International Journal of Pharmaceutics, 63 (1990) 83–93
Elsevier

IJP 02187

Workshop Report

Report of the workshop on: in vitro and in vivo testing and correlation for oral controlled/modified release dosage forms

Co-sponsored by the American Association of Pharmaceutical Scientists, U.S. Food and Drug Administration, Federation Internationale Pharmaceutique and United States Pharmacopeial Convention, Inc.

December 1988, Washington, DC

Jerome P. Skelly [1], Gordon L. Amidon [2], William H. Barr [3], Leslie Z. Benet [4], James E. Carter [5], Joseph R. Robinson [6], Vinod P. Shah [1] and Avraham Yacobi [7]

(Received 15 April 1990)
(Accepted 9 May 1990)

Contributors:

Jean-Marc Aiache [8], Kenneth S. Albert [9], Gordon L. Amidon [2], William H. Barr [3], Leslie Z. Benet [4], James E. Carter [5], Vernon M. Chinchilli [3], Alexander H.C. Chun [10], Stanley S. Davis [11], Karl A. DeSante [12], Michael R. Dobrinska [13], Hugo E. Gallo-Torres [14], Arthur H. Goldberg [15], Mario A. Gonzalez [16], Ursula Gundert-Remy [17], John G. Harter [18], Barbara Hubert [19], Lewis J. Leeson [20], Raymond J. Lipicky [21], Henry J. Malinowski [1], John W. Mauger [22], James H. Meyer [23], Helga Moller [24], K. George Mooney [7], A. Nicklasson [25], Patrick K. Noonan [26], Joseph R. Robinson [6], Malcolm Rowland [27], Vinod P. Shah [1], Gerald K. Shiu [1], Jerome P. Skelly [1], C.T. Viswanathan [1], Peter G. Welling [28] and Avraham Yacobi [7]

[1] Food and Drug Administration, Division of Biopharmaceutics, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857 (U.S.A.), [2] University of Michigan, College of Pharmacy, Ann Arbor, MI 48109 (U.S.A.), [3] Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA 23298-0032 (U.S.A.), [4] University of California, School of Pharmacy (S-926), San Francisco, CA 94143-0446 (U.S.A.), [5] Janssen Pharmaceutica Inc., 40 Kingsbridge Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854 (U.S.A.), [6] University of Wisconsin, School of Pharmacy, 425 North Charter Street, Madison, WI 53706 (U.S.A.), [7] American Cyanamid Co., Middletown Road, Pearl River, NY 10965 (U.S.A.), [8] Faculty of Pharmacy, 28 Place Henri Dunant, 63001 Clermont-Ferrand Cedex (France), [9] Forest Laboratories Inc., 150 East 58th Street, New York, NY 10155-0015 (U.S.A.), [10] Abbott Laboratories, Abbott Park, North Chicago, IL 60064 (U.S.A.), [11] Nottingham University, Department of Pharmacy, University Park, Nottingham NG7 2RD (U.K.), [12] Eli Lilly and Co., 1001 West 10th Street, Wishard Memorial Hospital, Indianapolis, IN 46202 (U.S.A.), [13] Merck Sharp and Dohme, W26A-2044, West Point, PA 19486 (U.S.A.), [14] Food and Drug Administration, Division of Gastrointestinal and Coagulation Drug Products, CDER, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857 (U.S.A.), [15] Chelsea Laboratories, 896 Orlando Avenue, West Hempstead, NY 11552 (U.S.A.), [16] Schering Research Corp., 50 North West 176th Street, Miami, FL 33169 (U.S.A.), [17] BGA, Federal Health Office, Seestr. 10, D-1000 Berlin 65 (Germany), [18] Food and Drug Administration, Division of Oncology and Radiopharmaceuticals, Center for Drug Evaluation and

Correspondence: V.P. Shah, Food and Drug Administration, Division of Biopharmaceutics, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857, U.S.A.

Research, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857 (U.S.A.), [19] *United States Pharmacopeial Convention, Inc., 12601 Twinbrook Parkway, Rockville, MD 20852 (U.S.A.),* [20] *CIBA-GEIGY Corp., 556 Morris Avenue, Summit, NJ 07901 (U.S.A.),* [21] *Food and Drug Administration, Division of Cardio-Renal Drug Products, CDER, Rockville, MD 20857 (U.S.A.),* [22] *West Virginia University, School of Pharmacy, Morgantown, WV 26505 (U.S.A.),* [23] *Veterans Administration Medical Center, Building 3, Room 257, 16111 Plummer Street, Sepulveda, CA 91343 (U.S.A.),* [24] *Hoechst AG, Pharma Qualitätskontrolle, Postfach 800320, D-6230 Frankfurt a.M. (F.R.G.),* [25] *Astra Laekemedel Research and Development Laboratories, Pharmaceutics and Solid Systems, 15185 Soedertaelje (Sweden),* [26] *Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc., P.O. Box 4293, Morgantown, WV 26505 (U.S.A.),* [27] *University of Manchester, Department of Pharmacy, Manchester M13 9PL (U.K.) and* [28] *Warner-Lambert Co., 2800 Plymouth Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48105 (U.S.A.)*

Introduction

This report is from the second workshop held in Washington DC on controlled/modified release dosage forms. The consensus of the first workshop (September–October 1985) sponsored by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA, Agency), Academy of Pharmaceutical Sciences, American Society for Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics and Drug Information Association was published in Pharmaceutical Research, Vol. 4, No. 1 (1987) pp. 75–77. This report is a synthesis of the first workshop report, and the recommendations of the second workshop.

The objectives of this second workshop were to determine the optimum information needed to characterize the drug entity and the drug dosage form, to explore the in vitro-in vivo relationship so as to determine the criteria for establishing an in vitro-in vivo correlation as well as the usefulness of in vitro data in the drug approval/regulatory process. Since the report is directed primarily towards oral controlled release dosage forms, designated modified-release by the United States Pharmacopeia (USP), the words controlled-release and modified-release are used interchangeably.

Controlled-release pharmaceutical dosage forms may offer one or more advantages over conventional or immediate-release dosage forms of the same drug, including a reduced dosing frequency, a decreased incidence and/or intensity of adverse effects, greater selectivity of pharmacologic activity, and a more constant or prolonged therapeutic effect. In some cases, controlled-release products may be therapeutically advantageous primarily for certain subpopulations of patients. In other instances, controlled-release products may have no significant advantages or they may actually be less effective and/or more hazardous than conventional dosage forms of the same drug. Ordinarily, oral controlled-release dosage forms should not be developed unless the recommended dosage interval for the controlled-release dosage form is longer than that for the immediate-release dosage form or unless significant clinical advantages for the controlled release dosage form can be justified (for example, decreased side-effects resulting from a lower C_{max} with the controlled-release dosage form relative to the immediate-release dosage form).

Guidelines for the evaluation of controlled-release pharmaceutical dosage forms may provide assistance to those designing, conducting and evaluating studies. However, it is important at the outset to recognize that each drug may possess inherent properties that require considerations specific to that drug and its dosage forms which may override the generalities of these guidelines.

This paper revises the informal guidelines published in 1987 for the design, conduct, and evaluation of studies of controlled-release pharmaceutical dosage forms. As was the case previously, no attempt has been made to achieve completeness. The report has been written with the recognition that it can and should be improved. Comments on the proposal are, therefore, solicited and are welcomed. While this guideline is primarily designed with oral drug delivery systems in mind, the general principles are applicable to other controlled-release drug delivery routes, e.g., transdermal, intramuscular, intranasal, etc.

In some cases, it is desirable to evaluate controlled-release dosage forms in the anticipated target population(s). Thus, drugs intended for use in pediatric patients should be studied in children, whereas products intended for geriatric patients should be studied in geriatric subjects. Since con-

trolled-release dosage forms may contain a relatively large amount of drug compared to conventional dosage forms, postmarket surveillance for unanticipated effects is essential.

Need for Clinical Studies

A fundamental question in evaluating a controlled-release product is whether formal clinical studies of the dosage form's safety and efficacy are needed or whether a pharmacokinetic evaluation will suffice. A rational answer to this question must be based on evaluation of pharmacokinetic properties and plasma concentration effect relationship of the drug. Where there is a well-defined predictive relationship between plasma concentration(s) of drug and/or active metabolite(s) and clinical response (therapeutic and adverse), it may be possible to rely on plasma concentration data alone as a basis for the approval of the controlled-release product. This may be true, for example, where the degree of fluctuation $[(C_{max} - C_{min})/\bar{C}]$ (see Glossary, p. 92) of plasma concentration following dosing of the immediate-release product, as generally administered, is small. Where the therapeutic or toxic effects are indirectly related to plasma concentrations, where irreversible toxicity can occur, where there is evidence of functional (i.e., pharmacodynamic) tolerance, where peak-to-trough differences of the immediate-release form are very large, or where there are uncertainties concerning the relationship between plasma concentration and therapeutic and adverse effects, it will probably be necessary to carry out clinical studies.

Premarketing evaluation of a controlled-release product should include consideration of possible development of functional tolerance to the drug, the occurrence of sensitivity reactions or local tissue damage due to dosage form-dependent persistence or localization of the drug, the clinical implications of dose dumping or of an unexpected decrease in bioavailability by physiological or physicochemical mechanisms, and quantitative alteration in the metabolic fate of the drug due to nonlinear, or site-specific disposition.

Specific claims for all therapeutic advantages of a controlled-release product over the conventional dosage forms should be based on adequate clinical studies, the results of which should be available to health professionals upon request.

Optimum Information to Characterize the Drug Entity

I. Physico-chemical characterization

While the required physico-chemical information to characterize the drug entity in a controlled-release dosage form should generally be no different than that for the drug entity in an immediate-release dosage form, additional physico-chemical information on solubility, dissolution, stability, and other release controlling variable(s) of the drug under conditions which may mimic the extremes of the physiologic environment experienced by the dosage form is necessary.

II. Pharmacokinetic characterization

A. Input (absorption)

It is necessary to characterize the oral input profile of the drug entity from a rapidly available dosage form which serves as a reference to evaluate the input profile of the controlled or modified release dosage form. This information together with the disposition characteristics for the drug entity can be used to characterize and predict changes in the bioavailability of the drug entity when input is modified following administration of the controlled-release dosage form. (For example, the drug may exhibit saturable first pass hepatic metabolism which could result in decreased systemic availability when the input rate is decreased.)

In designing a controlled-release dosage form, it may be useful to determine the absorption characteristics of the drug entity in various segments of the gastrointestinal tract (particularly the colon for dosage forms that may release drug in the colon). Such information may not be required for regulatory submission if an appropriate de-

termination of controlled-release is provided via pharmacokinetic or pharmacodynamic measurements.

B. Disposition

The information required to characterize the disposition processes for the drug entity in a controlled-release dosage form should include those generally determined for the drug entity in an immediate-release dosage form. This may include:

(1) Disposition parameters — clearance, volume of distribution, half-life, mean residence time, or model-dependent or noncompartmental parameters.
(2) Linearity or characterization of nonlinearity over the dose and/or concentration range which could possibly be encountered.
(3) Accumulation.
(4) Metabolic profile and excretory organ dependence with special attention to active metabolite(s), and active enantiomers of racemic mixtures.
(5) Enterohepatic circulation.
(6) Protein binding parameters and dialyzability.
(7) The effect of age, gender, race and relevant disease states.
(8) Plasma/blood ratio.

In addition, in cases where the drug has a narrow therapeutic index, or where there is evidence that clinical response varies significantly as a function of the time of the day, it is recommended that circadian variability in the drug's disposition parameters (ADME) and pharmacodynamics be characterized to determine whether changes in the rate of drug input with time are essential to ensure adequate safety and efficacy.

III. Pharmacodynamic characterization

For the drug entity a concentration response relationship over a sufficiently wide dose range should be available for important therapeutic and adverse responses. In addition, the equilibration time (see Glossary) characteristics between plasma concentration and effect should have been evaluated. These concentration-response relationships should be sufficiently characterized so that a reasonable prediction can be made of the safety margin, if dose dumping from the controlled-release dosage form should occur. As defined above, under Need For Clinical Studies, the clinical performance of a new controlled release dosage form could be characterized by plasma concentration-time data, if there is a well-defined relationship between plasma concentration of drug and/or active metabolite(s) and clinical response (therapeutic and adverse). If such data are not available, then clinical trials of the controlled-release dosage form must be carried out with concurrent pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic measurements.

Optimum Information to Characterize the Dosage Form

I. Physico-chemical characterization

The variables employed to characterize the physico-chemical properties of the dosage form should be the same as employed to characterize the drug entity. Solubility and dissolution profiles from pH 1 to 7.4 should be obtained with particular attention to the effect of the formulation (as compared to the drug entity). Characterization of formulations which are highly insoluble in purely aqueous systems may require the addition of sodium lauryl sulfate or another suitable surfactant to mimic more closely in vivo conditions.

II. Pharmacokinetic studies

The type of pharmacokinetic studies that need to be carried out depends upon how much is known about the drug, its clinical pharmacokinetics and biopharmaceutics, and on whether pharmacokinetic studies are intended to be the sole basis for product approval. There should be a sufficient number of dosage strengths of the controlled-release dosage form to allow flexibility for the clinician to titrate the patient over the recommended therapeutic dose range of the immediate-release dosage form.

As a minimum, a single-dose crossover study for each strength of the controlled-release dosage form and a multiple-dose, steady-state study using the highest strength of controlled-release dosage form is required for New Drug Application/Abbreviated New Drug Application (NDA/ANDA) approval. (Appropriate single-dose crossover and multiple-dose steady-state studies are described below as A and B, respectively.)

In the case of a controlled-release capsule dosage form, where the strengths differ from each other only in the amount of *identical beaded material* each capsule contains, a single dose and a multiple-dose steady-state study at the highest dosage strength will be sufficient for NDA/ANDA approval. Other strengths may be approved solely on the basis of comparative in vitro dissolution data.

The types of studies needed can be categorized as follows:

Case I: Controlled-release oral dosage form of a marketed immediate-release drug for which extensive pharmacodynamic-pharmacokinetic data exist

The following pharmacokinetic studies would be needed for most controlled-release dosage forms. They may, for this case, constitute the sole basis for approval of a controlled-release dosage form. (See Need For Clinical Studies, above). If approval is to be sought without clinical trials, it is recommended that there be preconsultation with the regulatory authorities to ensure that an adequate data base exists for such approval.

A: A single-dose crossover study A single-dose, crossover study with the following treatments: the controlled-release dosage form administered under fasting conditions, a rapidly available dosage form (an i.v. solution and/or oral solution, or a well-characterized FDA-approved immediate-release drug product) administered under fasting conditions, and the controlled-release dosage form administered at the same time as a high fat meal (and/or another type of meal that has a potential for causing maximum perturbation).

The study of food effects should include provision for control of the fluid intake (e.g., 6–8 oz) and temperature (e.g., ambient), at the time of drug administration. The dosage form should be administered within 5 min after completion of the breakfast or meal.

If there are no significant differences in rate or extent of bioavailability (most of the time AUC and peak concentration) in this study as a function of the meal, then no further food effect studies are necessary.

If significant differences in bioavailability are found, it would be necessary to define the cause of the food effect on the controlled-release dosage form, as well as the effect of time on the food-drug effect:

(1) Cause: If no well controlled studies have previously defined the effects of a concurrent high fat meal on the immediate-release dosage form, studies should be carried out to determine whether a food effect is present and to define whether this food effect is a result of: (a) problems with the dosage form, i.e., food-related changes in release, or (b) food effects that are unrelated to the dosage form, such as changes in the drug's absorption from the gastrointestinal tract and/or changes in the drug's disposition (i.e., distribution and/or elimination) that are independent of absorption. The cause of the food effect, i.e., a or b, should be determined by conducting a single-dose crossover study comparing the solution (or immediate-release dosage form) under fed and fasting conditions. If there is no effect of food, then conclude a; if there is an effect of food, then conclude b.

(2) Effect of timing of food vs drug administration: The effect of timing on the food-drug effect should be tested by performing a four-way crossover study with the controlled-release product under the following treatment conditions: fasting, drug with a high fat meal, drug one hour before a high fat meal, and drug two hours after a high fat meal.

(3) If the food effect on the immediate-release dosage form is determined to result from changes in the dissolved drug's absorption from the gastrointestinal tract or from changes in drug disposition, studies should be designed, in consultation with the FDA, to define the appropriate relationship between drug dosing and meals.

(4) Alternative appropriate studies could be conducted if the applicant wanted to label the drug for administration with a meal which is not fat loaded. In this case alternative meal composition should be considered.

(5) Blood sampling schedule — the entire single-dose controlled-release absorption profile should be monitored. Where appropriate (e.g., in a multiple-dose study) for specific drugs and drug delivery systems, blood samples should be taken following breakfast on the second day, before the second dose is administered. This sampling schedule is particularly important for once-a-day products.

(6) For delayed-release (enteric coated) dosage forms, bioavailability studies adequately characterizing the food effects to support the dosing claims stated in the labeling, need to be performed.

The purpose of these studies is two-fold: First, to determine whether there is any need for labeling specifications of special conditions for administration with respect to meals; and second, to provide information concerning the pattern of absorption of the controlled-release dosage form compared to the rapidly available dosage form. The drug input function should be defined for controlled-release dosage forms by an appropriate method, e.g., Wagner-Nelson, Loo-Riegelman, or other deconvolution methods. Additionally, this will aid in the development of an appropriate in vitro dissolution test. For dosage forms that exhibit high variability, replicate studies are recommended.

B. Multiple-dose — steady-state studies (either 1 or 2 below)

(1) When data exist for the immediate-release product establishing linear pharmacokinetics, a steady-state study with the controlled-release product at one dose rate (preferably at the high end of the usual dose rate range) using an immediate-release formulation as a control should be conducted. At least three trough concentrations (C_{min}), over a period equal to or greater than two times the biological half-life of the drug, should be measured to ascertain that the subjects are at steady state. Concentrations over at least one dosage interval of the controlled-release product should be measured in each leg of the crossover, although it may be preferable (in case of rhythmic variation in absorption or disposition of the drug) to measure concentrations over an entire day in each leg. The presence or absence of circadian variation should be verified. The controlled-release product should produce an AUC that is equivalent, using accepted Agency criteria, to the immediate-release product and the degree of fluctuation, $[(C_{max} - C_{min})/\bar{C}]$, for the controlled-release product should be the same as, or less than, that for the immediate-release dosage form given by the approved regimen. This is predicated on the knowledge that FDA requires C_{min} of the controlled-release dosage form to be higher than the C_{min} of the immediate-release dosage form and that the C_{max} of the controlled-release dosage form be below the C_{max} of the immediate-release dosage form unless it can be shown that the deviations are not therapeutically significant. Appropriate concentration measurements should include unchanged drug and/or major active metabolites. For racemic products, consideration should be given to measurement of the active enantiomer(s).

(2) Where comparisons of pharmacokinetics of the immediate-release product at different dose rates are not available, or where the data show nonlinearity, steady-state crossover studies comparing the controlled-release product with the immediate-release formulation at two different dose rates should be conducted (one at the low end of the recommended dosing range and a second at the high end of the dosing range). For each of the comparisons, the controlled-release product must meet the criteria with respect to AUC and fluctuation stated in the preceding paragraph. If there are significant differences between the controlled-release product and the immediate-release product at either the low or high dosing rate, these data alone would not serve as a basis for approval.

Since the data could be misleading if obtained from subjects with atypical drug disposition or physiologic characteristics, relative to the target population, subject selection should be randomized or from an appropriate target population. If the controlled-release product is aimed at the specific subpopulation, e.g., a controlled-release product designed for children, it should be tested in that population. Independent of whether a drug exhibits linear or nonlinear pharmacokinetics, the basis for approval is not equivalence of fraction of dose absorbed as such, but rather equivalence of AUC and of the relative degree of fluctuation of concentrations of the controlled-release and immediate-release products as administered. The controlled-release dosage form is not necessarily required to contain the same amount of drug as several doses of the immediate-release dosage form administered in the same dosing interval, e.g., if first pass metabolism was greater for the controlled-release dosage form, it might contain more drug than the total of immediate-release doses.

Steady-state studies in selected patient population groups and/or drug interaction studies may also be necessary, depending upon the therapeutic use of the drug and the type of individuals for which the controlled-release product will be recommended. For drugs with narrow therapeutic indices it may be necessary to carry out more extensive plasma concentration measurements to determine the potential for unusual drug release patterns in certain subpopulations. In such studies, it may be advisable to carry out more than one AUC measurement per patient to assess variability with both the controlled-release and the immediate-release dosage forms.

Case II: Non-oral controlled-release dosage forms of drugs meeting the criteria in case I

The studies described previously (omitting the food effect studies) would be appropriate for the evaluation of a controlled-release formulation designed for an alternate route of administration unless an altered biotransformation pattern of active metabolites is observed. In that event a clinical efficacy study would be required. In addition to bioavailability studies, special studies should be concerned with specific risk factors, e.g., irritation and/or sensitization at the site of application, etc.

Case III: Generic equivalent of an approved controlled-release product

The same bioequivalence requirements apply to (a) the establishment of the equivalence of the formulation used in efficacy trials if it is different from the formula intended for marketing and (b) for the generic product approval. For development of a generic equivalent of an approved controlled-release form, the new generic formulation must be comparable with respect to rate and extent of availability (usually using AUC, C_{max}, C_{min} and the degree of fluctuation as criteria) in a crossover steady-state study vs the standard controlled-release product using the accepted Agency criteria for equivalence. In some cases it may also be necessary to match the concentration-time profile of the approved controlled-release dosage form.

The food studies described previously are also needed (generic product with or without high-fat meal). Other special studies mentioned in previous paragraphs may also be indicated.

Statistical analysis: (i) Any appropriate statistical method should be considered; (ii) where bioequivalence is to be demonstrated, the statistical test should be such that the null hypothesis states inequivalence and the alternative states equivalence.

The currently accepted Agency criteria for equivalence for most products requires that the mean pharmacokinetic parameters of the test product should be shown to be within 80–120% of the reference product using the 90% confidence interval (or equivalently the two one-sided test procedure; $P = 0.05$).

Case IV: Controlled-release pharmaceutical dosage form as a new drug application

Independent of whether a controlled-release dosage form is evaluated by a clinical study, this dosage form should be characterized as described previously. That is, linearity of dose, food effects, absorption characteristics (rate, pattern, and extent) and fluctuation $[(C_{max} - C_{min})/\bar{C}]$ must be characterized.

In Vitro-In Vivo Correlations

The in vitro dissolution test is important for the purposes of (a) providing necessary process control, (b) stability determinations of the relevant release characteristics of the product, and (c) facilitating certain regulatory determinations and judgments concerning minor formulation changes, change in site of manufacture, etc.

The present state of the science and technology does not always permit meaningful correlations between in vitro dissolution rates and the rate and extent of availability as determined by blood concentrations, and/or urinary excretion of drug or metabolites (referred to as in vitro-in vivo correlations). Development of such correlations is an important objective and should be vigorously and systematically pursued on a product-by-product basis. Such correlations allow one to develop product specifications with bioavailability implications providing maximum assurance and predictability.

Indeed, the value of in vitro dissolution specifications as a quality control measure is dependent primarily upon a relationship to bioavailability. The current state of the art is such that it is unlikely that a single in vitro-in vivo correlation for different products of the same drug can be accomplished at this time. Rather, it is likely that a separate in vitro-in vivo correlation will have to be developed for each manufacturer's product. The issue of in vitro-in vivo correlations has been addressed in a Stimuli Article in the July–August 1988 issue of *Pharmacopeial Forum*. There is an agreement in principle with the approaches given there, but also a recognition that alternative approaches are possible.

Relationship between Critical Manufacturing Variables and In Vitro Dissolution

The in vitro dissolution procedure and operating parameters must be optimized to be sensitive to critical manufacturing variables within the acceptable range of values expected during the manufacturing process. Critical manufacturing variables are those materials and methods used in the manufacturing processes that can significantly affect release of drug from the product (e.g., coating thickness, excipient concentrations, tablet hardness, compression pressure, etc.). The in vitro dissolution specifications (range of values permitted) should correspond to the range of values of the critical manufacturing variables that might be expected during normal manufacturing procedures using an in vitro procedure that has been developed and optimized to detect differences in critical manufacturing variables.

Developing an In Vitro-In Vivo Correlation

Currently, dissolution specifications are usually defined by either of two methods: (1) The range of dissolution values found in the lot used in the pivotal bioavailability study. (2) The range of values from different lots produced during the development phase. Neither procedure necessarily provides in vivo validation.

The in vitro dissolution procedure used for quality control should be validated by appropriate in vivo bioavailability studies. To accomplish validation, the following procedures are suggested as possible approaches.

(1) *Correlation approaches*
These procedures validate the in vitro process by testing one or more products with altered rate characteristics, or evaluating alternative dissolution procedures until a 'correlation' can be established to an acceptable degree. The following process might be used: (a) Prepare two or more dosage formulations with different biopharmaceutic characteristics. Changes in in vitro dissolution of these test dosage forms should be accomplished by changing only those process and component variables that are likely to be varied under normal manufacturing conditions, i.e., the critical manufacturing variables; (b) develop an appropriate in vitro test that can distinguish between these formulations and (c) determine the absorption characteristics of these formulations in a small group of human subjects.

(A) Correlation approach where dissolution rate is independent of testing conditions

When dissolution rate is independent of testing conditions (i.e., pH, surfactant, osmotic pressure, agitation, etc.), a single curve will define the dissolution rate. This in vitro dissolution curve is compared to the input function resulting from deconvolution of the plasma concentration time curve of the definitive bioavailability/bioequivalence study. If these curves are superimposable, there is a 1 : 1 relationship which is defined as a Level A Correlation (see Glossary).

It is also possible, through appropriate use of time corrections or other mathematical functions, to obtain reproducible correlations between in vitro dissolution curves and input functions. Although not 1 : 1 correlations, these procedures provide point-to-point relationships and can be considered Level A Correlations.

Further validation of this correlation may be done by preparing one or more batches of product which release at different rates and determining the absorption characteristics of these batches in a small group of human subjects. Corresponding correlation at these other rate(s) may be considered to validate the in vitro-in vivo correlation for that dosage form. Modifying the in vitro dissolution of these test dosage forms should be accomplished by changing only those process and component variables that are likely to be varied under normal manufacturing conditions, i.e., the critical manufacturing variables. If Level A Correlation is not demonstrated with a product, one should attempt Correlation Level B or C. Correlation at the B and C Levels requires in vivo testing of three or more formulations having different release rates.

(B) Correlation approach where dissolution rate is dependent on testing conditions

Under such conditions, the curve obtained by deconvolution of the plasma concentration-time curve obtained from the bioavailability/bioequivalence study is compared to the in vitro dissolution curves obtained under various dissolution conditions. Once the dissolution conditions which correlate best with the deconvolution curve are found, validation of these conditions should be performed. This may be accomplished by preparing one or more batches of product with different dissolution rates (usually one faster and one slower than the definitive bioavailability/bioequivalence batch) measured using the dissolution conditions that correlated with the in vivo data, and determining the absorption characteristics of these formulations in a small (e.g., 6) panel of human subjects. If the correlation is consistent it may be considered to be validated. As in the previous case, this represents a Level A Correlation. Furthermore, the test dosage forms are subject to the same caveats as apply when the dissolution rate is independent of testing conditions.

Again, if Correlation Level A is not demonstrated, one should attempt to correlate at Levels B or C. As in the case above it is necessary to test at least three dosage forms for a Level B or C correlation.

(2) *Specification validation*

In this case the upper and lower dissolution specifications are validated by a bioavailability study in normal subjects, using the currently accepted statistical criteria, showing that the products exhibiting the lower and higher dissolution specifications are bioequivalent. This would assure that the lot-to-lot variation permitted in the marketplace would not result in bioinequivalence. It is important to validate the procedure of relating the upper and lower dissolution specifications to bioavailability parameters.

Type of Apparatus

The current Agency policy of allowing alternative dissolution methods and apparati is necessary to assure further technological development. However, since it is also important that needless proliferation of methods be discouraged, the official in vitro dissolution methods described in the current U.S. Pharmacopeia should be utilized unless shown to be unsatisfactory. Alternative in vitro procedures such as the flow-through filter method, the modified rotating bottle or rotating flask methods might be considered, since all have some merit. Other methods should be considered on the

basis of their proven superiority for a particular product. In other words, alternative approaches should not be discouraged. It is important to allow experimentation because of the diversity of biological and formulation variables and the evolving nature of our understanding and methodologies in this area.

Dissolution Conditions and Sampling Times

(1) Characterization of the dosage form over the full range of physiological pH values is essential, e.g., pH 1, 4, 6, and 7.4.

(2) It is recommended that different agitation rates be used. This evaluation should include the standard operating conditions of 50 rpm for the paddle and 100 rpm for the basket. For solid dosage forms where particles result from disintegration, visual observation of the dosage form is recommended to detect changes due to increased agitation such as physical effects or changes in particle location and shape in the dissolution vessel.

(3) In general, it is recommended that the media be confined to only aqueous systems rather than hydro-organic, e.g., hydro-alcoholic systems. For water-insoluble drugs, aqueous systems containing surfactant (e.g., sodium lauryl sulfate) should first be explored. For poorly soluble drugs where sink conditions cannot be achieved with the basket or paddle methods, the flow-through apparatus may serve as an appropriate alternative.

(4) At a minimum, at least three time points are recommended, but more are strongly encouraged: one hour time point to ensure that there is no dose dumping, a second time point around 50% dissolution, and a third time point around 80% dissolution. However, generally it is best to characterize the entire in vitro release profile.

Examples of Applications of In Vitro-In Vivo Correlations

(1) *Interlot variation*
Based on an in vitro-in vivo correlation, the relevance of interlot dissolution variability can be assessed and appropriate specifications defined. If a valid in vitro-in vivo correlation does not exist then appropriate studies in humans may be required to access interlot variability.

(2) *Product shelf life*
Product shelf life specifications can be defined in terms of in vitro dissolution tests using accepted stability studies if an in vitro-in vivo correlation has been established. If a valid in vitro-in vivo correlation does not exist then appropriate human studies may be required to establish that product storage for the stated shelf life has no significant influence on expected performance of the dosage form.

(3) *Minor formulation and process changes*
When the relationships between the critical manufacturing variables and in vitro dissolution rates have been clearly defined for controlled release preparations and an in vitro-in vivo correlation has been established, it may be possible to use in vitro dissolution data to justify minor formulation and process changes. These might include minor changes in color, size, shape, preservatives, flavor, coating procedure, the amount and composition of materials, source of inactive and active (if adequately characterized) ingredients and changes in equipment or site of manufacture. In the absence of a clearly defined relationship between the manufacturing variable in question and dissolution rate, or if a valid in vitro-in vivo correlation does not exist, then appropriate testing in humans may be required.

Glossary

C_{max}:	Observed maximum drug plasma concentration achieved after dosage form administration.
C_{min}:	Observed minimum drug plasma concentration at steady state.
$\overline{C}$ (C Average):	$\overline{C} = AUC/T$ where AUC is area under the concentration time

curve from time t to time $t + T$, and T is the dosing interval.

Degree of Fluctuation: $(C_{max} - C_{min})/\bar{C}$.

Correlation: To show a relationship between two parameters. Typically a relationship is sought between in vitro dissolution rate and in vivo input rate. This initial relationship may be expanded to critical formulation parameters and in vivo input rate.

Equilibration Time: A measure of the time-dependent discontinuity between measured plasma concentrations and measured effects. The discontinuity is most often characterized by the degree of hysteresis observed when the effect-concentration plot for increasing concentrations is compared with that for decreasing concentrations. Where the equilibration time is very short (i.e., rapid equilibration) and no active metabolites are generated, there will be little or no hysteresis. That is, the same effect will be observed for a given concentration independent of the time after dosing when measurements are made.

Level A and B Correlation (*Pharmacopeial Forum*, July–August 1988, p. 1460)

Level A: In this level of correlation, the in vitro dissolution curve of the product is compared with the in vivo dissolution curve generated by deconvolution of the plasma level data.

Level B: In this level of correlation, the mean in vitro dissolution time of the product is compared to either mean in vivo residence time or the mean in vivo dissolution time of the product derived by using principles of statistical moment analysis.

Level C: In this level of correlation, a mean in vitro dissolution time of the product is compared to one mean pharmacokinetic parameter. This does not reflect the complete dissolution profile or the blood level profile, which is important for controlled release products.

Modified Release Dosage Forms: Those products that release a drug other than immediately. These dosage forms include extended release (sustained) and delayed release (enteric coated).