Research Papers

Inclusion complexations of steroid hormones with cyclodextrins in water and in solid phase

K. Uekama, T. Fujinaga, F. Hirayama, M. Otagiri and M. Yamasaki *

Faculty of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Kumamoto University, 5-1, Oe-honmachi, Kumamoto 862 and * Department of Biochemistry, Medical School, Kumamoto University, 2-2-1, Honjo, Kumamoto 860 (Japan)

> (Received May 25th, 1981) (Modified version received August 10th, 1981) (Accepted August 11th, 1981)

Summary

Inclusion complexation of 18 steroid hormones with 3 cyclodextrins (α -, β - and γ -CyDs) in water and in solid phase were studied by the solubility method, spectroscopies (UV, CD, IR and ¹H-NMR), X-ray diffractometry and thermal analysis, and their modes of interactions were assessed. A spatial relationship between host and guest molecules was clearly reflected in the magnitude of the stability constant (γ -> β -> α -CyD) and in the stoichiometry of the inclusion complexes. The ¹H-NMR studies including spin-lattice relaxation time and chemical shift measurements suggested that the A-ring of the steroid molecule was predominantly included in the cavity of CyDs. The solid complexes of some steroids with β - and γ -CyDs were obtained generally in the molar ratios of 1:2 and 2:3, respectively, and their dissolution behaviors were examined. The results indicated that the CyD complexes may have a great utility as a rapidly dissolving form of steroids in water.

Introduction

Cyclodextrins (CyDs) have received considerable attention in pharmaceutical fields because of improved aqueous solubility, chemical stability and bioavailability of various drug molecules through inclusion complex formation (Uekama, 1979; Saenger, 1980). The solubilization of poorly soluble steroid hormones by macromolecule adjuvants has been investigated by several authors (Lach et al., 1966; Thakkar et al., 1968; Tomida et al., 1978; Lundberg et al., 1979). Testosterone and cortisone

acetate reportedly form inclusion complexes with β -CyD by means of solubility analysis (Lach and Pauli, 1966). Preliminary studies in this laboratory also showed that some steroid hormones, including cortisone acetate, form soluble complexes with β - and γ -CyDs in various molar ratios. The present study deals, in detail, with the cavity size effect of CyDs (α -, β - and γ -CyDs) on the inclusion complexes of 18 steroid hormones in water and in the solid state. Solubility analysis, spectroscopies (ultraviolet (UV), circular dichroism (CD), infrared (IR) and proton magnetic resonance (¹H-NMR)), X-ray diffractometry and thermal analysis were employed. In addition the dissolution behaviors of some solid inclusion complexes in water were examined.

Materials and methods

Materials

The natural and synthetic steroids (see Table 1) were re-crystallized from ethanol -water before use. Compounds 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 were obtained from Nakarai Chemicals (Kyoto, Japan). Compounds 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18 were kindly donated by Mitsubishi Yuka Pharmaceuticals (Ibaraki, Japan). Compound 13 was a gift of Showa Yakuhin Kako (Kawasaki, Japan). The α -, β - and γ -CyDs were purchased from Nippon Shokuhin Kako (Tokyo, Japan), and re-crystallized twice from water. All other materials were of analytical reagent grade. Deionized, double-distilled water was used throughout the study.

Solubility studies

Solubility measurements were carried out according to Higuchi and Lach (1954). Excess amounts of steroid were added to aqueous solutions containing various concentrations of CyDs and were shaken at 25 ± 0.5 °C. After equilibration was attained (approximately 10 days), an aliquot was centrifuged and pipetted through a cotton filter. A portion of the sample (0.5 ml) was then diluted with 50% v/v ethanol-water and analyzed spectrophotometrically. An apparent stability constant, K_c , was calculated from the initial straight line portion of phase solubility diagrams according to the following equation (Higuchi and Connors, 1965).

$$K_{c} = \frac{\text{slope}}{\text{intercept} \cdot (1 - \text{slope})}$$
(1)

Preparation of solid complexes

The solid complexes were derived by mixing appropriate amounts of the CyD and the steroid in water. Amounts were calculated from the descending curvature of the phase solubility (see Fig. 1). For example, 0.45 g of cortisone acetate and 6.8 g of β -CyD were added in 300 ml water, sealed in a flask, and the inixture was stirred with magnetic stirrer at 25°C for 7 days. The complex, which precipitated as a micro-crystalline powder, was filtered and dried under vacuum at 60°C for 48 h.

TABLE 1

STEROIDS USED IN THIS STUDY

Compound	Structure					
	R	R2	R ₃	R4	R,	R
(1) Hydrovortisone ^a	сосн,он	HO-10	Н	но-в	H	H
(2) Cortisone ^a	COCH, OH	a-OH	Н	0:1	Н	Η
(3) Hydrocortisone acctate ^a	COCH2OCOCH3	HO-0	Н	но-в	н	Η
(4) Cortisone acetate ^a	COCH, OCOCH,	HO-n	Н	0=	Н	н
(5) Progesterone ^a	COCH,	Н	Н	Н	Н	Н
(6) Testosterone ²	, но	H.	Н	Н	Н	Н
(7) Prednisolone ^b	COCH ₂ OH	a-OH	Н	HO-8	Н	Н
(8) Prednisolone acetate ^b	COCH, OCOCH,	a-OH	Н	HO-8	Н	Н
(9) Triamcinolone ^b	COCH, OH	a-QH	ю-он	HO-8	α-F	Н
(10) Triamcinolone acetonide ^b	COCH, OH			HO-8	a-F	Н
(11) Triamcinolone diacetate ^b	COCH ₂ OCOCH ₃		a-OCOCH ₁	НО-8	α-F	H
(12) Dexamethasone ^b	COCH ₂ OH	a-OH	a-CH ₃	но-в	α-F	Н
(13) Betamethasone ^b	COCH ₂ OH	α-OH	B-CH,	B-OH	α-F	H
(14) Dexamethasone acetate ^b	COCH ₂ OCOCH ₃	a-OH	a-CH ₃	но-в	α-F	H
(15) Betamethasone-17-valerate ^b	COCH ₂ OH	a-OCOC ₄ H ₉	B-CH,	но-в	а-F	Н
(16) Paramethasone ^b	COCH, OH	a-QH	a-CH,	B-OH	Н	a-F
(17) Fluocinolone acetonide ^b	COCH ₂ OH	-U C		HO-8	a-F	α-F
(18) Beclomethasone dipropionate ^b	COCH ₂ OCOC ₂ H ₅	a^{-0} COC_2H_5	β-CH ₃	но-я	a-CI	Н
(a) R ₁	(q)	8				

Ŗ Ř لح م







Fig. 1. Phase solubility diagrams of progesterone-CyD systems in water at 25°C. O, α -CyD; \triangle , β -CyD; \Box , γ -CyD. An arrow showing experimental condition of the preparation of solid complex (see text).

This powder corresponded to a 1:2 cortisone acetate- β -CyD complex which had a molecular weight of 2672 ± 5%.

Spectroscopic studies

The CD and UV spectra were taken by a Jasco J-40 S recording spectropolarimeter (Tokyo, Japan) and Hitachi 556S double-beam spectrophotometer (Tokyo, Japan), respectively, at $25 \pm 0.5^{\circ}$ C. The CD spectra were expressed as molar ellipticities (θ) (deg · cm² · dmol⁻¹). The IR spectra were measured as KBr disc, using a Jasco DS-702 double-beam spectrophotometer (Tokyo, Japan).

¹H-NMR spectra were taken on a JEOL JNM-FX 200 spectrometer (200 MHz) (Tokyo, Japan) equipped with a JEOL Fourier-transform computer system (22 K memory), using a 10 mm sample tube. The concentrations of hydrocortisone and CyDs in D₂O solvent were 1.1×10^{-3} M and 4.0×10^{-3} M, respectively. In general, an average of 5000 accumulations with 8000 data points was made at a sweep-width of 2000 Hz. The ¹H-chemical shifts were referenced to external 3-(trimethylsilyl)propanesulfonic acid sodium salt (DSS) with an accuracy of ± 0.0012 ppm. ¹H spin-lattice relaxation times (T₁) were measured by the inversion-recovery method (Freeman and Hill, 1970) using a $(-180^{\circ} - t - 90^{\circ} - T -)$ pulse sequence with $T > 5T_1$ for protons being measured. The T₁ values were obtained by least-squares analysis of $\ln(A_{\infty} - A_1)$ vs t, where A_{∞} , A_1 and t are the peak intensity at time ∞ , the peak intensity at time t, and pulse interval time t in ms, respectively. The slope of the line was taken as $-1/T_1$, with accuracy of $\pm 2\%$.

X-Ray diffractometry

The powder X-ray diffraction patterns were taken by a Rigaku Denki Geiger Flex-2012 diffractometer (Tokyo, Japan). The operation conditions were as follows:

X-ray: Ni-filtered Cu-K α radiation, voltage: 30 kV, current: 20 mA, time constant: 2 s, scanning speed: 1°/min.

Differential thermal analysis (DTA)

All measurements were carried out using a scanning rate of 10°/min on a Shimadzu DT-20B thermal analyzer (Tokyo, Japan).

Dissolution studies

The sample powder was compressed into a cylindrical tablet (diameter 10 mm) at a pressure of about 200 kg/cm². The release of steroid was measured using a rotating disc apparatus (Nogami et al., 1966) in 25 ml water at 91 rpm and 25°C. At appropriate intervals, 1 ml samples were removed from the flask, diluted with 75% ethanol-water solution and assayed spectrophotometrically at the UV maximum of the steroid. Corrections were applied for cumulative dilution caused by replacement of sample by equal volumes of the original medium. The tablets maintained a constant shape throughout the measurement.

Results and Discussion

Inclusion complexation in water

Solubility studies

Fig. 1 shows the phase solubility diagrams obtained for progesterone with 3 CyDs, as a typical example, where the difference in solubility curves was clearly noted. In the case of α -CyD, the solubility of progesterone increased linearly as a function of α -CyD concentration and the solubility curve can be generally classified as type A_L (Higuchi and Connors, 1965). On the other hand, β - and γ -CyD systems showed B_s-type solubility curves with micro-crystalline complexes precipitating at the higher CyD concentrations. The stoichiometries of the complexes in the solid phase were analyzed on the basis of data in the plateau region of the solubility diagrams, and were estimated to be 1:2 for progesterone– β -CyD and 2:3 for progesterone– γ -CyD, respectively. The results were in good agreement with those obtained by isolation and analysis of the solid complexes. In sharp contrast, no precipitation was observed for the α -CyD system. This might be due to the smaller cavity size of α -CyD, therefore allowing very little penetration of the bulky steroid molecule.

The apparent stability constants, K_c , were calculated from the initial straight line portion of the solubility diagrams. The results of the solubility studies and the partition coefficients of steroids are listed in Table 2. In all cases, K_c values increased in the order of $\gamma -> \beta -> \alpha$ -CyD, suggesting that the larger the CyD cavity, the more favorable is the fit of steroid molecules. The hydrophobic guest molecules such as progesterone, triamcinolone acetonide, dexamethasone acetate and fluocinolone acetonide exhibited the greatest binding (largest K_c values), as would be expected from their partition coefficients. However, there was no linear correlation

Ka Type ⁶ Ka Molar ^b Type ⁶ Ka Molar ^b Type ⁶ Ka Molar ^b Type ⁶ Type ⁶ Type ⁶ Ka Molar ^b Type ⁶ Type ⁷	Compound	P.C.ª	a-CyD	system	β-CyD sy	stern	2	γ-CyD sy:	stem		
(1) Hydrocortisone 35.7 5.7 AL 1720 1:2 Bs 2240 2:3 Bs (2) Cortisone 26.2 63 AL 2300 1:2 Bs 2170 2:3 Bs (3) Hydrocortisone acctate 136 AL 2300 1:2 Bs 2170 2:3 Bs (4) Cortisone acctate 126 86 AL 13300 1:2 Bs 2470 2:3 Bs (5) Progesterone 126 86 AL 13300 1:2 Bs 2400 2:3 Bs (6) Testoterone 1960 134 AL 7540 2:3 Bs 2400 2:3 Bs (6) Trancisolone 112 AL 2370 - Ap 2370 - Ap 26100 2:3 Bs (9) Triancinolone 103 1:2 Ap 2330 1:2 Bs 2600 2:3 Bs (10) Trianciolone acctate 83.7			×.	Type "	Kβ	Molar ^b ratio	Type "	K,	Molar ^b ratio	Type ^c	
(2) Cortisone 26.2 6.3 $\overline{A_1}$ 2300 1:2 $\overline{B_5}$ 2170 2:3 $\overline{B_5}$ (3) Hydrocortisone acctate 134 $\overline{A_1}$ 3250 1:2 $\overline{B_5}$ 2170 2:3 $\overline{B_5}$ (4) Cortisone acctate 134 $\overline{A_1}$ 3250 1:2 $\overline{B_5}$ 2470 2:3 $\overline{B_5}$ (5) Progesterone 134 $\overline{A_1}$ 3230 1:2 $\overline{B_5}$ 2400 2:3 $\overline{B_5}$ (6) Testosterone 1960 134 $\overline{A_1}$ 7540 1:2 $\overline{B_5}$ 2400 2:3 $\overline{B_5}$ (6) Transcione 414 298 $\overline{A_1}$ 370 1:2 $\overline{B_5}$ 3240 2:3 $\overline{B_5}$ 3260 1:2 $\overline{B_5}$ 3260 2:3 $\overline{B_5}$ $\overline{B_5}$ 3260 2:3	(1) Hydrocortisone	35.7	57	A.	1720	1:2	B	2240	2:3	Bs	
(3) Hydrocortisone acctate 154 88 $A_{\rm L}$ 3250 1:2 $B_{\rm S}$ 2270 2:3 $B_{\rm S}$ (4) Cortisone acctate 126 86 $A_{\rm L}$ 31300 1:2 $B_{\rm S}$ 2470 2:3 $B_{\rm S}$ (5) Progesterone 7410 145 $A_{\rm L}$ 7540 2:3 $B_{\rm S}$ 2470 2:3 $B_{\rm S}$ (5) Progesterone 1960 134 $A_{\rm L}$ 7540 2:3 $B_{\rm S}$ 24000 2:3 $B_{\rm S}$ (7) Prednisolone 1960 1:2 $B_{\rm S}$ 2400 2:3 $B_{\rm S}$ 3240 2:3 $B_{\rm S}$ (1) Prednisolone 2:0 274 $A_{\rm L}$ 2370 1:2 $B_{\rm S}$ 24000 2:3 $B_{\rm S}$ (10) Triamcinolone 10.8 121 $A_{\rm L}$ 2370 1:2 $B_{\rm S}$ 2100 2:3 $B_{\rm S}$ (10) Triamcinolone 2:0 2:1 $A_{\rm L}$ 2330 - $A_{\rm L}$ 2540 2:3 $B_{\rm S}$ (10) Triamcinolone diactate 8:1	(2) Cortisone	26.2	63	A ^r	2300	1:2	, a	2170	2:3	B,	
(4) Cortisone acetate 126 86 A_1 4150 1:2 B_2 2470 2:3 B_3 (5) Progesterone 7410 145 A_1 13300 1:2 B_3 2470 2:3 B_3 (6) Testosterone 1960 134 A_1 7540 2:3 B_3 16500 1:2 B_3 (7) Preduisolone 414 298 A_1 3600 1:2 B_3 3240 2:3 B_3 (7) Preduisolone 211 A_1 3730 1:2 B_3 3240 2:3 B_3 (9) Triamcinolone 10.8 121 A_1 2370 1:2 B_3 <td>(3) Hydrocortisone acetate</td> <td>154</td> <td>88</td> <td>• •</td> <td>3250</td> <td>1:2</td> <td>'n</td> <td>2270</td> <td>2:3</td> <td>B,</td> <td></td>	(3) Hydrocortisone acetate	154	88	• •	3250	1:2	'n	2270	2:3	B,	
(5) Progesterone 7410 145 A_{L} 13300 1:2 B_{S}^{*} 24000 2:3 B_{S}^{*} (6) Testosterone 1960 134 A_{L} 7540 2:3 B_{S}^{*} 16500 1:2 B_{S}^{*} (7) Prednisolone 414 298 A_{L} 7540 2:3 B_{S}^{*} 16500 1:2 B_{S}^{*} (9) Triamcinolone 121 A_{L} 2370 1:2 B_{S}^{*} 9920 2:3 B_{S}^{*} (10) Triamcinolone acetate 256 A_{L} 3530 1:2 B_{S}^{*} 12100 2:3 B_{S}^{*} (10) Triamcinolone diacetate 83.7 300 A_{L} 3530 1:2 B_{S}^{*} 12100 2:3 B_{S}^{*} (11) Triamcinolone diacetate 83.7 300 A_{L} 3530 1:2 B_{S}^{*} 12100 2:3 B_{S}^{*} (10) Triamcinolone acetonide 87.7 223 A_{L} 3540 1:2 B_{S}^{*} 21600 2:3 B_{S}^{*} (13) Betamethasone 67.8 </td <td>(4) Cortisone acetate</td> <td>126</td> <td>86</td> <td>A_L</td> <td>4150</td> <td>1:2</td> <td>B</td> <td>2470</td> <td>2:3</td> <td>B.</td> <td></td>	(4) Cortisone acetate	126	86	A _L	4150	1:2	B	2470	2:3	B.	
(6) Testosterone 1960 134 $A_{\rm L}$ 7540 2:3 $B_{\rm S}$ 16500 1:2 $B_{\rm S}$ (7) Prednisolone 414 298 $A_{\rm L}$ 3600 1:2 $B_{\rm S}$ 3240 2:3 $B_{\rm S}$ (8) Prednisolone acctate 250 274 $A_{\rm P}$ 3600 1:2 $B_{\rm S}$ 3240 2:3 $B_{\rm S}$ (9) Triamcinolone 10.8 121 $A_{\rm L}$ 2370 1:2 $B_{\rm S}$ 9920 2:3 $B_{\rm S}$ (10) Triamcinolone acctonide 205 256 $A_{\rm L}$ 3530 1:2 $B_{\rm S}$ 12100 2:3 $B_{\rm S}$ (11) Triamcinolone acctonide 205 256 $A_{\rm L}$ 3530 1:2 $B_{\rm S}$ 26600 2:3 $B_{\rm S}$ (11) Triamcinolone acctate 83.7 200 $A_{\rm L}$ 3530 1:2 $B_{\rm S}$ 21600 2:3 $B_{\rm S}$ (12) Dexamethasone 67.8 169 $A_{\rm L}$ 5420 1:2	(5) Progesterone	7410	145	Υ ^Γ	13300	1:2	, B	24000	2:3	B,	
(1) Prednisolone 414 298 A_1 3600 1:2 B_5 3240 2:3 B_5 (8) Prednisolone acctate 250 274 A_P 5770 $ A_P$ 3800 2:3 B_5 (9) Triamcinolone acctate 250 274 A_P 5770 $ A_P$ 380 2:3 B_5 (10) Triamcinolone acctonide 205 256 A_1 3530 1:2 B_5 9920 2:3 B_5 (10) Triamcinolone acctonide 205 256 A_1 3530 1:2 B_5 B_5 (11) Triamcinolone diacetate 83.7 300 A_1 3530 1:2 B_5 B_5 (13) Betamethasone 87.7 223 A_1 5420 1:2 B_5 B_5 (14) Dexamethasone 87.7 302 A_1 5420 1:2 B_5 B_5 (15) Betamethasone 580 310 2.2 B_5 B_6 </td <td>(6) Testosterone</td> <td>1960</td> <td>134</td> <td>A_</td> <td>7540</td> <td>2:3</td> <td>'n</td> <td>16500</td> <td>1:2</td> <td>B_S</td> <td></td>	(6) Testosterone	1960	134	A_	7540	2:3	'n	16500	1:2	B _S	
(8) Prednisolone acctate 250 274 $\overline{A_P}$ 5770 - $\overline{A_P}$ 380 2:3 $\overline{B_S}$ (9) Triamcinolone 10.8 121 $\overline{A_L}$ 2370 1:2 $\overline{B_S}$ 9920 2:3 $\overline{B_S}$ (10) Triamcinolone acctonide 205 256 $\overline{A_L}$ 3230 - $\overline{A_L}$ 26100 2:3 $\overline{B_S}$ (11) Triamcinolone diacetate 83.7 300 $\overline{A_L}$ 3530 1:2 $\overline{B_S}$ 12100 2:3 $\overline{B_S}$ (11) Triamcinolone diacetate 83.7 300 $\overline{A_L}$ 3530 1:2 $\overline{B_S}$ 12100 2:3 $\overline{B_S}$ (13) Betamethasone 87.7 223 $\overline{A_L}$ 5420 1:2 $\overline{B_S}$ 21600 2:3 $\overline{B_S}$ (14) Dexamethasone 87.7 223 $\overline{A_L}$ 2540 - $\overline{A_L}$ 37300 2:3 $\overline{B_S}$ (15) Betamethasone 307 302 $\overline{A_L}$ 2540 - $\overline{A_L}$ 37300 2:3 $\overline{B_S}$ (5) Betamethasone 580 <	(7) Prednisolone	414	298	A.	3600	1:2	B	3240	2:3	B,	
(9) Triamcinolone 10.8 121 A_L 2370 1:2 B_s 9920 2:3 B_s 9100 11000 11000 11000 11000 11000 11000 1	(8) Prednisolone acetate	250	274	A _P	5770	ł	Å,	3 880	2:3	, B,	
	(9) Triamcinolone	10.8	121	A.	2370	1:2	Ŕ	9920	2:3	Bs	
	(10) Triamcinolone acetonide	205	256	A.	3 2 3 0	1	A.	26100	2:3	Bs	
(12) Dexamethasone 67.8 169 $A_{\rm L}$ 4660 $1:2$ $B_{\rm S}$ 26600 $2:3$ $B_{\rm S}$ (13) Betamethasone 87.7 223 $A_{\rm L}$ 5420 $1:2$ $B_{\rm S}$ 21600 $2:3$ $B_{\rm S}$ (14) Dexamethasone 87.7 223 $A_{\rm L}$ 5560 $ A_{\rm L}$ 37300 $2:3$ $B_{\rm S}$ (14) Dexamethasone 806 316 $A_{\rm P}$ 9560 $ A_{\rm L}$ 37300 $2:3$ $B_{\rm S}$ (15) Betamethasone 17 -valerate 307 302 $A_{\rm L}$ 2990 $1:2$ $B_{\rm S}$ 9850 $2:3$ $B_{\rm S}$ (16) Paramethasone 580 489 $A_{\rm P}$ 2540 $ A_{\rm L}$ 31900 $2:3$ $B_{\rm S}$ (17) Fluocinolone acetonide 1120 297 $A_{\rm P}$ 1120 $ A_{\rm L}$ 31900 $2:3$ $B_{\rm S}$ (18) Beclomethasone dipropionate 3340 354 $A_{\rm P}$ 1120 $ A_{\rm L}$ 6300 $1:2$ $B_{\rm S}$	(11) Triamcinolone diacetate	83.7	300	A.	3 530	1:2	'nď	12100	2:3	B	
(13) Betamethasone 87.7 223 A_L 5420 $1:2$ B_S 21600 $2:3$ B_S (14) Dexamethasone acetate 806 316 A_P 9560 $ A_L$ 37300 $2:3$ B_S (15) Betamethasone acetate 806 316 A_P 9560 $ A_L$ 37300 $2:3$ B_S (15) Betamethasone-17-valerate 307 302 A_L 2990 $1:2$ B_S 9850 $2:3$ B_S (16) Paramethasone 580 489 A_P 2540 $ A_L$ 8310 $2:3$ B_S (17) Fluocinolone acetonide 1120 297 A_L 3000 $ A_L$ 31900 $2:3$ B_S (18) Beclomethasone dipropionate 3340 354 A_P 1120 $ A_L$ 6300 $1:2$ B_S	(12) Dexamethasone	67.8	169	A.	4660	1:2	'nď	26 600	2:3	B.	
(14) Dexamethasone acetate 806 316 A_p 9560 $ A_L$ 37300 2:3 B_s (15) Betamethasone-17-valerate 307 302 A_L 2990 1:2 B_s 9850 2:3 B_s (16) Paramethasone-17-valerate 307 302 A_L 2990 1:2 B_s 9850 2:3 B_s (16) Paramethasone 580 489 A_p 2540 $ A_L$ 8310 2:3 B_s (17) Fluocinolone acetonide 1120 297 A_L 3000 $ A_L$ 31900 2:3 B_s (18) Beclomethasone dipropionate 3340 354 A_p 1120 $ A_L$ 6300 1:2 B_s	(13) Betamethasone	87.7	223	A _L	5420	1:2	'n.	21600	2:3	B _S	
 Betamethasone-17-valerate 307 302 A_L Betamethasone 17-valerate 307 302 A_L Paramethasone 7-valerate 307 302 A_L Paramethasone 580 489 A_P Paramethasone 2540 - A_L Betamethasone 31900 2:3 B_S Fluocinolone acetonide 1120 297 A_L Betamethasone 41900 2:3 B_S Betamethasone 41900 1:2 B_S 	(14) Dexamethasone acetate	806	316	Ap	9560	1	A.	37300	2:3	Å	
(16) Paramethasone 580 489 $A_{\rm P}$ 2540 - $A_{\rm L}$ 8310 2:3 $\bar{B}_{\rm S}$ (17) Fluccinolone acetonide 1120 297 $A_{\rm L}$ 3000 - $A_{\rm L}$ 31900 2:3 $\bar{B}_{\rm S}$ (18) Beclomethasone dipropionate 3340 $3_{\rm P}$ 1120 - $A_{\rm L}$ 6300 1:2 $B_{\rm S}$	(15) Betamethasone-17-valerate	307	302	A L	2990	1:2	Å	9850	2:3	Ba	
 (17) Fluocinolone acetonide 1120 297 A_L 3000 A_L 31900 2:3 B_S (18) Beclomethasone dipropionate 3340 354 A_P 1120 A_L 6300 1:2 B_S 	(16) Paramethasone	580	489	AP	2540	ł	AL AL	8310	2:3	ıŋ Ş	
(18) Beclomethasone dipropionate 3340 354 $A_{\rm P}$ 1120 – $A_{\rm L}$ 6300 1:2 $B_{\rm S}$	(17) Fluocinolone acetonide	1120	297	AL	3000	ı	AL	31900	2:3	B,	
	(18) Beclomethasone dipropionate	3340	354	AP	1120	1	A L	6 300	1:2	'n	

STABILITY CONSTANTS (K_c, M⁻¹), STOICHIOMETRIES, TYPES OF PHASE SOLUBILITY DIAGRAMS AND PARTITION COEFFICIENTS (P.C.) FOR STEROID-CVD SYSTEMS AT 25°C **TABLE 2**

^a The partition coefficient (n-octanol/water) of steroid taken from Tomida et al. (1978). ^b Steroid: CyD

^c The type of phase solubility diagrams was defined according to Higuchi and Connors (1965).

between the K_c values and the partition coefficients, which may be due in part to the heterogeneous nature of the steroid substituents. The importance of the spatial relationship between host and guest molecules is most clearly noted in the stoichiometries of the solid complexes. The β - and γ -CyDs generally formed 1:2 and 2:3 complexes with steroids, respectively, although there were some exceptions. These findings suggest that steric and hydrophobic factors of the host and guest molecules were responsible for these interactions.

UV and CD studies

The solubility studies showed that the steroid hormones will form soluble complexes with the 3 CyDs. These interactions in aqueous solution were further examined by UV and CD spectroscopy. Hydrocortisone was selected for this study



WAVELENGTH (nm)

Fig. 2. Circular dichroism (A) and UV absorption (B) spectra of hydrocortisone in the absence and presence of β -CyD in water at 25°C. Hydrocortisone, 9.45×10⁻⁵ M; β -CyD, 5.0×10⁻³ M. — hydrocortisone; -----, hydrocortisone + β -CyD.

because it is relatively water-soluble and its spectral data are easily analyzed.

Fig. 2 shows the UV and CD spectra of hydrocortisone in the absence and presence of β -CyD in water. Hydrocortisone exhibited an intense UV maximum around 250 nm due to a π - π^* transition of the conjugated carbonyl group and showed at least two Cotton effects between 220 and 400 nm associated with the π - π^* and n- π^* carbonyl transitions (Crabbe, 1972), respectively. On the addition of β -CyD, the positive and negative CD peaks shifted to a longer wavelength with an increase in optical activity, accompanying the decrease in absorbance in the UV spectrum. When hydrocortisone was dissolved in a 50% methanol-water solution, similar spectral changes were observed. These facts suggest that the chromophores of the steroid molecule may be located in the hydrophobic CyD cavity.

NMR studies

¹H-NMR technique (200 MHz) was employed to gain insight into the inclusion mode of the hydrocortisone-CyD complexes in aqueous solution. The assignments for hydrocortisone (Hampel and Kraemer, 1966) and CyDs (Demarco and Thakkar, 1970) were further confirmed by a decoupling experiment in this study. The effects of hydrocortisone on ¹H-chemical shifts of CyDs are summarized in Table 3. It was expected that if inclusion does indeed occur, protons located within or near the cavity (e.g. H-3, H-5 or H-6) should be strongly shielded by aromatic moiety of guest molecule (Demarco and Thakkar, 1970). Alternatively, if association takes place at the exterior of the torus, H-1, H-2 and H-4 should be more strongly affected. As can be seen in Table 3, all protons experience a shielding effect, indicating that hydrocortisone may interact both on the exterior surface at the CyD cavity as well as in the

TABLE	3
-------	---

HYDROCORTISONE-INDUCED CHEMICAL	_ SHIFT	CHANGES	OF	CVE)5
---------------------------------	---------	---------	----	-----	----

Proton	Δδ (ppm)	99994-1-367,		
	a-CyD	β-CyD	γ-CyD	
H	0.006	- 0.009	-0.012	
H ₂	-0.002	-0.002	-0.005	
H	-0.017	-0.039	0.032	
H₄	-0.004	-0.006	··· 0.006	
H ₅	-0.007	-0.042	- 0.042	
H ₆	0.006	-0.020	-0.016	

 $\Delta\delta$ is difference in chemical shifts of CyDs in the presence and absence of hydrocortisone. Negative sign indicated the upfield displacement. Accuracy of chemical shift is ± 0.0012 ppm.



CyD-INDUCED CHEMICAL	SHIFT CHANGES OF HYDROCORTISONE
Denter 48/	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

Proton	Δδ (ppm)			
	a-CyD	β-CyD	γ-CyD	
H ₍₄₎	0.137	0.092	0.044	
CH ₃₍₁₈₎	0.011	0.087	0.031	
CH ₃₍₁₉₎	0.032	0.142	0.065	

 $\Delta\delta$ is the difference in chemical shifts of hydrocortisone in the presence and absence of CyDs. CH₂OH



TABLE 4

interior. When attention was directed toward the interior protons (H-3 and H-5), the magnitude of the upfield shift decreased in the order of $\beta - \gamma - \alpha - CyD$. The upfield shift of H-5 in α -CyD was significantly smaller than the other CyDs. These data suggest that the hydrocortisone molecule is located at the entrance of the α -CyD cavity, it could penetrate further into the β -CyD cavity, and is loosely bound to γ -CyD. Table 4 summarizes the effects of CyDs on some ¹H-chemical shifts (C₄-H, C_{18} -methyl, and C_{19} -methyl) of hydrocortisone. Unfortunately, the other proton signals were too weak to be quantitatively analyzed under the experimental conditions used. In the presence of CyDs, all the signals moved downfield, probably due to the steric perturbation through inclusion complex formation (Cheney, 1968; Suzuki and Sasaki, 1979). The smaller the CyD cavity size, the larger the deshielding effect of the C_4 -proton was observed. The downfield shifts of the C_4 -H and C_{19} -methyl protons were apparently greater than that of C_{18} -methyl protons, particularly for β -CyD. These facts suggest that the A-ring of hydrocortisone may strongly interact with β -CyD. The molecular motions of the inclusion complex between hydrocortisone and β -CyD was further examined by means of ¹H-nuclear

TABLE 5

EFFECT OF β -Cyd on some 'H spin-lattice relaxation times of Hydrocortisone

Proton	T ₁ (s)		
	Without β -CyD (I ₀)	With β -CyD (1)	I ₀ /I
H	1,44	0.336	4.29
CHWB	0.410	0.230	1.78
CH ₃₍₁₉₎	0.498	0.194	2.57

relaxation measurements. Table 5 summarizes the effects of β -CyD on the spin-lattice relaxation times (T₁) of some hydrocortisone protons. In the presence of β -CyD, the T₁ values decreased by a factor of about 3; the most significant decrease in T₁ occurred for the C₄ proton. This suggests that the molecular motion of hydrocortisone, particularly of the A-ring was reduced is a consequence of the coupling of its motion to that of β -CyD. This is consistent with observation made with the space-filling Corey-Pauling-Koltun molecular models of the inclusion complexes.

Inclusion complexation in solid state

Microcrystalline complexes of the steroids with the β - and γ -CyDs were examined by X-ray diffractometry, IR spectroscopy and DTA measurement, and compared with the corresponding physical mixtures in the same molar ratio.

Fig. 3 shows the powder X-ray diffraction patterns of the hydrocortisone-CyD complexes and their physical mixtures. The diffraction patterns of the physical



Fig. 3. Powder X-ray diffraction patterns of hydrocortisone-CyD system. (A) physical mixture of hydrocortisone and β -CyD; (B) complex of hydrocortisone with β -CyD; (C) physical mixture of hydrocortisone and γ -CyD; (D) complex of hydrocortisone with γ -CyD.



Fig. 4. IR spectra of hydrocortisone-CyD system, measured by KBr disc method. (A) β -CyD system; (B) γ -CyD system. -----, physical mixture of hydrocortisone and CyD; ------, complex of hydrocortisone with CyD.

mixtures were simply the superposition of each component, while those of CyD complexes were apparently different from each constituent and constitute a new solid phase. The CyD complexes gave somewhat diffuse diffraction patterns, suggesting that they are much less crystalline than the physical mixtures. It was difficult to determine the crystal packing of the complexes because the diffraction patterns were too complicated to be reliably indexed by the powder method (Takeo and Kuge, 1969).

Fig. 4 shows IR spectra of hydrocortisone-CyD complexes and their physical mixtures, in the carbonyl-stretching regions. The peaks at 1643 cm⁻¹ and 1710 cm⁻¹ are assigned to carbonyl-stretching bands of C_3 and C_{20} in hydrocortisone, respectively (Dence, 1980). In the cases of β - and γ -CyD complexes, the 1643 cm⁻¹ band shifted to 1655 cm⁻¹ and 1653 cm⁻¹, respectively, while no appreciable shift was observed for the 1710 cm⁻¹ band. These spectral changes can be explained by the dissociation of the intermolecular hydrogen bonds of hydrocortisone (Weeks et al., 1973) through inclusion complexation.

Fig. 5 shows the DTA thermograms of the testosterone-CyD systems. The physical mixtures showed an endothermic peak around 155° corresponding to the melting temperature of testosterone. The interactions of testosterone with both β -and γ -CyDs were accompanied by the disappearance of this endothermic peak, as would be expected (Uekama et al., 1979). A similar trend in the DTA thermograms



Fig. 5. DTA thermograms of testosterone-CyD systems. (1) testosterone; (2) physical mixture of testosterone and β -CyD; (3) complex of testosterone with β -CyD; (4) physical mixture of testosterone and γ -CyD; (5) complex of testosterone with γ -CyD.

was observed for all other steroid-CyD systems. The above results clearly indicate that the steroid-CyDs (β - and γ -CyDs) complexes exist in the solid state.

Dissolution behaviors of the complexes

The typical dissolution curves obtained for progesterone and its β - and γ -CyD complexes in water are shown in Fig. 6. It is evident that the dissolution rate of progesterone was significantly improved by complex formation, particularly by the γ -CyD complex. Table 6 summarizes the apparent dissolution rates $(k_0, k_\beta \text{ and } k_\gamma)$ and solubilities $(S_0, S_\beta, \text{ and } S_\gamma)$ of steroids and their β - and γ -CyD complexes. The S_β and S_γ values were estimated from the downward curvatures of the B_s -type phase solubility diagrams obtained for the β - and γ -CyD systems, respectively. The apparent dissolution rates were found to correlate well with the apparent solubilities



Fig. 6. Dissolution profiles of progesterone and its CyD complexes in water at 25°C by rotating disc method. O, progesterone; Δ , β -CyD complex: \Box , γ -CyD complex.

of the solid sample, as shown in Table 6. The apparent dissolution rate of the complex is known to be dependent upon various factors such as solubility, diffusion coefficient and the dissociation of the complex in the dissolution medium (Donbrow and Touitou, 1978). An attempt was made to analyze the dissolution rates of the complexes in terms of their solubility and dissociation constant $(1/K_e)$, using the method of multiple regression. Good correlations were found for both β - and γ -CyD systems with a correlation coefficient, r > 0.95 at the 99% confidence level.

$$\log k_{\beta} = 0.536 \log S_{\beta} + 0.322 \log(1/K_{c}) - 2.59$$
 (β -CyD system:

$$n = 7, r = 0.986, s = 0.075)$$

TABLE 6

APPARENT DISSOLUTION RATES (k) AND SOLUBILITIES (S) OF STEROID-CyD SYSTEMS IN WATER AT 25°C

Compound	Steroid		β -CyD complex		γ-CyD co	mplex
	k₀ (×10 ⁷ M∕min)	$\frac{S_0}{(\times 10^4 \text{ M})}$	$\frac{k_{\beta}}{(\times 10^7)}$ M/min)	$\frac{S_{\mu}}{(\times 10^5 \text{ M})}$	$rac{k_{\gamma}}{(imes 10^6}$ M/min)	S _γ (×10 ⁴ M)
Hydrocortisone	22.8	18.5	34.8	57.2	5.34	9.35
Cortisone	12.6	8.67	9,00	4.38	5.35	4.81
Hydrocortisone acetate	0.362	0.625	33.0	37.3	2.74	1.75
Cortisone acetate	1.01	0.784	12.0	6.82	1.77	1.50
Progesterone	0.797	0.532	4.39	3.14	1.60	1.44
Testosterone	2,70	1.29	7.97	7.82	8.80	12.1
Betamethasone	5.60	2.38	34.8	7.63	5.43	5.56

$$\log k_{\gamma} = 0.692 \log S_{\gamma} + 0.053 \log(1/K_c) - 2.87 \quad (\gamma - CyD \text{ system}:)$$

$$n = 7, r = 0.959, s = 0.097) \quad (3)$$

This suggests that both the solubility and the dissociation of the complexes are responsible for the apparent dissolution rates of the complexes. Further investigations should be made to elucidate the dissolution mechanism of the CyD complexes, since the wettability and diffusion coefficient of the complexes should not be excluded. This kind of knowledge will provide both a rational basis for formulation design and a means for enhancing the bioavailability of poorly soluble steroids.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank Miss M. Araki for her technical assistance.

References

- Chency, B.V., Magnetic deshielding of proton due to intramolecular steric interactions with proximate hydrogens. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 90 (1968) 5386-5390.
- Crabbe, P., ORD and CD in Chemistry and Biochemistry, Academic Press, New York and London, 1972, pp. 43-50.
- Demarco, P.V. and Thakkar, A.L., Cyclohepta-amylose inclusion complexes: a proton magnetic study. Chem. Commun., (1970) 2.
- Dence, B.J., Steroids and Peptides. Wiley-Interscience John Wiley, New York-Chinchester-Brisbane-Toronto, 1980, pp. 38–42.
- Donbrow, M. and Touitou, E., Estimation of dissolution rate of salicylamide in complexing media using a theoretical diffusion model. J. Pharm. Sci., 67 (1978) 95–98.
- Freeman, R. and Hill, H.D.W., Spin-lattice relaxation in high-resolution NMR apectra of carbon-13, J. Chem. Phys., 53 (1970) 4103-4105.
- Hample, von B. and Kraemer, J.M., Die kernressonanzspekten von steroiden in polaren lössungmitteln-II: Pridin. Tetrahedron, 22 (1966) 1601–1613.

Higuchi, T. and Connors, K.A., Phase-solubility techniques, Adv. Anal. Chem. Instr., 4 (1965) 117-212.

- Higuchi, T. and Lach, J.L., Investigation of some complexes formed in solution by caffeine IV: Interactions between caffeine and sulfathiazole, sulfadiazine, p-aminobenzoic acid, benzocaine, phenobarbital and barbital. J. Am. Pharm. Assoc., Sci. Edn., 43 (1954) 349-354.
- Lach, J.L. and Pauli, W.A., Interaction of pharmaceutical with Schardinger dextrins VI: interaction of β -cyclodextrin, sodium deoxycholate and deoxycholic acid with amines and pharmaceutical agents. J. Pharm. Sci., 55 (1966) 32-38.
- Lundberg, B., Lovgren, T. and Heikius, B., Simultaneous solubilization of steroid hormones II: androgens and estrogens. J. Pharm. Sci., 68 (1979) 542-545.
- Nogami, H., Nagai, T. and Suzuki, A., Studies on powdered preparations XVII: dissolution rate of sulfonamides by rotating disk method. Chem. Pharm. Bull., 14 (1966) 329-338.
- Saenger, W., Cyclodextrin inclusion compounds in research and industry. Angew. Chem. Int. Edn. Engl., 19 (1980) 344-362.
- Suzuki, M. and Sasaki, Y., Inclusion compounds of cyclodextrins and azo dye I: Methyl orange. Chem. Pharm. Bull., 27 (1979) 609-619.
- Takeo, K. and Kuge, T., Complexes of starchy materials with organic compounds III: X-ray studies on amylose and cyclodextrin complexes. Agr. Biol. Chem., 33 (1969) 1174-1180.

- Thakkar, A.L. and Hall, N.A., Micellar solubilization of testosterone II: in aqueous solutions of some ionic surfactants. J. Pharm. Sci., 57 (1968) 1394-1398.
- Tomida, H., Yotsuyanagi, T. and Ikeda, K., Solubilization of steroid hormones by polyoxyethylene lauryl ether. Chem. Pharm. Bull., 26 (1978) 2832-2837.
- Uekama, K., Inclusion complexes of cyclodextrins with organic drug molecules. Jap. J. Antibiot., 32 (1979) s-103-111.
- Uekama, K., Hirayama, F., Esaki, K. and Inoue, M., Inclusion complexes of cyclodextrins with cinnamic acid derivatives: Dissolution and thermal behavior. Chem. Pharm. Bull., 27 (1979) 76-79.
- Weeks, C.M., Duax, W.L. and Wolff, M.E., A comparison of the molecular structure of six corticosteroids. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 95 (1973) 2865-2868.