



**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

Investigation Into The Effect of Varying L-leucine Concentration on the product characteristics of Spray-dried Liposome Powders

Chen, K-H., Mueannoom, W., Gaisford, S., & Kett, V. (2012). Investigation Into The Effect of Varying L-leucine Concentration on the product characteristics of Spray-dried Liposome Powders. *Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmacology*, 64(10), 1412-24. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2042-7158.2012.01521.x>

Published in:

Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmacology

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:

[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

1 **Title:** Investigation Into The Effect of Varying L-leucine Concentration on the product
2 characteristics of Spray-dried Liposome Powders

3 K-H Chen^a, W. Mueannoom^b, S. Gaisford^b, V.L. Kett^{a*}

4 a School of Pharmacy, Queen's University of Belfast, Belfast BT9 7BL UK

5 b The School of Pharmacy, University of London, 29/39 Brunswick Square, London WC1N

6 1AX

7 *corresponding author email address v.kett@qub.ac.uk

8 Telephone +44 (0)2890 972008

9 Fax +44 (0)2890 247794

10

11

12 **Abstract**

13 Spray-dried formulations offer an attractive delivery system for administration of drug
14 encapsulated into liposomes to the lung, but can suffer from low encapsulation efficiency
15 and poor aerodynamic properties. In this paper the effect of the concentration of the
16 anti-adherent L-leucine was investigated in tandem with the protectants sucrose and
17 trehalose. Two manufacturing methods were compared in terms of their ability to offer small
18 liposomal size, low polydispersity and high encapsulation of the drug indometacin.
19 Unexpectedly sucrose offered the best protection to the liposomes during the spray drying
20 process, although formulations containing trehalose formed products with the best powder
21 characteristics for pulmonary delivery; high glass transition (T_g) values, fine powder fraction
22 (FPF) and yield. It was also found that L-leucine contributed positively to the characteristics
23 of the powders, but that it should be used with care as above the optimum concentration of
24 0.5% (w/w) the size and polydispersity index increased significantly for both disaccharide
25 formulations. Relating to the method of manufacture it was found that while both the
26 sucrose and trehalose conferred protection on the liposomes produced using either method
27 the ethanol-based proliposome method offered improved drug incorporation and did not
28 suffer from loss of drug caused by dilution effects.

29 (200 words)

30

31 **Keywords.** liposomes; spray drying; disaccharide; leucine

32 **1. Introduction**

33 Liposomes are suited to encapsulation of a variety of drugs from small molecular
34 weight compounds to macromolecules and including both hydrophilic and lipophilic entities.
35 This is reflected in the range of therapeutics that have been tested in liposomal
36 formulations including cytotoxic agents [3]; bronchodilators and anti-asthmatics [4; 5];
37 antibiotics [6] as well as photosensitizing agents [7] and genetic material [8-10]. The use of
38 spray drying to produce stable powder formulations for pulmonary administration is
39 attractive since it offers several advantages over the parenteral route [1]. Aerodynamic
40 diameter is a crucial factor in determining deposition of particles in the different sites of the
41 respiratory tract. Particles in the range 1-6 μm are best suited to deposition in the lower
42 airway following inhalation [2]; those with diameters $> 6 \mu\text{m}$ are deposited in the oropharynx,
43 whereas smaller particles ($< 1 \mu\text{m}$) are exhaled during normal tidal breathing. In addition,
44 fine particle fraction (FPF, the fraction of powder emitted from the inhaler with a particle size
45 $\leq 5 \mu\text{m}$) is a critical parameter to predict the proportion of the emitted dose that can deliver
46 deeply into the lower respiratory system. The Use of liposomes as carriers offers benefits
47 including protection of drug from enzymatic degradation; prolonging retention time and
48 reducing side effects.

49 Many methods are available for the manufacture of liposomes, including thin-film
50 hydration [11], organic solvent injection [12], reverse-phase evaporation [13] and
51 dehydration-rehydration [12; 14]. Both the ethanol injection and proliposome methods of

52 liposome preparation offer good potential for scale-up and have been used to encapsulate
53 a wide range of substances [15-25] [26-31]. The ethanol injection method involves the
54 rapid injection of a lipid-ethanol solution into an excess of aqueous medium to
55 spontaneously form large unilamellar vesicles (LUVs) [12]. Advantages of the technique
56 include simplicity and low risk of lipid degradation or oxidation. The ethanol-based
57 proliposome method is based on the preparation of hydrated stacked bilayer sheets in a
58 water-ethanol solution termed proliposomes. Spontaneous formation of liposomal
59 suspensions (multilamellar vesicles, MLVs) is achieved by addition of excess aqueous
60 solution to a lipid mixture [26]. The MLVs produced can be further processed for the
61 preparation of oligolamellar and unilamellar liposomes.

62

63 The effect of disaccharide protectants on the stability of spray dried liposomes has
64 been examined previously [32-34] , while amino acids have been shown to play an
65 important role in improving the aerosol behaviour of spray-dried powders by reducing
66 moisture sorption and surface tension of dried particles [37; 38]; they can also protect
67 proteins against thermal stresses and denaturation [39]. Leucine, in particular, tends to
68 improve powder aerosol properties, this anti-adherent effect has been attributed to its
69 hydrophobic character and surfactant-like properties that allow it to migrate rapidly to the
70 surfaces of the particles during drying [40; 41] and it has been shown to interact well with
71 lipid membranes [42]. Two studies have used leucine in combination with sugars at very

72 high fixed concentrations [43; 44]. To the best of our knowledge, the effect of varying
73 leucine concentration on the spray drying of liposomal systems has not been investigated
74 previously. In this paper we demonstrate the effect of varying concentrations of the
75 anti-adherent L-leucine in combination with optimised concentrations of disaccharides and
76 show for the first time that formulation effects can lead to significant differences in the
77 product characteristics for spray dried liposomes, especially in terms of for sucrose
78 formulations. Furthermore, at higher concentrations leucine increases liposome size.
79 Additionally, we investigated whether switching from the ethanol injection to the
80 proliposome method of liposome preparation affected liposome properties or drug release.
81 Indometacin was chosen as it has been used previously as a model drug in liposomal
82 studies [45; 25].

83

84 **2. Materials and methods**

85 **2.1 Materials**

86 Cholesterol (PhEur grade), sucrose (>99%), L-Leucine (PhEur grade), NaCl (≥99%),
87 Trifluoroacetic acid (99%), Iron (III) chloride hexahydrate (≥99%), Ammonium thiocyanate
88 (≥99%), Sephadex G-50 (20-80 µm), Indometacin (≥99%) phosphotungstic acid hydrate
89 and ethanol (≥99.5%) were purchased from Sigma Chemicals. α,α -Trehalose Dihydrate
90 (high purity, low endotoxin) was purchased from Ferro Pfanstiehl. Soy phosphatidylcholine
91 (LIPOID S 75, 80%) and soy phosphatidylcholine (Lipoid S PC, >98%) were purchased

92 from Lipoid. Methanol (HPLC grade, >99.8%) and chloroform (99.2%) were purchased from
93 VWR. Phosphate buffered saline tablets was purchased from Invitrogen Corporation. All
94 aqueous solutions were prepared with de-ionized water.

95

96 **2.2 Methods**

97 **2.2.1 Preparation and drying of liposomal dispersions**

98 **2.2.1.1 Preparation of liposomes by ethanol injection**

99 Small unilamellar vesicles (SUV's) were prepared by ethanol injection method followed
100 by sonication in order to reduce liposomal size. Each batch was prepared on a 10g scale.
101 0.02 g Indometacin was dissolved in 0.7 g ethanol (at 57 °C) together with the lipids
102 composed of 1g SPC and 0.115 g cholesterol. Hydration media were prepared by
103 dissolving varying amounts (2.5, 5, 7.5, 10 and 15% w/w) of disaccharides (sucrose or
104 trehalose) in 0.9% NaCl solution. Once the optimum concentration of these protectants
105 had been determined, liposomal dispersions were prepared using various concentrations
106 (0.25, 0.5 and 1% w/w) of L-Leucine added into the hydration medium also containing the
107 optimum concentration of each protectant. The lipid solution was rapidly injected into
108 8.165g of hydration medium at room temperature with stirring. After 2 hr hydration, the
109 prepared liposomal suspension was then submitted to a probe sonication process with a
110 sequence of 40 s of sonication and 20 s of rest in an ice bath to the desired size. In all
111 cases, the initial turbid liposomal suspension was translucent after sonication. Then, the

112 sonicated liposomes were annealed at 4 °C overnight before centrifugation (12,000 rpm, 30
113 min) and diluted 4-fold to give a final lipid concentration of 25 mg/mL of lipid.

114

115 **2.2.1.2 Preparation of liposomes by proliposome method**

116 1.5g of the appropriate hydration medium was added to a lipid dispersion containing
117 soya lecithin (750 mg), cholesterol (86.4 mg) and indometacin (30 mg) in ethanol (600 mg)
118 at 60 °C. The dispersion was stirred for 10 min at 60 °C, cooled to room temperature and
119 then converted to a 25 mg/mL liposome suspension by drop-wise addition of the rest of
120 hydration medium with continuous stirring for 2 hr following sonication and centrifugation.

121

122 **2.2.1.3 Spray drying of liposomes**

123 Spray drying was performed with a Mini Spray-dryer (Büchi 190). Applied spraying
124 parameters were: inlet temperature 100 °C, outlet temperature 70 °C, air-flow 600-650 NI/h,
125 aspirator setting 20 (100%), pump setting 2.5- 3 ml/min. A 0.5-mm nozzle was used.

126

127 **2.2.2 Liposome size analysis**

128 The average liposome size was determined with a ZetaSizer 3000HS (Malvern
129 Instruments Ltd, Malvern, United Kingdom) at a temperature of 25±0.1 °C. Samples of the
130 dispersion were diluted with hydration medium and the Z-average vesicle size and
131 polydispersity were determined at 25 °C by dynamic light scattering. The values of the

132 viscosity and refractive index used in the calculation of the liposome size of the light
133 scattering data were modified in terms of protectant concentration. The intensity of the laser
134 light scattered by the samples was detected at an angle of 90° with a photomultiplier. For
135 each specimen 10 autocorrelation functions were analyzed using a Contin analysis. From
136 this analysis, the z-average diameter (D_z) was obtained, which is an approximation of the
137 diameter of the liposomes. The particle size distribution was characterized using the
138 polydispersity index (PI). The spray-dried liposomes were reconstituted with de-ionized
139 water to attain the original lipid content according to the method of Bligh and Dyer [46] and
140 then performing the Stewart assay [47]. Samples were further diluted with hydration
141 medium for liposome size analysis.

142

143 **2.2.3 HPLC analysis of indometacin**

144 HPLC was carried out using a Waters system (Waters 1525 Binary HPLC Pump,
145 Waters IN-Line Degasser AF, Waters 2487 Dual λ Absorbance Detector, Waters 717 plus
146 Autosampler). Luna C-18 column (100A⁰, 150 X 4.6 mm 5 μ m, Phenomenex) was used.
147 The detector wavelength was set at 260 nm. The mobile phase consisted of a gradient of
148 methanol and 0.1% v/v trifluoroacetic acid. The gradient schedule was: (a) 0-4.5 min, 85%
149 methanol, flow rate of 1ml/min; (b) 4.5-5.5 min, 85 \rightarrow 100% methanol, flow rate of 1ml/min;
150 (c) 5.5-7 min, 100% methanol, flow rate of 1.2 ml/min; (d) 7-9 min, 100% methanol, flow
151 rate of 1.5 ml/min; (e) 9-15 min, 100% methanol, flow rate of 1.5 ml/min; (f) 15-16 min,

152 100% methanol, flow rate of 1 ml/min (g) 16-17 min, 100→85% methanol, flow rate of 1.0
153 ml/min; (h) 17-23 min, 85% methanol, flow rate of 1.0 ml/min. In order to determine
154 encapsulation efficiency (EE %) 50 µL of separate liposome solutions and reconstituted
155 dispersions were applied to a Sephadex G-50 column and eluted with hydration medium.
156 The fractions were diluted with methanol and the concentrations of indometacin were
157 determined by HPLC. Loading efficiency was determined by dividing the encapsulated drug
158 content (µg) by the lipid content (mg). The encapsulation efficiency (EE (%)) of indometacin
159 was determined from the ratio of encapsulated to total drug concentration.

160

161 **2.2.4 Water content and thermal analysis of the powders.**

162 Thermogravimetric studies were carried out to measure the water content of the
163 spray-dried liposomes using a TGA (Q500, TA instruments). Samples were heated from 20
164 to 25 °C at a scan rate of 10 °C /min. Modulated differential scanning calorimetry (MTDSC)
165 measurements of the dried products were performed on TA Q100 Differential Scanning
166 Calorimeter (Q100, TA Instruments, which had been calibrated for temperature, enthalpy
167 and heat capacity). The product was sealed into a hermetic aluminium pan and after
168 equilibration at 0 °C , was heated at 2 °C /min to 200 °C with a modulation of ± 0.4 °C /40
169 sec. Tg values are recorded as onset values from the reversing heat flow signal and
170 reported as mean values (n=4-6) with standard deviation.

171 **2.2.5 Scanning electron microscopy (SEM)**

172 The spray-dried powders were coated with gold in a sputter coater and their surface
173 morphology was observed using a scanning electron microscope (JEOL 6500F field
174 emission scanning electron microscope).

175 **2.2.6 Powder particle size analysis**

176 The volume mean diameter of spray-dried liposomes was measured by Laser Light
177 Diffraction Analyzer (HELOS/BR, Sympatec, Clausthal-Zellerfeld, Germany).
178 Approximately 5 mg of powder were suspended in chloroform in a 50 ml glass cuvette and
179 stirred with a magnetic bar at 1000 rpm. A short period of sonication (60 s) at a power of
180 60W (CUVETTE, Sympatec; 8.5 mm diameter ultrasound tip) was applied before sizing [48;
181 49]. A R4 lens was used allowing measurements in the range of 0.45-875 μm .

182 **2.2.7 *in vitro* release of indometacin from liposomes**

183 Free drug was removed from the reconstituted liposome suspensions by use of
184 centrifugal filter tubes (Amicon Ultra 15 MW Cut-off 10 KDa, Millipore). 1 ml portions were
185 sealed into dialysis tube (MW cut-off 7 KDa, Thermo Scientific), and added to 50 mL of pH
186 7.4 PBS release medium in a shaking incubator ($37^\circ \pm 0.5^\circ\text{C}$, 60 rpm, 25 mm throw;
187 Unitron, Infors HT, Switzerland). 2-ml samples were drawn periodically and the amount of
188 drug release determined using the HPLC method. The release volume was kept constant
189 throughout.

190 **2.2.8 Aerodynamic study**

191 A twin-stage liquid impinger was used to determine the emitted dose and fine particle

192 fraction (FPF) of the spray-dried powders. The dried liposome powders were filled into
193 number 3 gelatin capsules. A dry powder inhaler (Cyclohaler, Teva, UK) was attached to
194 the mouthpiece of emitted dose apparatus. Ten capsules were pierced and the dried
195 liposome powders were emptied at 60 L/min for 10 seconds. The powders deposited at
196 each stage were washed out and recovered. The powders deposited in the inhaler and
197 capsules were also collected. After being diluted with methanol to a suitable concentration,
198 each indometacin solution was assayed by HPLC. The FPF values were defined as the
199 powder mass recovered at stage 2. The results are expressed as the percentage of drug
200 dose emitted to the capsule content (loaded dose).

201 **2.2.9 Statistical analysis:**

202 Kruskal-Wallis analysis with Dunn's all pairwise multiple comparisons or Mann-Whitney
203 U test were used to calculate the p values using SigmaPlot 8 software. Differences were
204 deemed significant if p values were <0.05.

205

206 **3. Results and discussion**

207 ***3.1 Initial Determination of Optimum Disaccharide and L-leucine concentrations***

208 **3.1.1 Effect of disaccharide concentration on liposomal size and PI**

209 The size change of any liposomes prior to and after spray drying is a critical parameter
210 in the assessment of liposomal stability so this was used as an initial screening parameter
211 in choosing which formulations to take forward to the next step of formulation optimisation.

212 Initially the optimum concentration of either sucrose or trehalose as protectants during the
213 spray drying process was determined.

214 <Figure 1>

215 As shown in Figure 1a, the addition of 2.5% (w/w) sucrose to the hydration medium did
216 not prevent the aggregation and fusion of reconstituted liposomes after spray drying, but
217 increasing the concentration to 5% (w/w) inhibited liposomal size increase prior to spray
218 drying and after reconstitution more effectively. A further increase to 7.5% (w/w) showed no
219 significant change in the PI values. 10% (w/w) Sucrose was more protective still; this was
220 the only formulation containing disaccharide alone that showed no statistical difference in
221 liposomal size after drying. A further increase in concentration to 15% (w/w) resulted in an
222 increase in liposome size. This effect can also be seen by comparing the S_F/S_i ratios,
223 where S_F is the final liposomal size after rehydration and S_i is the initial liposomal size
224 [50]. Previous research into freeze-drying of liposomes demonstrated that solute
225 incorporated by liposome in the presence of lyoprotectant in a mass ratio of sugar: lipid of
226 2:1 could be effectively retained after freeze-drying [51], in the 5% (w/w) sucrose
227 dispersions the mass ratio of sucrose to lipid is close to this ratio. A similar effect was
228 observed when trehalose was used as the protectant (Figure 1b). However, the protective
229 effect of trehalose was not so good; the addition of 15% (w/w) trehalose dihydrate to the
230 hydration medium did not prevent the liposome size increasing after reconstitution ($p <$
231 0.05).

232 **3.1.2 Effect of disaccharide concentration on recovery rate and water content of**
233 **spray-dried liposome powders**

234 The recovery rate of the spray-dried powders significantly improved when increasing the
235 concentration of protectants from 2.5% (w/w) to 5% (w/w) for both sugars (Figure 2),
236 although further addition of either disaccharide showed little additional effect. Further, the
237 spray-dried liposomes with trehalose had a much higher recovery rate than those with
238 sucrose, which is ascribed to its higher T_g (101 °C compared with 64 °C for sucrose [36]).
239 The sticky point (T_s) of an amorphous powder is generally considered to lie 10-20 °C above
240 T_g ; if the outlet temperature of the dryer surpasses T_s then particle cohesion increases
241 sharply and there may also be increased adhesion to the dryer walls [35]. Because the
242 powder temperature would have been greater than the T_g for the sucrose formulation, the
243 particles would have been more prone to adherence to the walls of the spray-dryer.
244 Increasing the concentration of either protectant reduced the water content of the
245 spray-dried powders (Figure 2). Since T_g data are inversely related to water content this
246 would be expected. Based on the results in 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 the formulations containing 10%
247 sucrose and 15% trehalose were selected for further optimisation by addition of the
248 anti-adherent L-leucine.

249 <Figure 2>

250 <Figure 3>

251 **3.2 Effect of varying L-leucine concentration**

252 **3.2.1 Effect of L-leucine concentration on liposomal size**

253 Figure 3a indicates that the inclusion of L-Leucine at a concentration of 0.5% (w/w)
254 was the most effective in preventing size changes for both the 10% (w/w) sucrose and the
255 15% (w/w) trehalose formulations, with no statistical difference seen in the sizes prior to
256 spray drying compared with the reconstituted dispersions. Increasing the concentration to
257 1% (w/w) L-Leucine had the effect of markedly increasing the liposomal size in the
258 reconstituted dispersions. This might be caused by partitioning of the hydrophobic amino
259 acid into the lipid membrane during drying, causing vesicle fusion. While this phenomenon
260 has not been investigated for spray dried liposomes it has been observed previously during
261 freezing and freeze-drying of liposomes; Anchordoguy et al [52] found that the amino acids
262 with hydrocarbon side chains increased membrane damage during freeze/thaw trials.
263 Popova et al [53] observed that the amphiphilic aromatic amino acids tryptophan and
264 phenylalanine induced solute leakage and membrane fusion during freezing studies of
265 liposomes, while Mohammed [54] et al demonstrated that basic, polar amino acids
266 stabilized liposomes during lyophilisation but that at higher concentrations these amino
267 acids promoted vesicle fusion.

268 <Figure 4>

269 **3.2.2 Effect of L-leucine concentration on recovery rate and water content**

270 Addition of 0.5% (w/w) L-Leucine markedly improved the recovery rate of the 10% (w/w)
271 sucrose formulations (Figure 4) but had little effect on the liposomes formulated with 15%

272 (w/w) trehalose, which exhibited good yields already. L-Leucine did not have a significant
273 effect on the water contents of the powders (Figure 4) but a marked improvement in the
274 appearance of the powders was apparent to the naked eye. Formulations without L-leucine
275 were clumped into aggregates in the mm size range while increasing L-leucine reduced the
276 size. This effect was especially apparent for the sucrose formulations.

277 Taking all data from 3.1 and 3.2 into account the two formulations selected for further
278 testing were those containing 0.5% (w/w) leucine and either 10% (w/w) sucrose or 15%
279 (w/w) trehalose.

280

281 **3.3 Effect of Liposome manufacturing method on liposomal size and drug content**

282 Once the optimal levels of disaccharide and anti-adherent had been determined, the
283 effects of manufacturing process variables were investigated. Table 1 shows that liposomal
284 size was clearly larger for the formulations prepared by the proliposome method. It has
285 been suggested that the proliposome-prepared liposomes produce multilamellar vesicles
286 [31], while those prepared by the ethanol-injection method are primarily unilamellar, which
287 are more amenable to size reduction under the same sonication conditions. Based on
288 encapsulation efficiency and loading efficiency, the two methods have the same capability
289 to incorporate indometacin. However, lipid loss during the alcohol injection method could
290 not be avoided owing to this process involving injection of lipid solution into hydration
291 medium. It has previously been reported that ethanol concentration is a decisive factor in

292 liposome size reduction using a high-pressure homogenizer, whereby the liposomal size
293 and range decreased with increasing concentration of ethanol [55].

294 Statistically significant changes were seen between freshly prepared and reconstituted
295 liposomes prepared by the ethanol injection in terms of PI value, encapsulated content and
296 loading efficiency. The small increases in encapsulated content and loading efficiency were
297 attributed to untrapped drug being reincorporated into the liposomes during
298 reconstitution, as has previously been demonstrated for liposomes prepared using the DRV
299 (dried-rehydrated vesicle) method [56]. Even though the formulation was optimised using
300 the ethanol injection method, excellent encapsulation efficiency in liposomes prepared by
301 the proliposome method was obtained. Dispersions produced using the proliposome
302 method showed small statistically significant reductions in PI values for both formulations,
303 while for the trehalose formulation there was also a small statistically significant reduction in
304 liposomal size after drying. However, the liposomal indometacin content and its loading
305 efficiency did not significantly change during spray drying. In short, while sucrose enabled a
306 better loading efficiency when comparing samples produced by the ethanol injection
307 method; the combination of either 10% (w/w) sucrose and 0.5% (w/w) leucine or 15% (w/w)
308 trehalose and 0.5% (w/w) leucine in the formulations could effectively protect liposomes
309 prepared by either method against spray drying stress. In terms of drug loading and
310 efficiency liposomes prepared by the proliposome method incorporated drug more
311 effectively than those produced using the ethanol-injection method (Table 1). In addition, a

312 dilution effect was observed when comparing loading efficiency of liposomal stock solutions
313 and the final dispersions prepared by the ethanol-injection method, which was attributed to
314 encapsulated drug leaking out of the liposome stock solutions upon dilution as observed by
315 Foldvari et al [57]. TEM images (data not shown) indicate that the vesicular structure of
316 liposome in the presence of the optimised disaccharide and anti-adherent formulations
317 could be preserved very well through spray drying .

318

319 <Figure 5>

320 **3.4 Imaging, size analysis and aerodynamic properties of the spray-dried powders**

321 SEM analysis showed that particles of the optimally formulated sucrose powder
322 exhibited a smooth surface (Figure 5a and b), while the powders containing trehalose were
323 wrinkled (Figure 5d, e and f), which potentially prevents particles from adhering tightly to
324 each other, thus preventing aggregation and lowering the energy required to disperse them
325 [58]. This may explain why the sucrose formulation appeared to contain more aggregates.
326 Furthermore, the fine particle fraction was higher for the trehalose/L-leucine formulation
327 than for that containing sucrose/L-Leucine (Figure 6).

328 <Figure 6>

329 Bosquillon et al [59] had reported that the type of sugar incorporated did not affect
330 morphology of the spray-dried powders. The wrinkled surface perhaps can be attributed to
331 the inclusion of additives that alter the surface tension that controls droplet shape during

332 drying as Adler et al [60] demonstrated that surfactant could change the interface viscosity
333 and that consequently, the dried particle morphology also changed. By increasing the ratio
334 of surfactant to other additives, more spherical, smooth particles were obtained. It is
335 proposed that L-leucine at a concentration of 0.5% (w/w) functions as a surfactant. Hence,
336 it is suggested that the ratio of 0.5% (w/w) leucine to 15% (w/w) trehalose is below the
337 critical point of powder morphology conversion between roughness and smoothness and
338 so it tends to exhibit a wrinkled surface. The formulation containing 10%(w/w) sucrose
339 and 0.5% (w/w) exhibited a smoother morphology. To investigate whether this was a
340 concentration effect rather than being specific for trehalose, spray dried liposomes were
341 prepared with a sucrose concentration of 15% (w/w), but these still had smooth surfaces
342 (Figure 5c and d), indicating that the wrinkling is not caused by surface tension effects
343 alone. The SEM images also show that the diameters of all the spray dried powders were
344 less than 10 μ m (Figure 5). Accurate size distribution data are given in Table 2, which show
345 that all formulations the volume mean diameters were measured to be 3~4 μ m with the
346 exception of the formulation containing 10% (w/w) sucrose and 0.5% (w/w) L-leucine,
347 prepared by ethanol injection, which gave a larger diameter of 5.40 μ m. This size increase
348 cannot be attributed to hygroscopicity of the sucrose formulations [34] as the water content
349 values for all formulations were similar. Although the sucrose formulations exhibited lower
350 Tg values than the trehalose formulations, as might be expected, there was no significant
351 difference between those obtained for the liposomes prepared by the ethanol injection

352 rather than the proliposome method. The emitted dose and fine particle fraction of
353 spray-dried liposome formulated with trehalose and L-leucine were higher than those
354 formulated with 10% (w/w) sucrose and 0.5% (w/w) L-leucine. (Figure 6). Therefore, spray
355 dried liposomes with 15% (w/w) trehalose and 0.5% (w/w) leucine exhibited better aerosol
356 powder performance than those in the presence of 10% (w/w) sucrose and 0.5% (w/w)
357 leucine in terms of emitted dose, aerodynamic diameter and fine particle fraction.

358 <Figure 7>

359 **3.5 Release of indometacin from reconstituted liposomes**

360 Release data for Indometacin from reconstituted liposomes for both optimised
361 formulations using both methods of manufacture are shown in Figure 7. Diffusion of free
362 indometacin through the dialysis membrane was measured as a control. The release profile
363 of free drug shows over 80% diffusion in 4 hr. Over the same interval, the reconstituted
364 liposomes prepared by the ethanol-injection method released 15.1 % and 16.9% drug
365 (optimised formulations containing sucrose & trehalose respectively) and released ~45% of
366 the encapsulated drug over 24 hr. Those prepared by the proliposome method in the
367 presence of disaccharide (sucrose or trehalose) and leucine exhibited drug release of
368 21.8% and 24.3% in 4 hr and in total released 54.5% and 61.5% over 24 hours respectively
369 (Figure 7). These differences are not significant suggesting that the mode of release is the
370 same for all formulations. The mechanism responsible for the release of drug from the
371 liposomes may be due to diffusion phenomena, degradation effects, or a combination of

372 both processes. To examine the drug release kinetics and mechanism, the release data
373 were fitted to models representing zero-order, first-order, and Higuchi's square root of time
374 and the Korsmeyer–Peppas models (Table 3). All systems showed best correlation with the
375 Higuchi model and anomalous (non-Fickian) diffusion ($n > 0.5$). It is reasonable to
376 propose that this is because the indometacin is located within the phospholipid membrane
377 of the liposomes and must diffuse through in order to be released.

378

379 **4. Conclusions**

380 The inclusion of either 10% (w/w) sucrose or 15% (w/w) trehalose dihydrate and 0.5%
381 (w/w) L-leucine protected liposomes prepared by ethanol injection or proliposome method
382 against spray drying stress in terms of size change, polydispersity index, encapsulated
383 drug content and loading efficiency of the reconstituted liposomes. Formulation design was
384 of more importance than the method of liposome manufacture. The method for preparing
385 the liposomes had no effect on the stability or encapsulation efficiency of spray-dried
386 liposomes with optimal protectant and anti-adherent.

387 This paper has demonstrated for the first time that L-leucine should be used with care
388 as an additive for spray dried liposomes in combination with disaccharide. While there was
389 a clear advantage in using this material at an optimum level; at higher concentrations it
390 caused an increase in liposomal size upon rehydration of the spray dried powders that
391 might be attributed to it partitioning into the lipid membrane during drying, causing vesicle

392 fusion. This is an area for future research.

393

394

395 References

396

397 [1] Cryan SA. Carrier-based strategies for targeting protein and peptide drugs to the lungs.

398 *Aaps Journal* 2005; 1: E20-E41.

399 [2] Zeng XM et al. The controlled delivery of drugs to the lung. *Int J Pharm* 1995; 2:

400 149-164.

401 [3] Mccullough HN, Juliano RL. Organ-selective action of an anti-tumor drug -

402 pharmacologic studies of liposome-encapsulated beta-cytosine arabinoside administered

403 via the respiratory system of the rat. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1979; 3: 727-731.

404 [4] Mccalden Ta AR, And Mihalko Pj. Bronchodilator efficacy of liposome formulations of

405 metaproterenol sulfate in the anesthetized guinea pig. *Journal of Liposome Research* 1989;

406 2: 211-222.

407 [5] Taylor KMG et al. The influence of liposomal encapsulation on sodium cromoglycate

408 pharmacokinetics in man. *Pharm Res* 1989; 7: 633-636.

409 [6] Wong JP et al. Liposome delivery of ciprofloxacin against intracellular francisella

410 tularensis infection. *J Control Release* 2003; 3: 265-273.

411 [7] Ferro S et al. Efficient photoinactivation of methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus by

412 a novel porphyrin incorporated into a poly-cationic liposome. *Int J Biochem Cell Biol* 2007; 5:

413 1026-1034.

414 [8] Guo WJ et al. Characterization of a novel diolein-based lpdii vector for gene delivery. *J*

415 *Control Release* 2002; 1: 121-132.

416 [9] Igarashi S et al. Biosurfactant mel-a enhances cellular association and gene transfection

417 by cationic liposome. *J Control Release* 2006; 3: 362-368.

- 418 [10] Maitani Y et al. Cationic liposome (dc-chol/dope=1 : 2) and a modified ethanol injection
419 method to prepare liposomes, increased gene expression. *Int J Pharm* 2007; 1-2: 33-39.
- 420 [11] Bangham AD, Standish, M.M., Watkins, J.C., . Diffusion of univalent ions across the
421 lamellae of swollen phospholipids *J Mol Biol* 1965: 238-252.
- 422 [12] Batzri S, Korn ED. Single bilayer liposomes prepared without sonication. *Biochim*
423 *Biophys Acta* 1973; 4: 1015-1019.
- 424 [13] Szoka F, Papahadjopoulos D. Procedure for preparation of liposomes with large
425 internal aqueous space and high capture by reverse-phase evaporation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*
426 *U S A* 1978; 9: 4194-4198.
- 427 [14] Kirby CJ, Gregoriadis G. Preparation of liposomes containing factor viii for oral
428 treatment of haemophilia. *J Microencapsul* 1984; 1: 33-45.
- 429 [15] Naeff R. Feasibility of topical liposome drugs produced on an industrial scale.
430 *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews* 1996; 3: 343-347.
- 431 [16] Both DM et al. Liposome-encapsulated ursolic acid increases ceramides and collagen
432 in human skin cells. *Arch Dermatol Res* 2002; 11: 569-575.
- 433 [17] Wagner A et al. Liposomes produced in a pilot scale: Production, purification and
434 efficiency aspects. *Eur J Pharm Biopharm* 2002; 2: 213-219.
- 435 [18] Elzainy AaW et al. Hydroxyzine from topical phospholipid liposomal formulations:
436 Evaluation of peripheral antihistaminic activity and systemic absorption in a rabbit model.
437 *AAPS pharmSci* 2003; 4: E28.
- 438 [19] Stano P et al. Novel camptothecin analogue (gimatecan)-containing liposomes
439 prepared by the ethanol injection method. *Journal of Liposome Research* 2004; 1-2:

440 87-109.

441 [20] Justo OR, Moraes AM. Kanamycin incorporation in lipid vesicles prepared by ethanol
442 injection designed for tuberculosis treatment. *J Pharm Pharmacol* 2005; 1: 23-30.

443 [21] Ugwu S et al. Preparation, characterization, and stability of liposome-based
444 formulations of mitoxantrone. *Drug Dev Ind Pharm* 2005; 2: 223-229.

445 [22] Zhong HJ et al. Multivesicular liposome formulation for the sustained delivery of
446 breviscapine. *Int J Pharm* 2005; 1-2: 15-24.

447 [23] Padamwar MN, Pokharkar VB. Development of vitamin loaded topical liposomal
448 formulation using factorial design approach: Drug deposition and stability. *Int J Pharm* 2006;
449 1-2: 37-44.

450 [24] Wang Z et al. Development and pharmacokinetics of nimodipine-loaded liposomes. *J*
451 *Pharm Pharmacol* 2006; 9: 1289-1294.

452 [25] Jaafar-Maalej C et al. Ethanol injection method for hydrophilic and lipophilic
453 drug-loaded liposome preparation. *Journal of Liposome Research* 2010; 3: 228-243.

454 [26] Perrett S et al. A simple method for the preparation of liposomes for pharmaceutical
455 applications - characterization of the liposomes. *J Pharm Pharmacol* 1991; 3: 154-161.

456 [27] Turanek J et al. Linkup of a fast protein liquid chromatography system with a stirred
457 thermostated cell for sterile preparation of liposomes by the proliposome-liposome method:
458 Application to encapsulation of antibiotics, synthetic peptide immunomodulators, and a
459 photosensitizer. *Anal Biochem* 1997; 2: 131-139.

460 [28] Pavelic Z et al. Liposomes containing drugs for treatment of vaginal infections. *Eur J*
461 *Pharm Sci* 1999; 4: 345-351.

- 462 [29] Rengel RG et al. High efficiency entrapment of superoxide dismutase into
463 mucoadhesive chitosan-coated liposomes. *Eur J Pharm Sci* 2002; 5: 441-448.
- 464 [30] Ishikawa H et al. Liposomal microcapsulation of enzymes by proliposome method with
465 chitosan-coating. *Journal of the Faculty of Agriculture Kyushu University* 2005; 1: 141-149.
- 466 [31] Elhissi AMA et al. Formulations generated from ethanol-based proliposomes for
467 delivery via medical nebulizers. *J Pharm Pharmacol* 2006; 7: 887-894.
- 468 [32] Hauser H, Strauss G. Stabilization of small unilamellar phospholipid-vesicles during
469 spray-drying. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 1987; 2: 331-334.
- 470 [33] Goldbach P et al. Spray-drying of liposomes for a pulmonary administration .1.
471 Chemical-stability of phospholipids. *Drug Dev Ind Pharm* 1993; 19: 2611-2622.
- 472 [34] Lo YL et al. Liposomes and disaccharides as carriers in spray-dried powder
473 formulations of superoxide dismutase. *J Control Release* 2004; 2-3: 259-272.
- 474 [35] Maury M et al. Effects of process variables on the powder yield of spray-dried trehalose
475 on a laboratory spray-dryer. *Eur J Pharm Biopharm* 2005; 3: 565-573.
- 476 [36] Hatley RH. Glass fragility and the stability of pharmaceutical preparations--excipient
477 selection. *Pharm Dev Technol* 1997; 3: 257-64.
- 478 [37] Seville PC et al. Amino acid-modified spray-dried powders with enhanced
479 aerosolisation properties for pulmonary drug delivery. *Powder Technology* 2007; 1: 40-50.
- 480 [38] Lechuga-Ballesteros D et al. Trileucine improves aerosol performance and stability of
481 spray-dried powders for inhalation. *J Pharm Sci* 2008; 1: 287-302.
- 482 [39] Arakawa T et al. Biotechnology applications of amino acids in protein purification and
483 formulations. *Amino Acids* 2007; 4: 587-605.

- 484 [40] Lucas P et al. Enhancement of small particle size dry powder aerosol formulations
485 using an ultra low density additive. *Pharm Res* 1999; 10: 1643-1647.
- 486 [41] Chew NYK et al. Effect of amino acids on the dispersion of disodium cromoglycate
487 powders. *J Pharm Sci* 2005; 10: 2289-2300.
- 488 [42] Oradd G et al. Effects of peptide hydrophobicity on its incorporation in phospholipid
489 membranes - an nmr and ellipsometry study. *Biochimica Et Biophysica*
490 *Acta-Biomembranes* 2011; 1: 244-252.
- 491 [43] Chougule M et al. Nano-liposomal dry powder inhaler of tacrolimus: Preparation,
492 characterization, and pulmonary pharmacokinetics. *International Journal of Nanomedicine*
493 2007; 4: 675-688.
- 494 [44] Chougule M et al. Development of spray dried liposomal dry powder inhaler of dapsone.
495 *Aaps Pharmscitech* 2008; 1: 47-53.
- 496 [45] Puglia C et al. Evaluation of in-vivo topical anti-inflammatory activity of indometacin
497 from liposomal vesicles. *J Pharm Pharmacol* 2004; 10: 1225-1232.
- 498 [46] Bligh EG, Dyer W. J. . A rapid method of total lipid extraction and purification. *Can J*
499 *Biochem Phys* 1959; 8: 911-917.
- 500 [47] Stewart JCM. Colorimetric determination of phospholipids with ammonium
501 ferrothiocyanate. *Anal Biochem* 1980; 1: 10-14.
- 502 [48] Dalpiaz A et al. Developement and characterization of biodegradable nanospheres as
503 delivery systems of anti-ischemic adenosine derivatives. *Biomaterials* 2005; 11: 1299-1306.
- 504 [49] Minne A et al. Optimization of the aerosolization properties of an inhalation dry powder
505 based on selection of excipients. *Eur J Pharm Biopharm* 2008; 3: 839-844.

- 506 [50] Abdelwahed W et al. Investigation of nanocapsules stabilization by amorphous
507 excipients during freeze-drying and storage. *Eur J Pharm Biopharm* 2006; 2: 87-94.
- 508 [51] Crowe JH, Crowe LM. Factors affecting the stability of dry liposomes. *Biochim Biophys*
509 *Acta* 1988; 2: 327-334.
- 510 [52] Anchordoguy T et al. Mechanisms of interaction of amino-acids with
511 phospholipid-bilayers during freezing. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 1988; 2: 299-306.
- 512 [53] Popova AV et al. Differential destabilization of membranes by tryptophan and
513 phenylalanine during freezing: The roles of lipid composition and membrane fusion.
514 *Biochimica Et Biophysica Acta-Biomembranes* 2002; 1: 109-118.
- 515 [54] Mohammed AR et al. Amino acids as cryoprotectants for liposomal delivery systems.
516 *Eur J Pharm Sci* 2007; 5: 406-413.
- 517 [55] Rodriguez RB, Xamani MS. Liposomes prepared by high-pressure homogenizers.
518 *Liposomes, Pt A* 2003: 28-46.
- 519 [56] Zadi B, Gregoriadis G. A novel method for high-yield entrapment of solutes into small
520 liposomes. *Journal of Liposome Research* 2000; 1: 73-80.
- 521 [57] Foldvari M et al. Topical liposomal local-anesthetics - design, optimization and
522 evaluation of formulations. *Drug Dev Ind Pharm* 1993; 19: 2499-2517.
- 523 [58] You Y et al. Physical characteristics and aerosolization performance of insulin dry
524 powders for inhalation prepared by a spray drying method. *J Pharm Pharmacol* 2007; 7:
525 927-934.
- 526 [59] Bosquillon C et al. Influence of formulation excipients and physical characteristics of
527 inhalation dry powders on their aerosolization performance. *J Control Release* 2001; 3:

528 329-339.

529 [60] Adler M et al. Surface composition of spray-dried particles of bovine serum
530 albumin/trehalose/surfactant. *Pharm Res* 2000; 7: 863-870.

531

532

533

Table 1. The characterization of liposomes prepared by ethanol injection and by proliposome. The hydration buffers were in either a combination of 10% (w/w) sucrose and 0.5% (w/w) L-Leucine or 15% (w/w) trehalose dihydrate and 0.5% (w/w) L-Leucine. * denotes P<0.05 (Mann-Whitney U test) in comparison with the corresponding samples prior to spray-drying. + P<0.05 (Mann-Whitney U test) compared to formulations with the inclusion of trehalose/L-Leucine. Each value represents the mean \pm SD (three different batches) and n denotes replicate measurements of each batch.

Preparative methods	Ethanol injection		Proliposome	
	Before spray-drying	After reconstitution	Before spray-drying	After reconstitution
Liposome with 10% (w/w) sucrose and 0.5% (w/w) L-Leucine				
Liposome size (nm) & (PI)	107.4 \pm 13.8 (0.20 \pm 0.02)	115.1 \pm 11.5* (0.25 \pm 0.04*)	137.9 \pm 4.9 (0.48 \pm 0.02)	134.0 \pm 8.2 (0.39 \pm 0.03*)
Total drug content (μ g/mL)	407.5 \pm 7.9	384.8 \pm 7.3*	846.4 \pm 23.5	797.2 \pm 13.1*
Encapsulation efficiency (%)	33.3 \pm 6.1	53.2 \pm 15.1*	45.4 \pm 1.0	45.9 \pm 2.3
Encapsulated drug content (μ g/mL)	135.6 \pm 24.9	204.8 \pm 58.1*	397.6 \pm 8.3	366.3 \pm 23.7
Lipid content (mg/mL)	23.57 \pm 0.37	21.60 \pm 1.17*	26.75 \pm 0.47	25.87 \pm 0.26
Loading efficiency (μ g drug/ mg lipid)	5.7 \pm 1.0	9.5 \pm 2.9* ⁺	14.4 \pm 0.6	14.3 \pm 1.8
Liposome with 15% (w/w) trehalose dihydrate and 0.5% (w/w) L-Leucine				
Liposome size (nm) & (PI)	130.7 \pm 2.7 (0.31 \pm 0.03)	132.7 \pm 4.2 (0.36 \pm 0.02*)	138.5 \pm 4.8 (0.52 \pm 0.04)	127.3 \pm 3.6* (0.40 \pm 0.03*)
Total drug content (μ g/mL)	442.1 \pm 7.4	428.2 \pm 10.9*	899.9 \pm 8.1	868.6 \pm 16.7*
Encapsulation efficiency (%)	37.4 \pm 6.4	42.5 \pm 3.8	49.7 \pm 7.1	52.0 \pm 7.0
Encapsulated drug content (μ g/mL)	165.3 \pm 27.4	181.8 \pm 16.5	447.5 \pm 67.7	449.1 \pm 66.0
Lipid content (mg/mL)	26.21 \pm 0.70	25.51 \pm 1.80	29.60 \pm 0.10	27.85 \pm 0.39
Loading efficiency (μ g drug/ mg lipid)	6.3 \pm 0.9	7.2 \pm 0.70	15.1 \pm 2.2	15.7 \pm 2.0