## CHAPTER III

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

## In Vitro Study

The original brand of paracetamol elixir and four brands of paracetaimol suspensions were tested for content of active ingredient and were studied for the in vitro absorption through Saptorius Absorption Simulator SM16750. Table 2 summarizes the findings of the in vitro studies. Results indicated that the alixir was within the range of limit content $, 95-1,05 \pi \%$ existing standard in the B.P.1980(11) and all of the four brands of paracetamol suspensions met the U.S.P. XXI (9) requirement for the percent labeled amount, $90-110 \%$.

Of all the five products tested, one brand of paracetamol suspensions (Brand S3) was removed from the in vitro absorption study. The reason wast frat, its vehicle was hardly passed the filter making the circulation of the systen eqratic and inconsistent.? 9 F ?

Figure 1 illustrates the increasing of average paracetamol concentrations in phase II of Brands E, S1, S2 and S4 in both simulated gastric and intestinal conditions. Tables 3-6 list results of the in vitro absorption studies for Brands E, S1, S2 and S4, respectively.

Table 2 In Vitro Stucty of the Paracetamol Elixir and the Paracetamol Suspensions.


Most drugs are absorbed from gastrointestinal tract by passive diffusion which absorption occurs more rapidly in small intestine than in stomach, and so does the paracetamol (17). In this study the diffusion rate constants, $K d$ and absorption rate constants, $K i$ were higher in intestinal experiments than those in gastric conditions. This is not surprising since enyironmental conditions in the intestine are more obviously suitable for absorption of any drugs than those in the stomach such as ; larger surface areas, etc. However, there/were no statistically significant difference in Kd or Ki values obtained from stomach and intestine among Brands E, S1, S2 and S4 ( $\mathrm{p}>0.05$ ) (Tables 7-8).

Table 3 In Vitro flbsorption Study of Paracetamol Elixir, Brand E Using Sartorius fbsorption Simulator SM 16750.

Concentration of Paracetamol in phase II (mg\%)


[^0]D. Standard error

Table 4 In Uitro Absorption Study of Paracetamol Suspension, Grand 51 Using Sartorius Absorption Simulator SM 16750.

Concentration of Paracetamol in phase II (mg\%)

a. The starting concentration
b. Standard error

a. The starting concentration
b. Standard error

Table 6 In Vitro Absorption Study of Paracetamol Suspension, Brand S4 Using Sartorius Rbsorption Simulator SM 16750.

Concentration of Paracetamd in phase II (mg\%)

a. The starting concentration
b. Standard error


Figure 1 In vitro representative increasing of mean paracetamol concentrations in phase II after 60 mg dose of paracetamol from paracetamol elixir and ค) qpargcetamol? suspensions using the Sartorius Absorption Simulator SM16750.

Table 7 Analysis of Variance for In Vitro Absorption Rate Constants , Ki of the Paracetamol Elixir (Brand E) and Paracetanol Suspensions(Brands S1,S2 and S4).


Table 8 Comparison of In Vitro Absorption Rate Constants, Ki of Commercial Brands of Paracetamol Suspensions with Paracetamol Elixir, Brand $E$ and the Original Brand of Paracetamol Suspension, Brand S1 Using t-test.

a A t-value from the table

## In Vivo Study

Standard curve of paracetamol in pooled urine was constructed to determine concentrations of total paracetamol excreted into the urine (Appendix D, Table 27, Figure 13). Since very low concentrations in urine samples at the time 32 hour postadministration, some of the results were determined by extrapolation of the standard curve. Table 9 illustrates the amount of drug excreted into the urine for each brand as a function of time

The cumulative amount of drug excreted into the urine is directly related to the total amount of drug absorbed. Table 10 presents the cumulative amount of drug excreted into the urine as a function of time for Brands $E$, S1, S2, S3 and S4 (Figure, 2). In this study, the cumulative amount of drug excreted into the urine at the time 32 hour postdose was read as the maximum cumulative amount of drug excreted into the urine, $[D u]_{\infty}$ (Table 11). No statisticalyy significant fafferfence fn the maximum cumulative amount of drug excreted into the urine among the five brands was obseryeq ( $\beta>0,95$ ) Tables 127 13). The total paracetamol recovery studied here was about $70-75 \%$ of the dose. The value is less than those of approximately $80-90 \%$ reported by Miller, R.P. et al (18) and Holt, S. et al (19). However, the total recovery of paracetamol in urine of about 67-80 \% was published by McGilveray, I.J. and Mattok,G.L.(20).

Table 9 Individual Amount of Paracetamol Excreted into the Urine from 8 Subjects Following Oral Single Dose of 600 mg Paracetamol Elixir and Paracetamol Suspensions.

| Brand | Time(hr) | Amount of Paracetamol Excreted into the Urine (mg) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 |  | jeet |  |  | 7 | 8 | Mean | $5 E^{\text {b }}$ |
| E | 0.5 | 5.96 | 8.17 |  | 7.77 | 9.88 | 10.72 | 5.79 | 5.68 | 7.72 | 0.67 |
|  | 1.0 | 26.78 | 27.49 | 32.26 | 19.60 | 29.00 | 20.12 | 23.55 | 21.84 | 25.08 | 1.60 |
|  | 1.5 | 29.61 | 28.07 | 28.56 | 29.62 | 31.24 | 29.34 | 23.46 | 27.53 | 28.43 | 0.81 |
|  | 2.0 | 30.89 | 34.08 | 36.85 | 35,28 | 32.15 | 33.04 | 30.12 | 29.85 | 32.78 | 0.89 |
|  | 3.0 | 53.96 | 66.27 | 70.48 | 65.87 | 61.51 | 55.76 | 47.48 | 53.31 | 59.33 | 2.80 |
|  | 4.0 | 52.64 | 60.03 | 66.40 | 50, 16 | 52.48 | 60.11 |  | 85. 17 |  |  |
|  | 6.0 | 73.03 | 78.59 | 79.03 | 88.85 | 82.15 | 72.55 44.14 | 78.53 | 87.17 57.66 | 79.89 50.57 | 2.03 |
|  | 8.0 | 46.11 | 63.03 59.37 | 44.38 41.52 | 40.48 51.35 | 54.18 65.44 | 44.14 69.88 | 54.55 | 57.66 55.73 | 50.57 | 2.79 3.62 |
|  | 12.0 | 18.87 | 22.87 | 30.58 | 22.37 | 36.80 | 27.35 | 23.29 | 25.59 | 25.96 | 1.99 |
|  | 24.0 | 14.20 | 14.65 | 19.80 |  | 27.19 .9 | 20.41 a | 21.03 l | $18.95{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 20.37 | 1.69 |
|  | 32.0 | 7.67. | 9.44 | 6.66 . | $7.99^{\circ}$ | $9.28{ }^{\circ}$ | $9.53{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $8.61{ }^{\text {a }}$ | $12.65{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 8.97 |  |
| 51 | 0.5 | 6.25 | 7.09 | 5.48 | 3.70 | 6.22 | 3.89 | 4.80 | 4.94 | 5.30 | 0.42 |
|  | 1.0 | 29.00 | 19.34 | 20.98 | 18.29 | 29.07 | 12.94 | 13.54 | 19.46 | 20.20 | 2.08 |
|  | 1.5 | 31.76 | 24.62 | 29.57 | 27.46 | 27.70 | 26.81 | 24.03 | 24.72 | 27.10 | 0.95 |
|  | 2.0 | 31.65 | 26. 83 | (31.879 | 32, 72 | 32.889 | 27.53 | 24.35 | 25.74 | 29.20 | 1.22 |
|  | 3.0 | 57.30 | 57.070 | 65.67 | 5963 | 59.81. | 47.87 | 46.88 | 56.98 | 56.40 | 2.21 |
|  | 4.0 | 49.53 | 54. 77.29 | $53.33$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48.92 \\ & 77.77 \end{aligned}$ | 54.79 83.41 | 49.62 71.79 | 49.48 67.43 | 46.94 75.15 | 50.91 74.01 | 1.04 |
|  | 6.0 | 41.35 | 65.61 | 46.66 | 50.56 | 57.18 | 61.19 | 47.94 | 56.00 | 53.31 | 2.86 |
|  | 12.0 | 38.15 | 64.14 | 38.85. | 66.98 | 64.17 | 59.03 | 54.58 | 59.28 | 55.52 | 3.97 |
|  | 16.0 | 16.77 | 28.17 | 15.73 | 34.05 | 32.82 | 27.37 | 22.20 | 26.12 | 25.40 | 2.39 |
|  | 24.0 | 13.22 a | 22.17 | 11.54 | $33.65{ }^{3}$ | $32.03{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 18.22 14.58 | 18.05 | 23.96 12.84 | 21.61 | 2.85 0.77 |
|  | 32.0 | $12.16{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 10.88 | 7.44 | $13.38^{\text {a }}$ | $13.14{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 14.58 | 11.09 | 12.84 | 11.94 | 0.77 |

a. Determined by extrapolation of the standard curve.
b. Standard error

Table 9 (continued)

a. Determined by extrapolation of the standard curve.
b. Standard error

Table 9 (continued)


Table 10 Individual Cumulative Fmount of Paracetamol Excreted into the Urine from B Subjects Following Oral Single Dose of Paracetamol from Paracetamol Elikir and Paracetamol Suspensions.

| Brand | Cumulative Amount of Paracetamol Excreted into the Urine |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tin | 1 | 2 |  | bject | 15 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Mean | $S^{\text {a }}$ |
| $E$ | 0.5 | 5.96 | 8.17 | 7.78 |  | . 88 | 10.72 | 5.79 | 5.68 | 7.72 | 0.67 |
|  | 1.0 | 32.74 | 35.66 | 40.04 | 27,36 | 38.88 | 30.83 | 29.34 | 27.53 | 32.80 | 1.75 |
|  | 1.5 | 62.35 | 63.73 | 68.60 | 56.98 | 70,12 | 60.17 | 52.80 | 55.06 | 61.23 | 2.19 |
|  | 2.0 | 93.24 | 97.81 | 105.46 | 92.26 | 102.27 | 93.21 | 82.92 | 84.91 | 94.01 | 2.75 |
|  | 3.0 | 147.21 | 164.08 | 175.94 | 158.13 | 163.78 | 148.98 | 130.40 | 138.22 | 153.34 | 5.29 |
|  | 4.0 | 199.84 | 224.11 | 242.34 | 208. 29 | 216.26 | 209.08 | 171.90 | 193.83 | 208.21 | 7.41 |
|  | 6.0 | 272.88 | 302.70 | 321.37 | 296.34 | 258. 41 | 281.64 | 250.43 | 281.01 | 289.10 | 7.60 |
|  | 8.0 | 318.99 | 365.73 | 365.76 | 336.82 | 352.59 | 325.78 | 304.98 | 338.66 | 338.66 | 7.74 |
|  | 12.0 | 362.13 | 425.10 | 407.27 | 388.17 | 418.03 | 395.66 | 367.53 | 394.39 | 394.78 | 7.87 |
|  | 16.0 | 391.00 | 447.97 | 437.85 | 410.54 | 454.83 | 423.01 | 390.83 | 419.98 | 420.75 | 9.24 |
|  | 24.0 | 395.20 | 462.61 | 457.65 | 437.30 | 482.81 | 443.41 | 411.85 | 438.94 | 441.12 | 9.82 |
|  | 32.0 | 402.87 | 472.05 | 464.31 | 445.23 | 491.30 | 452.94 | 420.46 | 451.58 | 450.09 | 9.93 |
| 51 | 0.5 | 6.25 | 7.09 | 5.48 | 3.70 | 6.22 | 3.89 | 4.80 | 4.94 | 5.30 | 0.42 |
|  | 1.0 | 34.25 | 26.43 | 26.46 | 21.99 | 35.29 | 16.83 | 18.34 | 24.40 | 25.50 | 2.37 |
|  | 1.5 | 65.01 | 51.05 | 56.12 | 49.45 | 62.99 | 43.64 | 42.38 | 49.13 | 52.59 | 3.02 |
|  | 2.0 | 97.66 | 77.88 | 87.99 | 82. 17 | 95.87 | 71.16 | 66.72 | 74.87 | 81.79 | 3.99 |
|  | 3.0 | 154.96 | 134.95 | 153.66 | 141.80 | 155.68 | 119.04 | 113.60 | 131.84 | 138.19 | 5.77 |
|  | 4.0 | 204.49 | 189.64 | 206.98 | 190.72 | 210.47 | 168.65 | 163.00 | 178.79 | 189.10 | 6.29 |
|  | 6.0 | 278.11 | 266.93 | 272.58 | 268.49 | 293.88 | 240.45 | 230.51 | 253.94 | 263.11 | 7.28 |
|  | 8.0 | 319.46 | 332.54 | 319.24 | 319.05 | 351.06 | 301.64 | 278.46 | 309.94 | 316.42 | 7.54 |
|  | 12.0 | 357.61 | 396.68 | 358.09 | 386.03 | 415.22 | 959.67 | 393.04 | 363.22 | 371.94 | 9.21 |
|  | 16.0 | 374.37 | 424.86 | 373.82 | 420.08 | 448.04 | 787.03 | 355.24 | 795.34 | 397.35 | 11.03 |
|  | 24.0 | 387.60 | 447.02 | 385.36 | 453.73 | 480.09 | 405.26 | 373.30 | 419.30 | 418.95 | 13.44 |
|  | 32.0 | 399.75 | 457.91 | 392.81 | 467.11 | 493.21 | 419.84 | 384.39 | 432.14 | 430.89 | 13.78 |

[^1]Table 10 (continued)

| Brand | Time(hr) | Cumulative Amount of Paracetanol Excreted into the Urine |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 |  | Subject |  |  | 7 | 8 | Mean | $5^{\text {a }}$ |
| 52 | 0.5 | 8.43 | 5.00 | 2.89 | . 80 | 5.55 | B. 41 | 6.49 | 2.71 | 5.91 | 0.81 |
|  | 1.0 | 33.75 | 28.04 | 20.57 | 34.14 | 28.29 | 34.44 | 16.85 | 12.98 | 26.13 | 2.96 |
|  | 1.5 | 61.48 | 57.29 | 62.80 | 66.95 | 60.80 | 54.39 | 34.28 | 33.59 | 55.12 | 4.72 |
|  | 2.0 | 95.38 | 88.94 | 101.15 | 104.43 | 93.54 | 93.72 | 56.45 | 59.96 | 86.70 | 6.45 |
|  | 3.0 | 159.16 | 148.75 | 173.86 | 174.55 | 155.96 | 145.27 | 95.44 | 108.09 | 145.13 | 10.23 |
|  | 4.0 | 219.59 | 206.53 | 241.85 | 235.24 | 210.36 | 199.55 | 133.22 | 161.63 | 201.00 | 12.99 |
|  | 6.0 | 307.86 | 301.21 | 334.16 | 328.85 | 296.07 | 289.10 | 192.70 | 253.58 | 287.94 | 16.20 |
|  | 8.0 | 351.45 | 361.31 | 389.40 | 382.19 | 355.94 | 353.72 | 237.27 | 307.34 | 343.20 | 17.42 |
|  | 12.0 | 409. 64 | 426.42 | 437.25 | 446.94 | 419.24 | 414.20 | 283.99 | 373.48 | 401.27 | 18.46 |
|  | 16.0 | 42 E .72 | 447.71 | 455.47 | 473.61 | 455.80 | 445.79 | 305.75 | 400.84 | 426.46 | 18.89 |
|  | 24.0 | 445.62 | 469.37 | 473.82 | 500.96 | 490.52 | 467.58 | 320.81 | 421.26 | 449.75 | 20.28 |
|  | 32.0 | 453.30 | 477.30 | 484.09 | 514.31 | 496.58 | 472.37 | 326.43 | 431.86 | 457.02 | 20.67 |
| 53 | 0.5 | 8.26 | 8.64 | 7.61 | 7.21 | 9.99 | 4.49 | 2.20 | 10.01 | 7.30 | 0.96 |
|  | 1.0 | 32.16 | 30.98 | 32.01 | 29.94 | 36.08 | 26.45 | 12.92 | 37.95 | 29.81 | 2.72 |
|  | 1.5 | 59.67 | 56.22 | 58.99 | 659.31 | 67.09 c | ,54.41 | 31.34 | 70.01 | 57.13 | 4.13 |
|  | 2.0 | 89.79 | 89.43 |  | ${ }^{87} .86$ | ${ }^{98}$ | ${ }^{181}$ | 55.96 | 100.30 | 85.69 | 4.81 |
|  | 3.0 | 140.16 | 144.50 | 147.74 | 151.35 | 159.56 d | 130.59 | 99.90 | 160.05 | 141.73 | 6.90 |
|  | 4.0 | 181.11 | 206.81 | 197.42 | 211.88 | 211.36. | 177.43 | 137.50 | 211.54 | 191.88 | 9.16 |
|  | 6.0 | 261.35 | 309.23 | 274.00 | 294.59 | 282.27 | 245.59 | 199.86 | 275.86 | 267.09 | 11.52 |
|  | 8.0 | 302.83 | 351.50 | 317.070 | 350.75 | 335.84 | 296.07 | 243.97 | 333.67 | 316.46 | 12.63 |
|  | 12.0 | 345.17 | 414.08 | 350006 | 409.62 | 396.69/ | 362.09 | 308.11 | 391.13 | 373.24 | 12.76 |
|  | 16.0 | 363.99 | 434,92 | 378.79 | $432.46^{\circ}$ | 423.23 | 397.42 | 335.95 | 417.50 | 398.09 | 12.64 |
|  | 24.0 | 380.10 | 453.53 | 393.43 <br> 988.68 | 459.14 | 450.55 467.50 | 414.48 420 | 361.93 | 437.61 | 418.85 | 13.09 |
|  | 32.0 | 391.31 | 463.64 | 398.68 | 479.61 | 467.50 | 420.30 | 368.46 | 444.41 | 429.24 | 14.37 |

[^2]Table 10 (coritinued)

| Brand | Time (hr) | Cumulative Amount of Paracetamal Exareted into the Urine |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 2 |  | 4 |  |  | 7 | 8 | Mean | $5 E^{\text {a }}$ |
| 54 | 0.5 | 7.23 | 3.82 | 5.77 | 7 | 5.58 | 8.25 | 8.25 | 7.79 | 6.18 | 0.73 |
|  | 1.0 | 28.90 | 23.46 | 30.04 | 15.43 | 25.43 | 31.16 | 16.33 | 32.02 | 25.35 | 2.30 |
|  | 1.5 | 54.05 | 49.93 | 59.91 | 36.11 | 55.02 | 60.65 | 32.92 | 63.64 | 51.59 | 4.02 |
|  | 2.0 | 82.41 | 76.70 | 90.51 | 65.79 . | 91.58 | 88.44 | 52.23 | 92.66 | 80.04 | 5.12 |
|  | 3.0 | 136.43 | 129.28 | 149.60 | 116.94 | 158.94 | 137.40 | 89.94 | 150.90 | 133.68 | 7.82 |
|  | 4.0 | 185.95 | 181.97 | 197.78 | 167.31 | 217.11 | 184.98 | 126.47 | 206.60 | 183.52 | 9.81 |
|  | 6.0 | 259.36 | 260.48 | 273.34 | 241.61 | 308.11 | 274.72 | 181.23 | 297.10 | 261.99 | 13.76 |
|  | 8.0 | 300.61 | 314.01 | 311.07 | 302.82 | 364.71 | 328.14 | 221.76 | 354.33 | 312.18 | 15.35 |
|  | 12.0 | 342.64 | 369.24 | 349.54 | 360.08 | 411.15 | 391.41 | 275.95 | 418.43 | 364.82 | 16.03 |
|  | 16.0 | 365.76 | 400.68 | 362.64 | 388.97 | 437.67 | 420.94 | 301.11 | 443.11 | 390.11 | 16.58 |
|  | 24.0 | 382.27 | 420.98 | 374.64 | 416.13 | 460.93 | 446.60 | 325.05 | 467.42 | 411.75 | 17.22 |
|  | 32.0 | 392.18 | 426.68 | 378.98 | 429.19 | 472.91 | 453.70 | 331.21 | 482.59 | 420.93 | 18.08 |
|  |  | 6 - - - - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a. Standard error |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Figure 2 Mean cumulative amount of paracetamol excreted into the urine from 8 subjects following oral single dose of 600 mg paracetamol from P 9 paracetamol elixir and paracetamol suspensions. จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

Table 11 Individual Maximum Cumulative Amount of Paracetamol Excreted into the Urine ([Du] $]_{\infty}$ ) from 8 Subjects Following Oral Single Dose of 600 mg Paracetamol from Paracetamol Elixir and Paracetamol Suspensions.

Maximum Cumulative Amount of Paracetamol Excreted into the Urine (mg)
Subject No.

Brand E Brand S1 Brand S2 Brand S3 Brand S4

| 1 | 402.87 | 399.75 | 453.30 | 391.31 | 392.18 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 472.05 | 457,81 | 477.30 | 463.64 | 426.68 |
| 3 | 464.31 | 392.81 | 484.03 | 398.69 | 378.98 |
| 4 | 445.23 | 467.11 | 514.31 | 479.61 | 429.19 |
| 5 | 491.30 | 493.21 | 496.58 | 467.50 | 472.91 |
| 6 | 452.94 | 419.84 | 472.37 | 420.30 | 453.70 |
| 7 | 420.46 | 384.39 | 326.43 | 368.46 | 331.21 |
| 8 | 451.58 | 432.14 | 431.86 | 444.41 | 482.59 |

Table 12 Analysis of Variance for Maximun Amount of Paracetamol Excreted into the Urine, $[\mathrm{Du}]_{\infty}$ of Paracetamol Elixir (Brand E) and Paracetamol Suspensions (Brands S1,S2,S3 and S4).


Table 13 Comparison of Maximun Amount of Paracetamol Excreted into the Urine, [Du] of Commercial Brands of Paracetamol Suspensions with Paracetamol Elixir, Brand E and the Orisinal Brand of Paracetamol Suspension, Brand S1 Using t-test


The rate of drug excretion, $d D u / d t$ could not be determined experimentally for any given instance. Therefore, an average urinary excretion was calculated for the collection period. The rate of drug excretion, as a function of time, of Brands $\mathrm{E}, \mathrm{S} 1, \mathrm{~S} 2, \mathrm{~S} 3$ and S 4 were shown in Table 14. The average ratel of drug excretion of each brand was plotted on a semilosarithmic scale against the time at midpoint of the collection period (Figure 3).

Since most druss are eliminated by a first order process , the rate of drug excretion is dependent on the concentration of drug in Qlasina (14). Thus, the maximum rates of drug excretion for the five brands or (dDu/dt)max , as shownińn Table 15, were analyzed. The analysis of variance indiorted no statistically significant difference among the five brands ( $p>0.05$ ) (Table 16). Whereas, the t-test showed statistically significant difference in the maximum rate of drug excretion between Brand $E$ and $B r$ and $33(\mathrm{p}<0.05)$ (Table 17)

According to the semilogarithmic plots of the individual/rate of paracetamol/excreted intofthe urine-time data for eight subjects, the data were well described by a mean of one compartment open model with first-order absorption and elimination. The individual excretion data was estimated for the pharmacokinetic parameters utilizing CSTRIP computer program.

Table 14 Individual Rate of Paracetanol Excretion from/ $/$ Subjects Following Oral Single Dose of 600 mg Paracetamol Elixir and Paracetamol Suspensions.

| Brand | Rate of Paracetamol Excretion (mg/hr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tmid | 1 | 2 | 3 | jec | 5 |  | 7 | 8 | Mean | $S E^{\text {b }}$ |
| $E$ | 0.25 | 11.93 | 16.34 | 15.57 | 5.53 | 19.76 | 21.43 | 11.58 | 11.37 | 15.44 | 1.33 |
|  | 0.75 | 53.56 | 54.97 | 64.52 | 39.20 | 58.00 | 40.23 | 47.10 | 43.69 | 50.16 | 3.20 |
|  | 1.25 | 59.22 | 56.14 | 57.12 | 59.23 | 62.47 | 58.67 | 46.93 | 55.06 | 56. $\mathrm{B}_{6}$ | 1.63 |
|  | 1.75 | 61.78 | 68.16 | 73.71 | 70.56 | 54.31 | 66.08 | 60.24 | 59.70 | 65.57 | 1.78 |
|  | 2.50 | 53.96 | 66.27 | 70.48 | 65.87 | 51.51 | 55.76 | 47.48 | 59.31 | 59.33 | 2.80 |
|  | 3.50 | 52.64 | 60.03 | 66.40 | 50.16 | 52.48 | 60.11 | 41.50 | 55.61 | 54.87 | 2.67 |
|  | 5.00 | 36.52 | 39.30 | 39.52 | 44.02 | 41.08 | 36.28 | 39.26 | 43.59 | 39.94 | 1.01 |
|  | 7.00 | 23.06 | 31.51 | 22.19 | 20.24 | 27.09 | 22.07 | 27.28 | 28.83 | 25.28 | 1.39 |
|  | 10.00 | 10.79 | 14.84 | 10.38 | 12.84 | 16.36 | 17.47 | 15.64 | 13.93 | 14.09 | 0.90 |
|  | 14.00 | 4.72 | 5.72 | 7.65 | 5.59\% | 19.20 | 5.84 | 5.82 | 6.40 | 6.49 | 0.50 |
|  | 20.00 | 1.76 | 1.83 | 2. 47 | 3.34 | 3.40 | 2.55 | 2.63 | 2.37 | 2.55 | 0.21 |
|  | 28.00 . 0 , 0 .18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 51 | 0.25 | 12.50 | 14.19 | 10.95 | 7.40 | 12.44 | 7.77 | 9.59 | 9.74 | 10.57 | 0.84 |
|  | 0.75 | 56.00 | 38.67 | 41.96 | -36.58 | 58.15 | 25.89 | 27.09 | 39.51 | 40.48 | 4.16 |
|  | 1.25 | 63.52 | 49.23 | 59.93 | 54.912 | 55.40 | 53.61 | 48.07 | 48.21 | 54.04 | 1.95 |
|  | 1.75 | 63.30 | $53.66^{\circ}$ | 63.73 | . 65.45 | 65.76 | 55.06 | 48.69 | 51.96 | 58.45 | 2.41 |
|  | 2.50 | 57.30 | 57.07 | 65.67 | 59.63 | 59.81 | 47.87 | 46.88 | 56.08 | 56.29 | 2.21 |
|  | 3.50 | 49.53 | 54.69 | 53.33 | 48.92 | 54.79 | 49.62 | 49.48 | 46.69 | 50.88 | 1.06 |
|  | 5.00 | 36.81 | 238.64 | 32.80 | 38.89 | 41, 20 | 35.90 30.60 | 33.72 | 37.58 | 37.00 26.63 | 1.02 1.43 |
|  | 7.00 | 20.67 | 032.81 | 23.331 | 25.28 | 29.59 | 30.60 14.51 | 23.97 13.65 | 27.79 14.29 | 26.63 13.81 | 1.43 0.98 |
|  | 10.00 14.00 | 9.54 4.19 | 16.03 7.04 | 9.71 3.93 | 16.75 8.51 | 16.04 8.21 | 14.51 6.84 | 13.65 | 14.39 | 13.81 6.32 | 0.90 |
|  | 20.00 | 1.65 | 2.77 | 1.44 | 4.21 | 4.00 | 2.28 | 2.26 | 2.97 | 2.70 | 0.36 |
|  | 28.00 | 1.52 | 1.36 | 0.93 | 1.67 | 1.64 | 1.82 | 1.39 | 1.54 | 1.48 | 0.10 |

a. Time at midpoint of the collection period
b. Standard error

Table 14 (continued)

a. Time at midpoint of the collection period
b. Standard error

Table 14 (continued)

a. Time at midpoint of the collection period
b. Standard error


Figure 3 Mean rate of paracetamol excretion from 8 subjects iollowing oral single dose of 600 mg racetsmo ${ }^{3}$ from paracetamol celixir and paracetamol ค 9 paracetamol from paracetampl elixit

## จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

Table 15 Individual Maximum Rate of Paracetamol Excretion, (dDu/dt)max, from 8 Subjects Following Oral Single Dose of 600 mg Paracetamol from Paracetamol Elixir and Paracetamol Suspensions.


Table 16 Analysis of Variance for Maximum Rate of Paracetamol Excretion, (dDu/dt)max of Paracetamol Elixir(Brand E) and Paracetamol Suspensions(Brands S1,S2,S3 and S4).


b Sum of Square

d Variation ratio
e F obtained from the table•pa

Table 17 Comparison of the Maximm Rate of Paracetamol Excretion, ( $d D u / d t$ ) $\max$ of the Commercial Brands of Paracetamol Suspensions with Paracetamol Elixir, Brand E and the Original Brand of Paracetamol Suspension, Brand S1 Using t-test

a Significant (p<0.05)
b A t-value from the table

The individual absorption rate constant of paracetamol for each brand, Ka are listed in Table 18. The order of magnitude of the five brands in term of Ka were Brand $\mathrm{E}>\mathrm{Br}$ and $\mathrm{S} 1>\mathrm{Br}$ and $\mathrm{S} 3>\mathrm{Br}$ and $\mathrm{S} 4>\mathrm{Br}$ and S 2 . There was statistically significant difference between the Ka of Brand $E$ versus that of Br and S 2 , and the Ka of Br and E versus that of Brand S4 ( $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ) (Tables 19-20).

The individual averall elimination rate constants, $K$, and the half lives, $t_{1}, 2$, of each brand were shown in Tables 21 and 22 , respectively. No statistically significant difference among the five brands was observed in terms of $K$ and $t_{1 / 2}$ values $(p>0.05)$. The average overall elimination rate constant was $0.1615 \mathrm{hr}^{-1}$ with a range 0.1591-0.1679 $\mathrm{hr}^{-1}$. The average hajfilife for paracetamol of 4.32 hours with a range of $4.14-4,43$ hours studied here is longer than those of approximately $1.62-2.83$ hoyrs as reported by Nelson, E. and Morioka,T (21). and $2.67 \pm 0.43$ hours (Mean $\pm$ SD) as reported by Holt, S. et al (19). However, the half-lives
 have been थ published by Miller, R.P. et al (18) and


Table 18 Individual Absorption Rate constant (Ka) of Paracetamol from 8 Subjects Following Oral Single Dose of 600 mg Paracetamol from Paracetamol Elixir and Paracetamol Suspensions.


Table 19 Analysis of Variance for Absorption Rate Constant, Ka of Paracetamol Elixir (Brand E) and Paracetamol Suspensions (Brands S1,S2,S3 and S4).


Table 20 Comparison of Absorption Rate Constants of Paracetamol, Ka of Commercial Brands of Paracetamol Suspensions with Paracetamol Elixir, Brand E and the Original Brand of Paracetamol Suspension, Brand S1 Using t-test


Table 21 Individual Elimination Rate Constant (K) of Paracetamol from 8 Subjects Following Oral Single Dose of 600 mg Paracetamol from Paracetamol Elixir and Paracetamol Suspensions.


Table 22 Individual Half Life $\left(t_{1 / 2}\right)$ of Paracetamol from 8 Subjects Following Oral Single Dose of 600 mg Paracetamol from Paracetamol Elixir and Paracetamol Suspensions.


The time for maximum urinary excretion, $t_{\infty}$ refers to the total time required for the drug to be absorbed and completely excreted after drug administration. In this study, this time was approximately set to be seven times of the half life of the drug. This is because the drug in urine samples at the time 24-32 hours postdose was too low to be correctly determined with the analytical prosedure used here.

The individual time for maximum urinary excretion of the five brands wepe shown in Table 23. Results indicated that there were no statistically significant difference among the produets tested in the $t_{\infty}$ values using one way analysis of variance and t-test ( $p>0.05$ ) (Tables 24-25).

 จุหาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

Table 23 Individual Time for Maximum Urinary Excretion ( $\mathrm{t}_{\infty}$ ) of Paracetamol from 8 Subjects Following Oral Single Dose of 600 mg Paracetamol from Paracetamol Elixir and Paracetamol Suspensions.


Table 24 Analysis of Variance for Time for Maximn Urinary Excretion, $t_{\infty}$ of Paracetamol Elixir(Brand B) and Paracetamol Suspensions (Brands S1,S2,S3 and S4).


Table 25 Comparison of Time for Maximum Urinary Excretion, $\mathrm{t}_{\infty}$ of Commercial Brands of Paracetamol Suspensions with Paracetamol Elixir, Brand E and the Original Brand of Paracetamol Suspension, Brand S1 Using t-test.


Relative bioavailabilities of paracetamol suspensions (Brands S1, S2, S3 and S4) to paracetamol elixir were studied. Results indicated that Brand S1 and Brand E were bioequivalent according to four parameters : $[D u]_{\infty}$, ( $d D u / d t$ )max, $t_{\infty}$ and Ka . Although there were statistically significant difference $(p<0.05)$ in Ka between Brand S 2 and Brand $E$, and Brand $S 4$ and Brand $E$, these three brands were bioequivalent regarding to the following parameters : [Du $]_{\infty}$, ( $d D u / d t$ )max and $t_{\infty}$ In spite of the statistically significant difference $(p<0.05)$ between Brand S3 and Brand E in (dDu/dt)max, they weqe also bioequivalent with respect to $[\mathrm{Du}]_{\infty}, \mathrm{t}_{\infty}$ and Ka. MThe relative bioavailabilities of paracetamol suspensions with respect to paracetamol elixir were $104.31,98,35,104.12$ and $106.74 \%$ for Brand S1, S2, S3 and S 4 , respectively.


Table 26 Estimated Pharmacokinetic Parameters from 9 Subjects Following Oral Single Dose of 600 mg | Paracetamol from Paracetamol Elixir and Paracelamol Suspensions. |
| :--- |
| Parameters |

a. Mean and standard error (value in parenthesis).
b. $\mathrm{NS}=$ not significant ( $p>0.05$ )
c. $S=$ significant $(p<0.05)$

## In Vitro-In Vivo Correlation

An attempt to correlate the mean absorption rate constants, Ki of paracetamol in the stomach and in the intestine predicted by the Sartorius Absorption Simulator SM 16750, with the mean absorption rate constants, $K a$ of the drug in in vivo study was performed. There were poor correlation between the $K i$ values (both in simulated gastric and in intestinal simulated conditions) and the Ka values with correlation coefficients of -0.4732 and 0.4898 , respectively (Figures 4-5). The results obtained indicated that the in vivo absorption rate constants of paracetamol suspensions and/or elixitcould not be predicted by the in vitro model study $(p>0,05)$. These results were not agree with that previously repert (17). This may be due to the in vitro Absorption Simulator used in this study is not suitable for suspension dosage forms? However, the in vitro Absorption Simulator should be continuously studied and developedq for? m valuableqnad $\int_{0}^{\text {to }} \int^{\text {investigate }}$ the absorption of new drugs or new preparations.

## จุหาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย



Figure 4 Correlation between in vitro absorption rate constant, Ki, in simulated gastric condition and in vivo absorption rate constant, Ka.


Figure 5 Correlation between in vitro absorption rate constant, Ki , in simulated intestinal condition and in vivo absorption rate constant, Ka .


[^0]:    a. The starting concentration

[^1]:    2. Standard error
[^2]:    a. Standard error

