablet Layer Separation

Adherence between the two tablet layers was found to depend on the applied tamping force. The lowest force to separate the two layers was analyzed for tablets compressed with 4 kN tamping force.


If a tamping force of 2 kN was applied, a higher force was necessary to separate the bi-layer tablets at the layers' interface. Tablets compressed with an appropriate tamping force of < 1 kN could not be separated at the interface but broke within the layer consisting of the formulation D (Table 2).

Tamping Force	Formulation Used as First Layer	Force to Separate Tablet Layers [N]
< 1 kN	Formulation S	39.9*
	Formulation D	35.2*
2 kN	Formulation S	29.6
	Formulation D	26.5
4 kN	Formulation S	17.8
	Formulation D	20.3

* Tablets could not be separated between their two layers but broke within the layer of formulation D.

Tab. 2 Force to Separate Tablet Layers of Biplane Bi-Layer Tablets Depending on Applied Tamping Force and First Layer Composition

The forces to separate the two tablet layers with the Texture Analyser are visualized in Chart 1. The measurement curves showing the highest peaks (> 35 N) belong to the bi-layer tablets compressed with a tamping force of < 1 kN. These tablets broke within the layer composed of formulation D. Bi-layer tablets compressed with a tamping force of 2 kN and 4 kN have measurement curves with lower peaks and could be separated at their interface (Chart 1).



* Tablets could not be separated between their two layers but broke within the layer of formulation D.

Chart 1 Measurement Curves of Tablet Layer Separation, Measured with Texture Analyser

Tablet Hardness

When measured individually, the hardness of the first layer consisting of formulation S was found to be higher than for formulation D. This is due to the enhanced compressibility of silicified microcrystalline cellulose in comparison to dibasic calcium phosphate dihydrate. Similar tablet hardnesses were analyzed for bi-layer tablets compressed with a final compression force of 5 kN independent of the tamping force (Table 3).

Tamping Force	Formulation Used as First Layer	Hardness of First Layer [N]	Tablet Hardness of Bi-Layer Tablet [N]
< 1 kN	Formulation S	7	160
	Formulation D	5	180
2 kN	Formulation S	78	172
	Formulation D	8	177
4 kN	Formulation S	123	169
	Formulation D	11	180

Tab. 3 Tablet Hardnesses of First Layer and of Bi-Layer Tablets Depending on the Tamping Force. The Final Compaction Step was done at 5kN in all Cases.

Interestingly, layer adhesion and tablet hardness were not affected by the order in which the layers were compressed, i.e. whether the plastically deforming formulation S or the brittle formulation D was used as first layer.

Convex Bi-Layer Tablets

Cross Sections

The effect of tamping force was visualized by the cross section of convex bi-layer tablets. A horizontal line separated the tablet layers if an appropriate tamping force was applied (Picture 2 A and C). In contrast, the separation line between the layers was convex shaped if an excessive tamping force was applied (Picture 2 B and D). In each case, the black layer consists of formulation S and the white layer of formulation D.



Pic 2 A An Adequate Tamping Force was Applied, Leading to a Horizontal Separation Line Between the Layers. The Top Layer Consists of Formulation D, the Lower Layer Consists of Formulation S.



Pic 2 B An Excessive Tamping Force was Applied, Leading to a Convex Separation Line Between the Layers. The Top Layer Consists of Formulation D, the Lower Layer Consists of Formulation S.



Pic 2 C An Adequate Tamping Force was Applied, Leading to a Horizontal Separation Line Between the Layers. The Top Layer Consists of Formulation S, the Lower Layer Consists of Formulation D.



Pic 2 D An Excessive Tamping Force was Applied, Leading to a Convex Shaped Separation Line between the Layers. The Top Layer Consists of Formulation S, the Lower Layer Consists of Formulation D.

Conclusion

The adherence between the tablet layers was analyzed with a Texture Analyser, which measured the force needed to tear the layers apart. The tamping force influenced the bi-layer tablet robustness in terms of layer adhesion. Tablets compressed with an appropriate tamping force of < 1 kN were the most robust and could not be separated between their two layers. The lowest force to separate the layers was measured for tablets compressed with an excessive tamping force of 4 kN. No differences were seen in the tablet hardness of bi-layer tablets compressed with different tamping forces. In contrast to the tablet layer-separation force, tablet hardness is not suited for the analysis on the mechanical stability of bi-layer tablets. Selecting an appropriate tamping force was found to be more relevant for the tablet quality than the formulation plasticity or brittleness or the order of their addition.

References

- [1] Deshpande, R.; Gowda, D.; Mahammed, N.; Maramwar, D. Bi-layer tablets – an emerging trend: a review. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Research*, 2, 2534-2544 (2011).
- [2] Ud Din, M.; Mohi Din, S; Shukla, T. An overview on bilayered tablet technology. *American-Eurasian Journal of Scientific Research*, 9, 6-15 (2014).
- [3] Anusha, J.; Karthik, M. A review on bilayered tablets. *Research and Reviews: Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences*, 5, 118-124 (2016).
- [4] Aggarwal, S.; Syan, N.; Mathur, P. Bi-layer tablet technology – Opening new ways in drug delivery systems: An overview. *International Journal of Research in Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Sciences*, 4, 8-16 (2013).

To learn more, visit www.jrspharma.com

Disclaimer:

The information provided in this brochure is based on thorough research and is believed to be completely reliable. Application suggestions are given to assist our customers, but are for guidance only. Circumstances in which our material is used vary and are beyond our control. Therefore, we cannot assume any responsibility for risks or liabilities, which may result from the use of this technical advice.

The Global Excipient Maker

Global Network

GMP Manufacturing and Service Sites

- Excipients
- Coatings
- Biopharma Services
- JRS Sales Companies (Additionally, dedicated representatives in almost every country.)
- Technical Competence Centers
- Application Labs



HIGH FUNCTIONALITY EXCIPIENTS

- PROSOLV® SMCC**
Silicified Microcrystalline Cellulose
- PROSOLV® EASYtab SP**
Microcrystalline Cellulose, Colloidal Silicon Dioxide, Sodium Starch Glycolate, Sodium Stearyl Fumarate
- PROSOLV® EASYtab NUTRA**
All-in-one Composite for Nutraceutical Applications
- PROSOLV® ODT G2**
Microcrystalline Cellulose, Colloidal Silicon Dioxide, Mannitol, Fructose, Crospovidone

DISINTEGRANTS

- VIVASTAR®, EXPLOTAB®**
Sodium Starch Glycolate, Sodium Carboxymethyl Starch
- VIVASOL®**
Croscarmellose Sodium
- EMCOSOY®**
Soy Polysaccharides
- VIVAPHARM® Crospovidone**
Polyvinylpyrrolidone, crosslinked

COATINGS

- VIVACOAT®**
Ready-to-Use Coating System
- VIVACOAT® protect**
Ready-to-Use High Functional Coating System
- VIVAPHARM® HPMC**
Hydroxypropylmethylcellulose
- VIVAPHARM® PVA**
Polyvinyl Alcohol

BINDERS

- VIVAPUR®, EMCOCEL®**
Microcrystalline Cellulose
- EMDEX®**
Dextrates
- VIVAPHARM® Povidones**
Povidone and Copovidone

LUBRICANTS

- PRUV®**
Sodium Stearyl Fumarate
- LUBRITAB®**
Hydrogenated Vegetable Oil, Hydrogenated Oil
- LUBRI-PREZ™**
Magnesium Stearate

CARRIERS

- VIVAPUR® MCC SPHERES**
Microcrystalline Cellulose Pellets
- VIVAPHARM® Sugar Spheres**
Sugar Pellets, Non-GMO

FUNCTIONAL FILLERS

- ARBOCEL®**
Powdered Cellulose
- EMCOMPRESS®**
Calcium Phosphates
- COMPACTROL®**
Calcium Sulfate Dihydrate

THICKENERS • STABILIZERS • GELLING AGENTS

- VIVAPUR® MCG**
Microcrystalline Cellulose and Carboxymethylcellulose Sodium
- VIVAPHARM® Alginates**
Calcium Alginate
- VIVAPHARM® Alginates**
Sodium Alginate
- VIVAPHARM® Alginates**
Alginate Acid
- VIVAPHARM® Pectins**

BIOPHARMA SERVICES

Members of the JRS PHARMA Family