

1 **Chem. Pharm. Bull**

2 **Note**

3

4 **Quantitative appearance inspection for film coated tablets**

5

6 Hiroyuki Yoshino<sup>a,b</sup>, Kazunari Yamashita<sup>a</sup>, Yasunori Iwao<sup>b</sup>, Shuji Noguchi<sup>b</sup>, Shigeru Itai<sup>b,\*</sup>

7

8 *<sup>a</sup>Pharmaceutical Research & Technology Laboratories, Astellas Pharma Inc., 180 Ozumi,*

9

*Yaizu, Shizuoka 425-0072, Japan*

10 *<sup>b</sup>Department of Pharmaceutical Engineering, Graduate School of Pharmaceutical Sciences,*

11

*University of Shizuoka, 52-1 Yada, Suruga-ku, Shizuoka 422-8526, Japan*

12

13

14

15

\*Address correspondence to:

16

**Shigeru Itai, Ph.D.** Professor

17

Department of Pharmaceutical Engineering, Graduate School of Pharmaceutical Sciences,

18

University of Shizuoka, 52-1 Yada, Suruga-ku, Shizuoka 422-8526, Japan

19

Tel.: +81 54 264 5614, Fax: +81 54 264 5615

20

E-mail: [s-itai@u-shizuoka-ken.ac.jp](mailto:s-itai@u-shizuoka-ken.ac.jp) (S. Itai).

21

22

23 **Summary**

24           The decision criteria for the physical appearance of pharmaceutical products are  
25 subjective and qualitative means of evaluation that are based entirely on human interpretation.  
26 In this study, we have developed a comprehensive method for the quantitative analysis of the  
27 physical appearance of film coated tablets. Three different kinds of film coated tablets with  
28 considerable differences in their physical appearances were manufactured as models, and their  
29 surface roughness, contact angle, color measurements and physicochemical properties were  
30 investigated as potential characteristics for the quantitative analysis of their physical  
31 appearance. All of these characteristics were useful for the quantitative evaluation of the  
32 physical appearances of the tablets, and could potentially be used to establish decision criteria  
33 to assess the quality of tablets. In particular, the analysis of the surface roughness and film  
34 coating properties of the tablets by terahertz spectroscopy allowed for an effective evaluation  
35 of the tablets' properties. These results indicated the possibility of inspecting the appearance  
36 of tablets during the film coating process.

37

38 **Keywords:** film coated tablet; appearance inspection; surface roughness; contact angle; color  
39 difference; terahertz spectroscopy

40

41           The physical properties of pharmaceutical products can be evaluated by visual  
42 inspection based on human interpretation or by using machines for inspection. The decision  
43 criteria for the appropriate appearance of pharmaceutical products are generally specified  
44 based on a comparison with the appearance of products that have been prepared as a standard.  
45 This means that the interpretation of the decision criteria can be subjective and a qualitative  
46 means of evaluation. In this regard, evaluating the quality of film coated tablets can be  
47 difficult because no objective criteria are currently available for this purpose. The  
48 development of suitable decision criteria based on objective and quantitative evaluation  
49 methods is therefore highly desired.

50           Changes in the surface roughness of tablet films during the film coating process  
51 have been evaluated using a laser profilometer (Seitavuopio et al., 2006). Differences in the  
52 color properties of tablets have been used to measure differences in their physical appearance,  
53 which can be dependent on the compression pressure used during the manufacture of the  
54 tablets (Matsumoto et al., 2007). Furthermore, contact angle measurements have been used to  
55 characterize a variety of different physicochemical properties, including the hydrophilicity  
56 properties of silicone pressure-sensitive adhesives and ethyl cellulose matrix tablets (Tolia et  
57 al., 2012). The cracking of the film coated layers on a swelling tablet can be predicted in a  
58 non-destructive manner using terahertz waves (Momose et al., 2012). Although these  
59 quantitative methods of evaluation have been individually applied to assess the appearance of  
60 different tablets, there have been no reports in the literature to date pertaining to the  
61 development of a comprehensive system for evaluating the surface properties of tablets.  
62 Furthermore, it has not been determined whether any of these measurement values coincide  
63 with the appearance properties of tablets. Lastly, there has been no research aimed at  
64 developing a comprehensive method for quantitatively evaluating the quality characteristics

65 of film coated tablets.

66 We have developed a comprehensive and quantitative method for evaluating the  
67 appearance of film coated tablets. Three different types of film coated tablets with significant  
68 differences in their appearance were manufactured, and their surface roughness, contact angle,  
69 color and physicochemical properties were evaluated as potential performance parameters for  
70 the quantitative analysis of their appearance.

71

## 72 **Results and Discussion**

73 The physical appearances of the surfaces of the different batches of the tablets are  
74 shown in Fig. 1. The surface of the Product 1 tablet was uniform with very few imperfections,  
75 whilst the surface of the Product 2 tablet was heterogeneous with a highly uneven surface.  
76 The surface quality of Product 3 tablet was classed as intermediate between those of the  
77 Product 1 and Product 2 tablets. The results of a conventional method for evaluating the  
78 physical appearances of the tablets by visual inspection revealed that the quality of the  
79 physical appearance of the three tablet surfaces was ranked in the following order, from best  
80 to worst: Product 1, Product 3 and Product 2.

81 The surface roughness ( $R_a$ ) and contact angle ( $A_C$ ) values are shown in Table 1. The  
82  $R_a$  and  $A_C$  values were determined to be 4.08  $\mu\text{m}$  and 83.0°, 7.52  $\mu\text{m}$  and 70.7°, and 5.16  $\mu\text{m}$   
83 and 71.7° for Products 1, 2, and 3, respectively. The  $R_a$  values of the different products  
84 increased in the order of Products 1, 3 and 2, whilst the  $A_C$  values decreased in the same order.  
85 This result indicated that the heterogeneity of visual appearance for the tablet surfaces could  
86 be correlated with the  $R_a$  and  $A_C$  values of the tablets (i.e., tablet surfaces with higher  
87 heterogeneity showed higher  $R_a$  values and lower  $A_C$  values). Statistically significant  
88 differences in the  $R_a$  values were observed for multiple comparisons among the three different  
89 products. In contrast, there were no significant differences between the  $A_C$  values of Products

90 2 and 3.

91 The luminosity ( $L$ ), chromaticity ( $a$  and  $b$ ) and calculated color difference ( $\Delta E$ )  
92 values are shown in Table 2. The  $\Delta E$  value between Products 1 and 2 was classified as  
93 ‘Appreciable’, whilst the corresponding values between Products 1 and 3 and Products 2 and  
94 3 were classified as ‘Noticeable’. Based on these values, it was possible to quantify  
95 differences in the color of the tablets that could not be distinguished by visual inspection  
96 alone.

97 The average and relative standard deviation values of the thickness of the film  
98 coated layer ( $FT$ ), the film surface density ( $FSD$ ) and the difference between the interface  
99 density of the film layer and core tablet ( $IDD$ ) are shown in Table 3. The average of  $FT$ ,  $FSD$   
100 and  $IDD$  values of Products 1–3 were determined to be in the ranges of 54.1–59.0  $\mu\text{m}$ , 18.0–  
101 18.6% and -1.8 to -2.3%, respectively. The order of ranking among the average  $FT$  and  $FSD$   
102 values did not coincide with the results of the visual appearance test. Furthermore, a  
103 statistically significant difference in the  $IDD$  values was only observed between Products 1  
104 and 2, although the order of the  $IDD$  values for Products 1–3 coincided with that of the visual  
105 appearance test. These results therefore indicated that differences in the surface properties of  
106 Products 1–3 could not be detected based on the average  $FT$ ,  $FSD$  or  $IDD$  values. In contrast,  
107 the order of the RSDs of the  $FT$ ,  $FSD$  and  $IDD$  values for Products 1–3 coincided with that of  
108 the visual appearance test. Furthermore, an increase in the heterogeneousness of the tablet  
109 surface appearance corresponded to an increase in the absolute value of the RSD values.  
110 Statistically significant differences in the RSD values of  $FT$  were observed for multiple  
111 comparisons between the three products, whilst differences in the RSD values of  $FSD$  were  
112 only observed between Products 1 and 2 and Products 2 and 3. In contrast, there were no  
113 significant differences between the RSD values of  $IDD$  for any of the products.

114 We analyzed the surface roughness, contact angle, color and film coating layer

115 properties of three different film coated tablets. The results of this analysis clearly showed  
116 that variations in the appearance resulting from the different manufacturing conditions could  
117 be used as the basis of a quantitative method for evaluating the physical appearance of tablets.  
118 Decision criteria concerning the appearance of tablets could therefore be set using these  
119 comprehensive quantitative evaluation methods. In particular, the analysis of the surface  
120 roughness and film coating properties of the tablets by terahertz spectroscopy allowed for an  
121 effective evaluation of the tablet properties. These results therefore highlighted the possibility  
122 of inspecting the appearance properties of tablets during the film coating process.  
123 Furthermore, it is envisaged that these new methods could be used to evaluate film coating  
124 processes based on the quantitative evaluation of film coated tablets and film coated layers in  
125 terms of their physical appearance.

126

## 127 **Experimental**

### 128 **Materials**

129 The tablet cores were prepared using D-mannitol (Roquette, Lestrem, France),  
130 microcrystalline cellulose (Asahi Kasei Chemicals, Tokyo, Japan), crospovidone (BASF,  
131 Ludwigshafen, Germany) and magnesium stearate (Merck KGaA, Darmstadt, Germany). The  
132 composition of each tablet core was as follows: D-mannitol 64% (wt/wt), microcrystalline  
133 cellulose 30 % (wt/wt), crospovidone 5% (wt/wt) and magnesium stearate 1% (wt/wt). D-  
134 mannitol, microcrystalline cellulose and crospovidone were initially blended in a container  
135 mixer before being blended with magnesium stearate in the same container. The blended  
136 powder was subsequently compressed on a compression machine (HT-X20, Hata Iron Works,  
137 Kyoto, Japan) using 8 mm biconcave punches to form the core tablets. Opadry® Yellow  
138 (Colorcon, Shizuoka, Japan) containing hypromellose, polyethylene glycol, titanium oxide,  
139 talc and yellow ferric oxide was used as the film coating agent by dispersing in water at a

140 concentration of 10% (wt/wt).

141

## 142 **Equipment**

143 The film coating process was performed on a pilot scale with 33 kg of the core  
144 tablets charged into the film coater system (Powrex, Hyogo, Japan).

145

## 146 **Film coating**

147 The core tablets were coated with 3% (wt/wt) Opadry® Yellow by spraying the  
148 tablets with a dispersion of the coating. Three batches of film coated tablets were  
149 manufactured under the conditions shown in Table 4.

150

## 151 **Surface roughness**

152 The surface roughness of the tablets was measured using a VK-9700 laser  
153 microscope (Keyence, Osaka, Japan). The arithmetic average roughness (calculated as

154  $R_a = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^N |Z_n - \bar{Z}|}{N}$ , where  $Z_n$  is the individual height value of the measurement point **by the**

155 **laser reflection measurement**,  $\bar{Z}$  is the mean value of all of the height data points and  $N$  is the  
156 number of measurement points) was used as the standard roughness.

157

## 158 **Contact angle**

159 Contact angle measurements were recorded using a contact angle meter (Kyowa  
160 Interface Science, Saitama, Japan). The  $\theta/2$  method was used to measure the contact angles  
161 with 2  $\mu$ L of purified water.

162

## 163 **Color difference**

164           The luminosity and chromaticity values were measured using a color difference  
165 meter (Konica Minolta, Tokyo, Japan). The specular component exclude method was used to  
166 evaluate colors in the near visual range. Differences in the color  
167 ( $\Delta E = \sqrt{(\Delta L)^2 + (\Delta a)^2 + (\Delta b)^2}$ ) between two batch samples were evaluated based on the  
168 standard color difference value reported in the National Bureau of Standards (NBS unit) for  
169 each sample.

170

### 171 **Terahertz spectroscopy**

172           The film coated layers were visualized using a TAS-7500 terahertz spectroscopic  
173 imaging system (Advantest, Tokyo, Japan). **Details regarding element technology and the data**  
174 **acquisition process have already been reported (Imamura et al., 2010).** The images were  
175 collected in the reflection measurement mode. A circular area with a radius of 2.1 mm was set  
176 as the measurement area at the center of the tablet. Fifty points were measured within the  
177 circular area in each sample. Based on the principles of terahertz spectroscopic measurement,  
178 we measured the thickness of the film coated layer, the film surface density and the difference  
179 between the interface density of the film layer and core tablet. **The thickness of the film**  
180 **coated layer (FT) was obtained from the time lag between the reflected signal from the**  
181 **surface of film coated layer and core tablet. The reflectance of reflected signal from the**  
182 **surface of film coated layer was obtained from the ration of the amplitude of the reference**  
183 **signal and the measurement signal. The reflectance is known to change depending on the**  
184 **refractive index of the surface of the object to be measured (film coated layer), which can be**  
185 **regarded as a parameter representing the density of the material. Therefore, the reflectance**  
186 **can be termed as the film surface density (FSD) of the film coated layer.**

187           **The amplitude of reflected signal from the boundary between the film coated layer**  
188 **and the core tablet changes with the refractive index difference (density difference) at the**



189 boundary suggested by Fresnel's formula. Then, the interface density difference (IDD) is  
190 defined as the ration of the amplitude obtained from the reference signal and the measurement  
191 signal at the boundary. Definitions of these parameters have already been reported (Momose  
192 et al., 2012).

193

#### 194 **Statistics**

195 The results for the three different products were checked for statistically significant  
196 differences where there was a coincidence between the results, except for differences in color.  
197 Bartlett's test was used to check the equivalence of variance and a multiple comparison  
198 evaluation was also performed. The level of significance was taken as  $p < 0.05$ .

199

#### 200 **Acknowledgements**

201 The authors would like to thank Mr. Yasunori Mori at Astellas Pharma Tech Co.,  
202 Ltd for manufacturing the film coated tablets.

203

#### 204 **Conflict of Interest**

205 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

206

#### 207 **References**

- 208 1) Seitavuopio P., Heinämäki J., Rantanen J., Yliruusi J., *AAPS PharmSciTech.* **7** (2), E1–E6  
209 (2006).
- 210 2) Matsumoto R., Kawakami K., Aoki S., *Int. J. Pharm.* **341**, 44–49 (2007).
- 211 3) Tolia G., Li S.K., *Eur. J. Pharm. Biopharm.* **82**, 518–525 (2012).
- 212 4) Momose W., Yoshino H., Katakawa Y., Yamashita K., Imai K., Sako K., Kato E., Irisawa  
213 A., Yonemochi E., Terada K., *Results Pharma Sci.* **2**, 29–37 (2012).

- 214 5) Imamura M., Nishina S., Irisawa A., Yamashita T., Kato E., In: *Proceedings of the IEEE*  
215 *international conference on IR. MMW. THz. waves. Rome, Italy (2010)*  
216