biblio.ugent.be

The UGent Institutional Repository is the electronic archiving and dissemination platform for all UGent research publications. Ghent University has implemented a mandate stipulating that all academic publications of UGent researchers should be deposited and archived in this repository. Except for items where current copyright restrictions apply, these papers are available in Open Access.

This item is the archived peer-reviewed author-version of: Downstream processing from hot-melt extrusion towards tablets: A quality by design approach

Authors: Grymonpré W., Bostijn N., Van Herck S., Verstraete G., Vanhoorne V., Nuhn L., Rombouts P., De Beer T., Remon J.P., Vervaet C.

In: International Journal of Pharmaceutics 2017, 531(1): 235-245

To refer to or to cite this work, please use the citation to the published version:

Grymonpré W., Bostijn N., Van Herck S., Verstraete G., Vanhoorne V., Nuhn L., Rombouts P., De Beer T., Remon J.P., Vervaet C. (2017)

Downstream processing from hot-melt extrusion towards tablets: A quality by design approach

International Journal of Pharmaceutics 531(1): 235-245

DOI: 10.1016/j.ijpharm.2017.08.077

Downstream processing from hot-melt extrusion towards tablets: a quality by design approach

W. Grymonpré^a, N. Bostijn^b, S. Van Herck^a, G. Verstraete^a, V. Vanhoorne^a, L.

Nuhn^a, P. Rombouts^c, T. De Beer^b, J.P. Remon^a, C. Vervaet^{a,*}

^a Laboratory of Pharmaceutical Technology, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

^b Laboratory of Pharmaceutical Process Analytical Technology, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

^c Department of Electronics and Information Systems (ELIS), Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

*Corresponding author:

C. Vervaet

Ghent University, Laboratory of Pharmaceutical Technology

Ottergemsesteenweg 460

9000 Ghent (Belgium)

Tel.: +32 9 264 80 54

Fax: +32 9 222 82 36

E-mail address: Chris.Vervaet@UGent.be

Abstract

Since the concept of continuous processing is gaining momentum in pharmaceutical manufacturing, a thorough understanding on how process and formulation parameters can impact the critical quality attributes (CQA) of the end product is more than ever required. This study was designed to screen the influence of process parameters and drug load during HME on both extrudate properties and tableting behaviour of an amorphous solid dispersion formulation using a quality-by-design (QbD) approach. A full factorial experimental design with 19 experiments was used to evaluate the effect of several process variables (barrel temperature: 160-200 °C, screw speed: 50-200 rpm, throughput: 0.2-0.5 kg/h) and drug load (0-20%) as formulation parameter on the hot-melt extrusion (HME) process, extrudate and tablet quality of *Soluplus*®-*Celecoxib* amorphous solid dispersions. A prominent impact of the formulation parameter on the CQA of the extrudates (i.e. solid state properties, moisture content, particle size distribution) and tablets (i.e. tableability, compactibility, fragmentary behaviour, elastic recovery) was discovered. The resistance of the polymer matrix to thermo-mechanical stress during HME was confirmed throughout the experimental design space. In addition, the suitability of Raman spectroscopy as verification method for the active pharmaceutical ingredient (API) concentration in solid dispersions was evaluated. Incorporation of the Raman spectroscopy data in a PLS model enabled API quantification in the extrudate powders with none of the DOE-experiments resulting in extrudates with a CEL content deviating > 3 % of the label claim. This research paper emphasized that HME is a robust process throughout the experimental design space for obtaining amorphous glassy solutions and for tableting of such formulations since only minimal impact of the process parameters was detected on the extrudate and tablet properties. However, the quality of extrudates and tablets can be optimized by adjusting specific formulations parameters (e.g. drug load).

Keywords: Hot-melt extrusion (HME), tableting, Quality by Design, solid dispersion, tablet quality, Raman spectroscopy, Principle component analysis (PCA).

1. INTRODUCTION

With the increasing number of new chemical entities being classified as poorly water-soluble, pharmaceutical industry and academia have found themselves a major challenge how to formulate these drug candidates into potent immediate release solid dosage forms. The concept of solubility enhancement through the formation of amorphous solid dispersions has been widely explored for this purpose whereby the drug molecules are dispersed within a solid polymeric matrix. From the broad range of processing techniques which have been used in the last decades for solid dispersion manufacturing (Janssens and Van den Mooter, 2009; Leuner and Dressman, 2000; Paudel et al., 2013; Sethia and Squillante, 2004), hot-melt extrusion (HME) proved extremely suitable since it does not require solvents or water, thereby avoiding potential water-mediated drug degradation or time-consuming drying steps (Saerens et al., 2013). Polymer and API are fed into a heated barrel with screws and the combination of heat, mixing and shear finally results in a homogeneous melt where the drug is preferably molecular dispersed in the polymer matrix (Sarode et al., 2013; Shah et al., 2013). With the efforts made by the pharmaceutical industry to gradually shift the focus from batch towards continuous processing, HME steadily (re-)gained interest since the technique enables superior mixing (both distributive and dispersive) despite the short residence time, allows several downstream options towards various dosage forms and can be run in continuous mode (Plumb, 2005; Saerens et al., 2013; Vervaet et al., 2013). However, there is still insufficient understanding of the critical formulation and process parameters during the HME process of specific pharmaceutical formulations which is reflected in the limited number of pharmaceutical products available on the market processed by HME. Initiated by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) in order to increase the robustness and quality of a product, pharmaceutical quality-by-design (QbD) was introduced as a strategic product development approach which considers both formulation and process-related factors that affect the critical quality attributes of the final product (Patwardhan et al., 2015). This

92 already resulted in a few interesting approaches to implement QbD in pharmaceutical melt
93 extrusion processes (Agrawal et al., 2016; Islam et al., 2014; Patwardhan et al., 2015).

94 In a previous article (Grymonpré et al., 2017), glassy solutions of amorphous polymers
95 with Celecoxib (CEL) were made by HME and further downstream processed via milling
96 and compression into tablets. A polymer platform for HME/tableting purpose was
97 successfully established from which an adequate polymer could be selected. These glassy
98 solutions showed a high milling efficiency and excellent tableting properties, supporting the
99 high potential of HME for implementation in a continuous manufacturing line. In the current
100 research study, a promising polymer-drug combination (using Soluplus® as polymer and
101 Celecoxib as poorly soluble drug) was selected from the platform and subjected to a QbD
102 approach to thoroughly understand how process (barrel temperature, screw speed,
103 throughput) and formulation (drug load) parameters can influence the critical quality
104 attributes of extrudates and tablets prepared from these amorphous solid dispersions.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Materials

Soluplus® (SOL) was selected for this study as amorphous polymer and kindly donated by BASF (Ludwigshafen, Germany). Celecoxib (CEL, Utag, Amsterdam, The Netherlands), a BCS class II drug, was used as model drug.

2.2. Hot-melt extrusion

HME experiments were performed using a co-rotating, fully intermeshing twin-screw extruder (Prism Eurolab 16, Thermo Fisher, Germany) equipped with a DD Flexwall® gravimetric feeder (Brabender Technology, Germany), two co-rotating twin-screws with 3 mixing zones (length to diameter ratio $L/D=25$) and a cylindrical die of 3 mm. A data logging system allowed monitoring of the screw torque and barrel wall temperature during extrusion. The extrusion barrel is divided into 6 segments which can be heated/cooled separately. Barrel temperature from segment 1 to 5 were set at the same temperature (the actual temperature depended on the experiment as the extrusion temperature was included as a variable in the study), while the die temperature was 140 °C for all experiments to guarantee a solid end product. For each run, 300 g of extrudates were collected at steady state extrusion conditions. After cooling, the extrudates were milled using a knife mill (Moulinex AR110510, France) for 60 s and sieved through a 150 µm sieve.

2.3. Preparation of tablets

Direct compression of the milled extrudates was performed on a rotary tablet press (MODUL™ P, GEA Pharma Systems, Courtoy™, Halle, Belgium) equipped with cylindrical flat-faced Euro B punches of 10 mm diameter and an overfill cam of 16 mm. Tablets of approximately 270 mg were produced at 3 main compaction pressures: 127 (± 9.1), 255 (± 19.2) and 382 (± 27.0) MPa at a turret speed of 5 rpm without using a pre-compression step. Punch deformation at each compaction pressure was calculated and corrected for during this

study. All tablets were analysed for 'out-of-die' properties (tablet strength, dimensions and mass) immediately after ejection.

In-die measurements of the compaction properties was performed by linear variable displacement transducers (LVDT) incorporated inside the turret and clamped onto one pair of punches enabling the monitoring of punch stroke movements during a compression cycle (GEA Pharma Systems, Halle, Belgium). Calibration was done prior to each experiment, by interpolating the output voltage of the sensor to physical values during static measurements. A wireless transmission system continuously transmitted the data from these sensors to a data acquisition and analysis system (CDAAS™, GEA Pharma Systems, Halle, Belgium).

2.4. Design of experiments

The experimental ranges for the DOE factors barrel temperature, screw speed, throughput and drug load were determined based on preliminary experiments. A two-level full factorial design with 16 experiments was applied to evaluate the influence of three process parameters: barrel temperature (160-200 °C), screw speed (50-200 rpm), throughput (0.2-0.5 kg/h) and one formulation parameter: drug load (0-20 %) on the HME process and tableting behaviour of the resulting extrudates. Three centerpoint replicates were executed to evaluate the reproducibility. An overview of the experiments is given in Table 1. The responses were regressed against the factors via multiple linear regression (MLR) using MODDE 10.1. software (Umetrics, Umeå, Sweden) where all factors were scaled and centered making the regression coefficients comparable for the different factors. 95% confidence intervals were included for each effect in order to evaluate if factors or factor interactions were significant (i.e. 95% confidence interval of the corresponding effect not including zero).

2.5. Evaluation of the HME process

At each extrusion condition, the torque on the screws was recorded after reaching steady state conditions and the specific mechanical energy (SME) calculated to evaluate the HME process. A reading of 100 % corresponded to the maximum allowable torque of 14.2 Nm.

Prior to each run, the friction torque was determined by running the extruder with screws attached and the barrel empty at the specific conditions as given in Table 1. This friction torque was subtracted from the total recorded torque to obtain the net torque (Godavarti and Karwe, 1997). The SME represents the level of energy per mass unit that is transferred to the material by mechanical input during extrusion (Domenech et al., 2013) and was calculated as follows (Martin, 2013):

$$SME (KWh/kg) = (motor\ rating) \times (net\ torque) \times \frac{N}{N_{max} \times throughput} \times gearbox\ efficiency \quad (1)$$

where the extruder had a motor rating of 1.5 KW and a maximum screw speed (N_{max}) of 500 rpm. Net torque (%), operational screw speed (N) and throughput (kg/h) varied based on the experimental settings. Regarding the technical specification of the extruder drive, the gearbox efficiency was set at 0.95.

2.6. Evaluation of extrudates

2.6.1. Thermal analysis

Modulated Differential Scanning Calorimetry (MDSC) measurements were performed both after HME and milling in order to verify the solid state properties of all formulations after each processing step. A heating rate of 2 °C/min and a modulation of 0.318 °C/min over 2 cycles (heat/cool/heat) from -20 to 200 °C was used. The MDSC cell was purged with dry nitrogen at a flow rate of 50 ml/min. Three samples of each experimental run were analysed using the TA instruments Universal Analysis 2000 software.

2.6.2. Particle size analysis

Particle size distribution (PSD) of the powders was recorded (n=3) by laser diffraction (Mastersizer-S long bench, Malvern Instruments, Malvern, UK) via a dry dispersion method in volumetrical distribution mode using a 300 RF lens combined with a dry powder feeder at a feeding rate of 3.0 G and a jet pressure of 2.0 bar (Malvern Instruments, Malvern, UK).

199

200

201 2.6.3. *Moisture content*

202

203 Immediately before tableting, loss on drying (LOD) was performed (n=3) on the
204 powders corresponding to each experimental run to determine residual moisture content using
205 a Mettler LP16 moisture analyser, including an infrared dryer and a Mettler PM460 balance
206 (Mettler-Toledo, Zaventem, Belgium). Approximately 1 g of sample was dried at 105 °C until
207 the rate of change was less than 0.1% w/w for 30 s.

208 2.6.4. *Flowability*

209

210 The flow rate of the powders was determined using a flowability testing device
211 (FlowPro, IPAT, Finland) which consists of a frame, sample holder (5.96 ml) with orifice (3.0
212 mm) and an analytical scale. Vertical oscillations of the sample holder break the cohesive
213 forces in the powder bed and allow the powder to flow through the orifice. The mass discharged
214 from the sample holder is measured over time in order to calculate the flow rate (mg/s) (Sandler
215 et al., 2010). 5% of the mass flow function at the beginning and at the end was not taken into
216 account to minimize the non-linearity of the mass flow (Seppälä et al., 2010). All samples were
217 measured in triplicate.

218 2.6.5. *Size Exclusion Chromatography*

219

220 Molecular weight distribution analysis was applied to verify if the HME settings used in
221 this experimental design influenced this property of the polymer. Size exclusion
222 chromatography (SEC) measurements were performed on a Shimadzu 20A system using
223 dimethylacetamide (DMAc) supplemented with 50 mM LiBr as mobile phase. The system was
224 equipped with a 20A ISO-pump and a 20A refractive index detector (RID). Measurements were
225 recorded at 50 °C with a flow rate of 0.700 mL/min. Calibration of the 2 PL 5 µm Mixed-D
226 columns was done with poly(methyl methacrylate) (PMMA) standards obtained from PSS
227 (Mainz, Germany). Samples were run with toluene as an internal standard. All formulations of

the experimental design space without CEL (exp. 1-8) were analysed in triplicate together with the neat (non-processed) polymer. In addition, a SOL sample, processed at elevated temperatures (350 °C) to maximize the stress on the polymer, was analysed in order to verify if the technique was able to detect changes in the polymer molecular weight.

2.6.6. Raman spectroscopy

A calibration model was developed allowing off-line API quantification in the extrudates using Raman spectroscopy. Nine different SOL-CEL mixtures, containing 5, 10, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 30 and 40 % (w/w) CEL, were extruded at centerpoint-settings (Table 1) and milled to powders. Five validation mixtures of SOL-CEL, containing 19, 20, 21, 25 and 35 % drug were extruded at the same extrusion parameters to evaluate the suitability of Raman spectroscopy for off-line CEL quantification in glassy solutions. A Raman Rxn2 spectrometer (Kaiser Optical Systems, Ann Arbor, MI, USA), equipped with a fibre-optic PhAT-probe was used for collection of the Raman spectra. The laser wavelength was 785 nm and the spectra were recorded with a resolution of 5 cm⁻¹. For all the formulations an exposure time of 5 s with no averaging was used. The analysed spectral region was 665-1655 cm⁻¹, since this region contained all useful drug and polymer information. Data analysis was performed using SIMCA 13.0.3 (Umetrics, Umeå, Sweden). First derivative pre-processing was applied on the collected spectra of all formulations before principal components analysis (PCA) and partial least squares analysis (PLS). At least 6 spectra of each formulation were used to develop the PLS model, regressing the CEL concentrations (Y) versus the corresponding Raman spectra (X). Validation and uncertainty estimation of the quantitative analytical procedure was performed calculating the following parameters (Li et al., 2011; Saerens et al., 2014):

- Root mean square error of prediction:

$$RMSEP = \sqrt{\left(\sum_{i=1}^I \frac{(y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2}{I}\right)} \quad (1)$$

where I represent the number of samples, y_i and $\hat{y}_i$ the reference and Raman predicted value for sample i , respectively.

- Relative bias:

$$Relative\ Bias\ (\%) = \left(\frac{[\bar{x}_i - \mu]}{\mu} \right) \times 100 \quad (2)$$

with $\bar{x}_i$ and μ being the average measured API concentration and the true value of the sample, respectively.

- Relative standard deviation:

$$RSD\ (\%) = \left(\frac{[s \times 100]}{\bar{x}_i} \right) \quad (3)$$

where s denotes the standard deviation on the measured API concentrations of repeated samples whereas $\bar{x}_i$ represents the average measured API concentration of those samples.

2.7. Evaluation of the tableting behaviour

2.7.1. Out-of-die tablet properties

Tablet diametral tensile strength was calculated using the equation described by Fell and Newton (1968):

$$Tablet\ Tensile\ Strength\ (\sigma_t) = \frac{2P}{\pi Dt} \quad (4)$$

where P , D and t denotes tablet diametral breaking force (N), tablet diameter (mm) and tablet thickness (mm), respectively, which are determined using a hardness tester (Sotax HT10, Basel, Switzerland).

In order to determine the porosity of the compacts following equation is used:

$$Tablet\ Porosity = 1 - \frac{\rho_{app}}{\rho_{true}} \quad (5)$$

where ρ_{app} and ρ_{true} denote the apparent and true density (g/ml), respectively. The latter was measured using helium pycnometry (AccuPyc 1330, Micrometrics, Norcross, USA), while the apparent density was calculated by dividing the tablet mass by the volume of the tablet.

Out-of-die elastic recovery (ER) of the compacts was calculated based on following equation (Armstrong and Haines-Nutt, 1972):

$$ER (\%) = \left(\frac{T_a - T_{id}}{T_{id}} \right) \times 100 \quad (6)$$

for which T_{id} represents the minimal tablet thickness (mm) under maximal compression force 'in-die' and T_a is the tablet thickness (mm) measured immediately after ejection.

2.7.2. In-die tablet properties

Energy plots (i.e. force-displacement curves) were recorded during the compression cycles which enabled the calculation of the energy consumption or dissipation at each phase from the area under the curve (Michaut et al., 2010):

$$E = \int F dh \quad (7)$$

where F denotes the compression force (kN) and h the punch separation (mm). All energies are normalised by taking the compact mass into account to allow comparison between the different formulations. Resulting energies are used for calculating two specific compaction properties:

- A plasticity factor (PF) which represents the energy of compaction used for plastic deformation and fragmentation:

$$PF (\%) = \frac{\text{net energy}}{\text{total energy}} \times 100 \quad (8)$$

- In-die elastic recovery (IER) which represents the elasticity of a material:

$$IER (\%) = \frac{T_d - T_c}{T_c} \times 100 \quad (9)$$

where T_d and T_c represents the punch separation after decompression and the minimal punch separation during compression, respectively.

All calculations for in-line measuring the compaction properties were done using the **CDAAS™** software (GEA Pharma Systems, Halle, Belgium) on at least 3 compacts for each formulation.

Using the in-die data of the **CDAAS™** system, Heckel analysis was performed on all formulations using the data at a compaction pressure of approximately 65 MPa. The theory of Shapiro-Konopicky-Heckel is based on following equation (Heckel, 1961):

$$\ln \frac{1}{E} = KP + A \quad (10)$$

where E is the porosity of the powder bed at a compaction pressure P , K is the slope of the linear part of the plot (with the best R^2 fit) and A is the Y intercept with the linear part of the plot. The mean Heckel yield pressures (P_y) are given by the reciprocal values K , while the intercept of both the linear part of the plot (A) and the non-linear part (I) are used to calculate D_a , D_l .

$$D_a(I) = 1 - e^{-A(I)} \quad (11)$$

The difference between D_a and D_l denotes D_b , which describes the reduction in volume due to rearrangement of the particles since A is said to reflect low pressure densification by interparticulate motion (Tarlier et al., 2015).

$$D_b = D_a - D_l \quad (12)$$

2.7.3. Multivariate data analysis

Principal component analysis (PCA) was executed on the relevant compaction data in order to classify the different materials according to their compaction behaviour using the multivariate data analysing software SIMCA 13.0.3 (Umetrics, Umeå, Sweden). PCA is a multivariate projection method which extracts and displays the variation in the data set (Pieters et al., 2013). The data were pre-processed by unit variate scaling and centered in order to balance the weight of each variable.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Evaluation of the HME process

Although the torque values strongly varied in function of the experimental parameters, none of them exceeded 55 % of the maximum torque tolerated by the extruder (Table 2). Torque was mainly influenced by barrel temperature and drug load (Fig. 1) since both factors impact the melt viscosity of the formulation. Higher barrel temperatures reduced the melt viscosity of the formulation and therefore less energy input was required to rotate the screws at a predefined screw speed. The latter also occurred when adding CEL to the formulation, since the API can act as a plasticizer when solubilized in the polymer matrix, yielding lower torque values. These findings were confirmed by analyzing rheological data of SOL-CEL formulations as previously reported (Grymonpré et al., 2017).

Calculation of SME values during the HME process has proven its value in previous research as a variable to quantify mixing in an extruder (Sakai and Thommes, 2013), linking the HME process parameters with thermo-mechanical degradation (Wang et al., 2008) or as key descriptor of the influence of processing on the dispersion state (Domenech et al., 2013). Therefore, SME was added in this research as response of the experimental design (Table 2). The impact of process and formulation parameters on the SME levels during HME is represented by the effect plot in Fig. 2. An effect plot displays the change in the response when a factor varies from its low level (-1) to its high level (+1), with all other factors kept constant at their average values. Increasing the screw rotational speed during HME contributed significantly to higher SME-levels, indicating that more mechanical energy is transferred to the material under such conditions. Factors that reduced the torque such as higher barrel temperatures and drug load resulted in lower SME-levels caused by a decrease of the matrix viscosity under such conditions. When more material is fed into the barrel at fixed settings, the same amount of energy must be transferred to a larger amount of material, thereby reducing SME values.

3.2. Evaluation of the extrudates

For the experiments including CEL as model drug, changing the process parameters during HME had no impact on the solid dispersion type. Glassy solutions were obtained at every condition, indicating the suitability of SOL as polymeric carrier for CEL solid dispersions. This is in accordance to previous research where stable amorphous solid dispersions of SOL-CEL were made with drug loads up to 35 % (Grymonpré et al., 2017). In this experimental design, the drug load ranged from 0 to 20 % since preliminary experiments pointed out that higher drug loads decreased the flow properties of the physical mixtures, thereby hampering the ability of including the throughput as factor in the DOE. As throughput was an important process parameter under investigation in this research paper, a consensus was made by lowering the drug load (i.e. formulation parameter), enabling a profound screening design including both process and formulation parameters.

Higher drug loads reduced the glass transition temperature (T_g) of the resulting extrudates, as CEL acted as plasticizer, while the process parameters had no significant impact on solid state properties of the glassy solutions (Fig. 3). Similar conclusion was drawn after analysis of the particle size distribution (PSD) of the milled extrudates: d_{50} and d_{90} values increased for extrudates containing higher drug load (Fig. 3). Due to the drop in T_g , the material was less brittle during milling at room temperature compared to extrudates without CEL. However, these differences had no impact on the flow properties of the milled formulations, enabling further downstream processing such as (continuous) feeding of a rotary tablet press during tableting. Significant impact of drug load and barrel temperature was detected on the moisture content of the milled extrudates (Fig. 4). When formulating glassy solutions with high drug loads, the moisture content decreases significantly when higher extrusion temperatures are used. It has been described in literature that adsorption of water in dense glassy particles occurs mainly at the surface (via weak interactions) due to the absence of pores penetrable to water (Jouppila, 2006). The level of densification during HME might be influenced by the extrusion temperature at higher drug loads, as smaller amorphous clusters or a more extensive

molecular dispersion are created at elevated extrusion temperatures. Density of the extrudates was indeed higher with increasing drug loads and therefore this could explain the observed impact of extrusion temperature on the moisture content at higher drug loads. Although the effects in this study were relatively small (e.g. maximal deviation of 0.4 %) and the impact of moisture content was not reflected in the tableting behaviour of the formulations, it is an important observation since these effects could be more pronounced for other formulations. In general, it could be concluded that drug load had the most significant impact on the extrudates properties, indicating that for this specific formulation the HME process was very robust.

Commonly in literature, little attention is paid to the influence of processing techniques and settings on the polymer matrix, despite the evidence that extrusion can modify the polymer structure (Alexy et al., 2004; Capone et al., 2007). Molecular weight distribution (MWD) analysis of polymers provided insight into possible thermo-mechanical degradation of SOL during by the HME-process. MWD of extrudates resulting from runs with high, low and medium SME-values (exp. 3, 2 and 4, respectively), which represent the thermo-mechanical energy input during the extrusion process (Wang et al., 2008), were plotted against MWD of non-processed and deliberately stressed SOL in Fig. 5. The method used was able to detect changes in the MWD of SOL based on the peak broadening of the 'stressed' samples towards low and high molecular weight species. It is hypothesized that heat-induced side chain hydrolysis and cross-linking caused these changes in the 'stressed' SOL sample. However, no significant changes in MWD of SOL were detected under the conditions employed in the experimental design space. These findings confirmed the resistance of SOL towards thermo-mechanical stress during HME at regular extrusion settings.

In order to quantify the concentration of CEL in the extrudates, off-line Raman spectroscopy was applied on powders of the formulations containing API (exp. 9-19, Table 1). MDSC and XRD measurements confirmed the absence of crystalline CEL in each formulation, indicating the formation of glassy solutions comparable to the DOE-formulations. The concentration variations are clearly visible in the collected Raman spectra (Fig. 6, above) which is reflected in the PCA scores plot of the collected spectra (Fig. 6, lower). The two principle

components covered nearly all spectral variation, where the first principal component (PC_1) accounted for 96 % of the total variation. It was confirmed from the scores plot that PC_1 captured the spectral variation caused by differences in API-polymer concentration since a clear distinction can be made between the Raman spectra of the calibration set.

A PLS model was developed which allowed prediction of the CEL concentration in the extrudate powders of the DOE-formulations by regressing the off-line collected spectra (X) of the calibration set versus the known CEL concentrations (Y). Two PLS components were sufficient since the goodness of prediction of the model ($Q^2=0.996$) did not significantly increase when adding extra components. The predictive performance of the PLS model was validated by projecting the Raman spectra of a validation set onto the model in order to predict the corresponding CEL concentrations (Fig. 7). This resulted in a root mean square error of prediction (RMSEP) of 1.84 %. For each validation concentration level, accuracy was evaluated by calculating the trueness and precision (Table 3). A good precision of the method was noticed as the accuracy of all validated concentrations remained within the acceptance limits of 10 % (Saerens et al., 2014). The latter PLS model enabled quantification of CEL (%) in the extrudate powders of correlating experiments of the experimental design (Table 4). None of the experiments in the DOE resulted in extrudates with a CEL content deviating > 3 % of the label claim, taking into account the RMSEP.

3.3. Influence of the design variables on the tableting behaviour

3.3.1. Out-of-die tablet properties

Tabletability was clearly affected by the drug load as can be seen in Fig. 8 (full vs. dotted lines), while changing the process parameters had no significant impact on this tablet property. Tablets manufactured from extrudates formulated with CEL yielded significantly

higher tensile strengths. Additionally, the shape of the curves was influenced by the formulation parameter as the tableability of formulations without drug was independent of the compaction pressure, while CEL-containing formulations showed an inflection point prior to reaching the 'plateau' phase at higher main compaction pressures. The latter indicated that changes in the mechanical properties of these formulations had occurred, which resulted in tablets of higher tensile strength.

Some of the provided energy during compaction can be stored by materials as elastic energy, which is linked to the elastic recovery during decompression thereby causing disruption of some of the previously formed interparticulate bondings (Sun and Grant, 2001). Fig. 9 represents how process and formulation parameters influence the magnitude of this out-of-die descriptor, with an inverse correlation between drug load and out-of-die elastic recovery. Low values of the latter are preferred, since the phenomenon of capping was linked to modifications in the compact during the decompression phase (Wu et al., 2008) and low out-of-die elastic recoveries are beneficial within the context of continuous tablet coating after ejection.

3.3.2. *In-die tableting properties*

Previously, we have highlighted the added value of including in-die compaction properties to comprehensively investigate the tableting behaviour of materials since this provided better insight in the compression mechanisms which enable the formation of strong compacts. The compaction properties plasticity factor (PF) and in-die elastic recovery (IER), calculated from the recorded energy plots during a compression cycle, represent the contribution of respectively plastic deformation and elastic behaviour to the tensile strength of a tablet. Drug load had a significant impact on the plastic deformation of the formulation, with higher PF at increasing drug loads, while IER was unaffected by this formulation parameter. Analysis of the Heckel plots allowed to interpret the volume reduction processes during the compression phase, where high P_y and D_b values are indicative for materials undergoing more

particle rearrangement in the low pressure region (Tarlier et al., 2015). Formulation of glassy solutions with increasing levels of CEL yielded higher P_y and D_b values, highlighting the more fragmentary behaviour of these formulations which contributed to their higher tablet tensile strengths (Fig. 8).

3.3.3. Multivariate data analysis

The influence of the design variables on the tableting behaviour was summarized using principle component analysis (PCA) where different compaction properties and mechanical properties were included in order to classify formulations of the different experiments according to the contributions of these individual properties. The two principal components in the PCA accounted for 82.5 % of the total variance in the dataset, the first principal component (PC_1) comprising 68.5 % of the variance. When analysing the PCA bi-plot (Fig. 10) along PC_1 , the prominent influence of the formulation parameter drug load stands out with a cluster of the 20 % CEL formulations having low PC_1 values (blue triangles), formulations without drug having high PC_1 values (orange boxes) and the centerpoint formulations with 10 % CEL having intermediate values (green circles). The loadings indicated that PC_1 (i.e. the direction of the x-axis) differentiated between formulations which experienced more fragmentation and plastic deformation and therefore yielded tablets of higher tensile strength (left of the origin), while it was anti-correlated with the out-of-die elastic recovery (right of the origin). PC_2 (i.e. the direction of the y-axis) captured the flow properties of the powders and the IER which was anti-correlated to the PF.

4. CONCLUSIONS

A QbD approach for HME/tableting was successfully implemented in this research study to evaluate the influence of process parameters and drug load during HME on both extrudate properties and tableting behaviour of an amorphous solid dispersion formulation.

Modulation of the torque was possible by adjustment of the barrel temperature and drug load. Additional variations in screw speed and throughput led to different SME-levels, which represent the input of mechanical energy into the material during HME. Drug load had the most significant impact on the extrudate properties with minimal influence of the process variables. Similar results were obtained when evaluating the tableting behaviour of the formulations with a prominent influence of the formulation parameter (i.e. drug load) on the compaction and mechanical properties and no effect of varying HME process parameters. Increasing drug loads resulted in compacts with higher tensile strength since the volume reduction mechanisms changed towards more fragmentary behaviour combined with more plastic deformation and less out-of-die elastic recovery. A PLS model was developed and validated for Raman spectroscopy data which allowed off-line CEL quantification in the extrudates. This research emphasized that HME is a robust process throughout the experimental design space for obtaining amorphous glassy solutions and tablets of such formulations since only minimal impact was detected of the process parameters on the extrudate and tablet properties. However, the quality of extrudates and tablets can be optimized by adjusting specific formulations parameters (e.g. drug load).

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Camille Vanhoutte for the experimental help and GEA Pharma Systems™ for providing the complementary tooling for measuring punch displacement on the rotary tablet press.

521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541

542 5. LITERATURE

- 543 Agrawal, A., Dudhedia, M., Deng, W., Shepard, K., Zhong, L., Povilaitis, E., Zimny, E., 2016.
544 Development of Tablet Formulation of Amorphous Solid Dispersions Prepared by Hot
545 Melt Extrusion Using Quality by Design Approach. AAPS PharmSciTech 17, 214–232.
546 Alexy, P., Lacik, I., Simkova, B., Bakos, D., Pronayova, N., Liptaj, T., Hanzelova, S.,
547 Varosova, M., 2004. Effect of melt processing on thermo-mechanical degradation of
548 poly(vinyl alcohol)s. Polym. Degrad. Stab. 85, 823–830.
549 Armstrong, N.A., Haines-Nutt, R.F., 1972. Elastic recovery and surface area changes in
550 compacted powder systems. J. Pharm. Pharmacol. 24, Suppl:135P-136.

- Capone, C., Landro, L. Di, Inzoli, F., Penco, M., Sartore, L., Vinci, L., 2007. Thermal and Mechanical Degradation During Polymer Extrusion Processing. *Polym. Eng. Sci.* 1813–1819.
- Domenech, T., Peuvrel-disdier, E., Vergnes, B., 2013. The importance of specific mechanical energy during twin screw extrusion of organoclay based polypropylene nanocomposites. *Compos. Sci. Technol.* 75, 7–14.
- Godavarti, S., Karwe, M. V., 1997. Determination of Specific Mechanical Energy Distribution on a Twin-Screw Extruder. *J. Agric. Engng Res* 67, 277–287.
- Grymonpré, W., Verstraete, G., Bockstal, P.J. Van, Renterghem, J. Van, Rombouts, P., 2017. In-line monitoring of compaction properties on a rotary tablet press during tablet manufacturing of hot-melt extruded amorphous solid dispersions. *Int. J. Pharm.* 517, 348–358.
- Heckel, R.W., 1961. An analysis of powder compaction phenomena. *Trans. Met. Soc. AIME* 1001–1008.
- Islam, M.T., Maniruzzaman, M., Halsey, S.A., Chowdhry, B.Z., 2014. Development of sustained-release formulations processed by hot-melt extrusion by using a quality-by-design approach. *Drug Deliv. Transl. Res.* 4, 377–387.
- Janssens, S., Van den Mooter, G., 2009. Review: physical chemistry of solid dispersions. *J. Pharm. Pharmacol.* 61, 1571–1586.
- Jouppila, K., 2006. Mono- and Disaccharides: Selected Physicochemical and Functional Aspects, in: Eliasson, A.-C. (Ed.), *Carbohydrates in Food*. Taylor&Francis Group, pp. 41–88.
- Leuner, C., Dressman, J., 2000. Improving drug solubility for oral delivery using solid dispersions. *Eur. J. Pharm. Biopharm.* 50, 47–60.
- Li, Y., Du, G., Cai, W., Shao, X., Al, E.T., 2011. Classification and Quantitative Analysis of Azithromycin Tablets by Raman Spectroscopy and Chemometrics. *Am. J. Anal. Chem.* 2, 135–141.
- Martin, C., 2013. Twin Screw Extrusion for Pharmaceutical Processes, in: Repka, M.A. (Ed.), *Melt Extrusion*. pp. 47–79.
- Michaut, F., Busignies, V., Fouquereau, C., Huet De Barochez, B., Leclerc, B., Tchoreloff, P., 2010. Evaluation of a Rotary Tablet Press Simulator as a Tool for the Characterization of Compaction Properties of Pharmaceutical Products. *J. Pharm. Sci.* 99, 2874–2885.
- Patwardhan, K., Asgarzadeh, F., Dassinger, T., Albers, J., Repka, M.A., 2015. A quality by design approach to understand formulation and process variability in pharmaceutical melt. *J. Pharm. Pharmacol.* 67, 673–684.
- Paudel, A., Worku, Z.A., Meeus, J., Guns, S., Van Den Mooter, G., 2013. Manufacturing of solid dispersions of poorly water soluble drugs by spray drying: Formulation and process considerations. *Int. J. Pharm.* 453, 253–284.
- Pieters, S., Vander Heyden, Y., Roger, J.-M., DHondt, M., Hansen, L., Palagos, B., De Spiegeleer, B., Remon, J.-P., Vervaet, C., De Beer, T., 2013. Raman spectroscopy and multivariate analysis for the rapid discrimination between native-like and non-native states in freeze-dried protein formulations. *Eur. J. Pharm. Biopharm.* 85, 263–271.
- Plumb, K., 2005. Continuous Processing in the pharmaceutical industry: Changing the mind set. *Chem. Eng. Res. Desing* 83, 730–738.
- Saerens, L., Segher, N., Vervaet, C., Remon, J.P., Beer, T. De, 2014. Validation of an in-line Raman spectroscopic method for continuous active pharmaceutical ingredient quantification during pharmaceutical hot-melt extrusion. *Anal. Chim. Acta* 806, 180–187.
- Saerens, L., Vervaet, C., Paul, J., Beer, T. De, 2013. Process monitoring and visualization solutions for hot-melt extrusion : a review. *J. Pharm. Pharmacol.* 66, 180–203.
- Sakai, T., Thommes, M., 2013. Investigation into mixing capability and solid dispersion preparation using the DSM Xplore Pharma Micro Extruder. *J. Pharm. Pharmacol.* 66, 218–231.
- Sandler, N., Reiche, K., Heinämäki, J., Yliruusi, J., 2010. Effect of Moisture on Powder Flow Properties of Theophylline. *Pharmaceutics* 2, 275–290.

- Sarode, A.L., Sandhu, H., Shah, N., Malick, W., Zia, H., 2013. Hot melt extrusion (HME) for amorphous solid dispersions : Predictive tools for processing and impact of drug-polymer interactions on supersaturation. *Eur. J. Pharm. Sci.* 48, 371–384.
- Seppälä, K., Heinämäki, J., Hataara, J., Seppälä, L., Yliruusi, J., 2010. Development of a New Method to Get a Reliable Powder Flow Characteristics Using Only 1 to 2 g of Powder. *AAPS PharmSciTech* 11, 402–408.
- Sethia, S., Squillante, E., 2004. Solid dispersion of carbamazepine in PVP K30 by conventional solvent evaporation and supercritical methods. *Int. J. Pharm.* 272, 1–10.
- Shah, S., Maddineni, S., Lu, J., Repka, M.A., 2013. Melt extrusion with poorly soluble drugs. *Int. J. Pharm.* 453, 233–252.
- Sun, C., Grant, D.J.W., 2001. Influence of crystal structure on the tableting properties of sulfamerazine polymorphs. *Pharm. Res.* 18, 274–280.
- Tarlier, N., Soulairol, I., Bataille, B., Baylac, G., Ravel, P., Nofrerias, I., Lefèvre, P., Sharkawi, T., 2015. Compaction behavior and deformation mechanism of directly compressible textured mannitol in a rotary tablet press simulator. *Int. J. Pharm.* 495, 410–419.
- Vervaet, C., Vercruysse, J., Remon, J.P., De Beer, T., Vervaet, C., 2013. Continuous Processing of Pharmaceuticals, in: *Encyclopedia of Pharmaceutical Science and Technology*. Taylor&Francis Group, pp. 644–655.
- Wang, Y., Steinhoff, B., Brinkmann, C., Alig, I., 2008. In-line monitoring of the thermal degradation of poly (L -lactic acid) during melt extrusion by UV-vis spectroscopy. *Polymer (Guildf)*. 49, 1257–1265.
- Wu, C., Hancock, B.C., Mills, A., Bentham, A.C., Best, S.M., Elliott, J.A., 2008. Numerical and experimental investigation of capping mechanisms during pharmaceutical tablet compaction. *Powder Technol.* 181, 121–129.

Figure 1. Contour plot of torque as function of barrel temperature (°C) and drug load (%).

Figure 2. Effect plot of SME including 95% confidence intervals for screw speed (Scr), barrel temperature (T), throughput (Thr) and drug load (Dru) with their interactions (*) as factors.

Figure 3. Effect plots of extrudate properties including 95% confidence intervals: responses T_g (upper figure) and d_{90} (lower figure) for screw speed (Scr), barrel temperature (T), throughput (Thr) and drug load (Dru) with their interactions (*) as factors.

Figure 4. Effect plot including 95% confidence intervals of the moisture content (upper figure) for screw speed (Scr), barrel temperature (T), throughput (Thr) and drug load (Dru) with their interactions (*) as factors while the interaction plot (lower figure) is highlighting the combined effect of barrel temperature (T) and drug load on the moisture content.

Figure 5. Molecular weight distributions (left) of SOL-samples: non-processed (neat), hot-melt extruded at stress conditions (stressed) or hot-melt extruded using different (low, medium and high) SME conditions (EX). The molecular structure of SOL is shown (right).

Figure 6. Off-line collected Raman spectra with first derivative pre-processing (upper figure) and the corresponding PC1 versus PC2 scores plot (lower figure) of the calibration set for milled extrudates containing 5 % CEL (black), 10 % CEL (red), 20 % CEL (blue), 30 % CEL (yellow) and 40 % CEL (green).

Figure 7. Predicted versus observed CEL concentrations of the Raman spectra of the validation set containing 19 % CEL (black squares), 20 % CEL (red circles), 21 % CEL (blue triangles), 25 % CEL (yellow inverse triangles) and 35 % CEL (green diamond).

Figure 8. Tableability plot of all experiments (left) and the effect plot including 95% confidence intervals of the tablet tensile strength at 255 MPa (right). Formulations without API (experiments 1-8) are represented by dotted lines (.....), formulations with 20 % drug load (experiments 9-16) are represented by full lines (—) while the centerpoints containing 10 % drug load (experiments 17-19) are displayed by dashed lines (-----).

Figure 9. Out-of-die elastic recovery in function of main compaction pressure for all experiments (left) and the corresponding effect plot including 95% confidence intervals at 255 MPa (right). Formulations without API (experiments 1-8) are represented by dotted lines (.....), formulations with 20 % drug load (experiments 9-16) are represented by full lines (—) while the centerpoints containing 10 % drug load (experiments 17-19) are displayed by dashed lines (-----).

Figure 10. PC₁ vs. PC₂ bi-plot of the determined compaction and flow properties for formulations of experiments containing 20 % CEL (blue triangles), formulations of experiments without drug load (orange boxes) and centerpoints containing 10 % CEL (green circles) for which the number represents the corresponding experiment number in the experimental design. The loadings (red star shape) represent the fragmentation factor (D_b), the heckel value (P_y), the plasticity factor (PF) and the anti-correlated in-die elastic recovery (IER), tablet tensile strength (TS) and out-of-die elastic recovery (AR) for three compaction pressures (low, medium, high) and the flow rate of the powder formulations.

Figure 1. Contour plot of torque as function of barrel temperature (°C) and drug load (%).

718
719
720
721

Figure 2. Effect plot of SME including 95% confidence intervals for screw speed (Scr), barrel temperature (T), throughput (Thr) and drug load (Dru) with their interactions (*) as factors.

722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743

Figure 3. Effect plots of extrudate properties including 95% confidence intervals: responses T_g (upper figure) and d_{90} (lower figure) for screw speed (Scr), barrel temperature (T), throughput (Thr) and drug load (Dru) with their interactions (*) as factors.

Figure 4. Effect plot including 95% confidence intervals of the moisture content (upper figure) for screw speed (Scr), barrel temperature (T), throughput (Thro) and drug load (Dru) with their interactions (*) as factors while the interaction plot (lower figure) is highlighting the combined effect of barrel temperature (T) and drug load on the moisture content.

Figure 5. Molecular weight distributions (left) of SOL-samples: non-processed (neat), hot-melt extruded at stress conditions (stressed) or hot-melt extruded using different (low, medium and high) SME conditions (EX). The molecular structure of SOL is shown (right).

884
885
886
887
888
889
890

Figure 6. Off-line collected Raman spectra with first derivative pre-processing (upper figure) and the corresponding PC1 versus PC2 scores plot (lower figure) of the calibration set for milled extrudates containing 5 % CEL (black), 10 % CEL (red), 20 % CEL (blue), 30 % CEL (yellow) and 40 % CEL (green).

891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928

929
930
931
932
933

Figure 7. Predicted versus observed CEL concentrations of the Raman spectra of the validation set containing 19 % CEL (black squares), 20 % CEL (red circles), 21 % CEL (blue triangles), 25 % CEL (yellow inverse triangles) and 35 % CEL (green diamond).

934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975

976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986

Figure 8. Tableability plot of all experiments (left) and the effect plot including 95% confidence intervals of the tablet tensile strength at 255 MPa (right). Formulations without API (experiments 1-8) are represented by dotted lines (.....), formulations with 20 % drug load (experiments 9-16) are represented by full lines (—) while the centerpoints containing 10 % drug load (experiments 17-19) are displayed by dashed lines (-----).

987

988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008

Figure 9. Out-of-die elastic recovery in function of main compaction pressure for all experiments (left) and the corresponding effect plot including 95% confidence intervals at 255 MPa (right). Formulations without API (experiments 1-8) are represented by dotted lines (.....), formulations with 20 % drug load (experiments 9-16) are represented by full lines (—) while the centerpoints containing 10 % drug load (experiments 17-19) are displayed by dashed lines (-----).

1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048

Figure 10. PC₁ vs. PC₂ bi-plot of the determined compaction and flow properties for formulations of experiments containing 20 % CEL (blue triangles), formulations of experiments without drug load (orange boxes) and centerpoints containing 10 % CEL (green circles) for which the number represents the corresponding experiment number in the experimental design. The loadings (red star shape) represent the fragmentation factor (D_b), the heckel value (P_y), the plasticity factor (PF) and the anti-correlated in-die elastic recovery (IER), tablet tensile strength (TS) and out-of-die elastic recovery (AR) for three compaction pressures (low, medium, high) and the flow rate of the powder formulations.

1049

1050
1051
1052

1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060

1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101

Table 1. Overview of factor setting from the experimental design.
Table 2. Evaluation of the HME-process, extrudate and tablet properties from the experimental design.
Table 3. Validation parameters of the Raman PLS model: trueness and precision indicating the accuracy of the method.
Table 4. Quantification of the CEL concentration (%) in extrudate powders of the correlating experiment (DOE) based on the PLS model with an RMSEP of 1,84 %.

Table 1. Overview of factor settings of the experimental design.

Run	Barrel T (°C)	Screw speed (rpm)	Throughput (kg/h)	Drug load (%)
1	160	50	0.2	0
2	200	50	0.2	0
3	160	200	0.2	0
4	200	200	0.2	0
5	160	50	0.5	0
6	200	50	0.5	0
7	160	200	0.5	0
8	200	200	0.5	0
9	160	50	0.2	20
10	200	50	0.2	20
11	160	200	0.2	20
12	200	200	0.2	20
13	160	50	0.5	20
14	200	50	0.5	20
15	160	200	0.5	20
16	200	200	0.5	20
17	180	125	0.35	10
18	180	125	0.35	10
19	180	125	0.35	10

Table 2. Evaluation of the HME-process, extrudate and tablet properties from the experimental design.

Run	HME-process		Extrudate properties				Tablet properties			
	Torque (%)	SME (kWh/kg)	T _g (°C)	d ₉₀ (µm)	Moisture (%)	True density (g/ml)	TS ₂₅₅ (MPa)	OER (%)	PF (%)	Py (MPa)
1	48.5	0.18	60.8	64.3	2.08	1.183	3.26	14.6	91.0	60.8
2	54.0	0.08	60.8	58.0	2.15	1.181	3.52	14.5	89.7	60.3
3	42.5	0.63	58.5	50.8	2.05	1.181	3.56	14.6	88.8	54.4
4	49.0	0.29	59.7	46.8	1.99	1.182	3.71	15.2	90.2	55.8
5	26.5	0.04	57.8	78.9	2.14	1.179	3.62	15.4	91.0	62.4
6	17.0	0.10	57.6	57.7	1.99	1.183	3.84	14.7	90.9	53.0
7	12.5	0.05	58.7	64.8	2.18	1.186	3.62	16.0	90.3	55.6
8	23.0	0.34	55.1	54.5	2.19	1.178	3.61	15.1	89.7	54.9
9	23.5	0.09	56.9	114.3	1.86	1.215	4.67	10.4	91.6	73.0
10	21.0	0.31	52.5	105.9	1.89	1.220	4.50	11.9	92.0	74.0
11	29.0	0.04	54.1	108.8	2.05	1.221	4.42	11.3	91.6	74.5
12	20.5	0.12	56.0	96.6	1.95	1.219	4.71	10.4	90.9	73.1
13	6.5	0.02	55.9	102.9	1.37	1.220	4.50	11.5	90.1	75.7
14	9.0	0.01	57.5	101.7	1.65	1.219	4.36	12.2	91.4	73.1
15	9.0	0.13	57.0	96.0	1.51	1.220	4.59	11.3	91.9	76.4
16	11.5	0.07	58.3	97.3	1.58	1.220	4.45	11.3	90.9	78.0
17	19.0	0.10	57.8	68.2	2.01	1.200	3.89	13.5	90.8	67.9
18	17.5	0.09	56.5	85.3	2.11	1.200	4.09	12.1	90.9	63.7
19	18.0	0.10	60.6	68.3	2.05	1.197	4.08	12.5	91.7	69.9

Table 3. Validation parameters of the Raman PLS model: trueness and precision reflecting the accuracy of the quantification method.

Validation CEL concentration (%)	Accuracy	
	Trueness (% Relative bias)	Precision (% RSD)
19.0	-7.74	0.11
20.0	-8.14	0.99
21.0	-5.62	0.37
25.0	-7.14	0.21
35.0	-6.19	0.30

1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259

1260
1261

Table 4. Quantification of the CEL concentration (%) in the milled extrudates of the corresponding DOE experiment based on the PLS model with an RMSEP of 1.84 %.

	Exp. N°	Conc. CEL (%)
20 % CEL (label claim)	Exp. 9	19.2
	Exp. 10	20.3
	Exp. 11	20.3
	Exp. 12	20.0
	Exp. 13	19.2
	Exp. 14	19.4
	Exp. 15	19.6
	Exp. 16	19.8
10 % CEL (label claim)	Exp. 17	9.6
	Exp. 18	9.8
	Exp. 19	9.7