List of Figures

Figure no.	Description	Page No.
2.1	Pie Charts Present the Distribution of Cases (a) and Deaths (b) for the 10 Most Common Cancers in 2018 for Females.	10
2.2	Chemical structure of Vinorelbine tartrate	25
2.3	Chemical structure of Resveratrol	31
2.4	Chemical structure of GMO	35
2.5	Chemical structure of GMS	37
2.6	Chemical structure of PLGA	40
2.7	Chemical structure of TPGS	43
2.8	Chemical structure of Poloxamer-188	45
4.1	Schematic representation of Solid Lipid Nanoparticles (SLNs)	61
4.2	Schematic representation of aqueous core nanocapsules (ACNs)	64
4.3	Schematic representation of dual drug loaded Aqueous Core Nanocapsules (dd-ACNs)	67
5.1	Calibration curve of VRL in a) mobile phase and b) PBS, pH 7.4	79
5.2	Calibration curve of RES in a) mobile phase and b) PBS, pH 7.4	80
5.3	Typical chromatogram of VRL (Rt=8.24 min) and RES (Rt=3.4 min).	81
5.4	Three-dimensional response surface plots showing the effect of independent variables (concentration of lipid, concentration of surfactant and homogenization speed) on response variables. R1: particle size (a, b, c) and R2: entrapment efficiency (d, e, f) of TPGS-VRL-SLNs	85
5.5	Three-dimensional response surface plots showing the effect of independent variables (concentration of lipid, concentration of surfactant and homogenization speed) on response variables. P.S:	86

	particle size (g, h, i) and EE: entrapment efficiency (j, k, l) of PL-VRL-SLNs	
5.6	Surface morphology by scanning electron microscopy a) TPGS-VRL-SLNs and b) PL-VRL-SLNs	93
5.7	FTIR spectra of drug, excipients and lyophilized nanoparticles.	94
5.8	DSC thermograms of drug, excipients and lyophilized nanoparticles	95
5.9	Cumulative percentage Release of VRL by VRL solution, TPGS-VRL-SLNs and PL-VRL-SLNs.	96
5.10	Percentage cell viability of VRL, TPGS-VRL-SLNs and PL-VRL-SLNs at different concentrations. Results were analyzed by two way ANOVA followed by bonferroni posthoc test ; a: when compared with VRL, b: when compared with TPGS-VRL-SLNs; (***p< 0.0001), (**p<0.001) and (*p<0.05))	99
5.11	Percentage of haemolysis at different time intervals in whole blood samples after addition of test samples at (a) 10 and (b) 100 μg mL^{-1}	100
5.12	Three-dimensional response surface plots showing the effect of independent variables (LC: Lipid concentration, S.C: Surfactant concentration and H.S:homogenization speed) on response variables. P.S: Particle size (a, b, c) of GMS-VRL-ACNs; and EE: encapsulation efficiency (d, e, f) of GMS-VRL-ACNs	103
5.13	Three-dimensional response surface plots showing the effect of independent variables (PC: Lipid concentration, SC: Surfactant concentration and HS:homogenization speed) on response variables. P.S: Particle size (a, b, c) of PLGA-VRL-ACNs; and EE: encapsulation efficiency (d, e, f) of PLGA-VRL-ACNs	104
5.14	Surface morphology of (A) GMS-VRL-ACNs and (B) PLGA-VRL-ACNs by TEM	109
5.15	Diffraction Analysis by TEM	110
5.16	Drug excipient compatability studies by FTIR studies.	110
5.17	Drug excipient compatability studies by DSC studies	111

5.18 Cumulative percentage release of drug from VRL solution, GMS-VRL-ACNs and PLGA-VRL-ACNs. 113

5.19 Cell viability of VRL, Placebo-ACNs and PLGA-VRL-ACNs at different concentrations. Results were analyzed by two way ANOVA followed by bonferroni posthoc test ; a: when compared with VRL, b: when compared with GMS-VRL-ACNs-ACNs; ((***p< 0.0001), (**p<0.001) and (*p<0.05)) 115

5.20 Scatter plot for determination of IC_{50} 115

5.21 Percentage of haemolysis at different time intervals in whole blood samples after addition of VRL, placebo-ACNs, GMS-VRL-ACNs and PLGA-VRL-ACNs at (a) 10, (b) 50 and (c) 100 mg mL^{-1}. (d) Number of platelets after addition of PBS, VRL, placebo ACNs and PLGA-VRL-ACN at 10, 50 and 100 mg mL^{-1}. Values are represented as mean ± SD (n =3). 116

5.22 Number of platelets after addition of PBS, VRL, placebo ACNs, GMS-VRL-ACNs and PLGA-VRL-ACN at 10, 50 and 100 mg mL^{-1}. Values are represented as mean ± SD (n =3). 117

5.23 Qualitative platelet aggregation images of Leishman's stained whole blood samples after treatment with: (a) PBS (equivalent volume to 10, 50 and 100 mg mL^{-1} of test samples), (b) VRL (10, 50 and 100 mg mL^{-1}) and (c) PLGA-VRL-ACNs (10, 50 and 100 mg mL^{-1}). Images were captured at a magnification of 100×. 118

5.24 Single treatment with VRL and RES 119

5.25 Illustrative Fa-CI and Fa-DRI plots for the combination of VRL and RES using different fixed drug ratios. (a) CI values were calculated from each Fa for MCF-7 cell lines. (b) DRI values were calculated from each Fa for MCF-7 cells. (c) Classical isobologram at IC_{75} 121

5.26 Surface morphology of A) GMS-VRL-RES-ACNs and B) PLGA-VRL-RES-ACNs by Transmission electron microscopy (TEM) 123

5.27 Drug excipient compatibility by FTIR 124

5.28	Drug excipient compatibility by DSC analysis	125
5.29	Cumulative percentage drug release of (A) GMS-VRL-RES-ACNs and (B) PLGA-VRL-RES-ACNs in PBS, pH 7.4 and 5 % tween 80	126
5.30	In vitro cytotoxicity of different formulations. Results were analyzed by two way ANOVA followed by bonferroni posthoc test ; a: when compared with VRL; b: when compared to VRL+RES; c: when compared to GMS-VRL-RES-ACNs; ((***p< 0.0001), (**p<0.001) and (*p<0.05))	128
5.31	In-vivo toxicity of different formulations. Results were analyzed by two way ANOVA followed by bonferroni posthoc test ; a: when compared with VRL; b: when compared to VRL+RES; c: when compared to GMS-VRL-RES-ACNs; ((***p< 0.0001), (**p<0.001) and (*p<0.05))	132
5.32	Kaplan – Meier analysis of survival of Sprague dawley rats	133
5.33	The tumor growth curve following combination therapy. Results were analyzed by two way ANOVA followed by bonferroni posthoc test ; a: when compared with PLGA-VRL-RES-ACNs, b: compared to VRL; and c: compared to VRL+RES ((***p< 0.0001), (**p<0.001) and (*p<0.05))	135
5.34	Percentage relative tumor growth rate of after treatment with VRL, VRL+RES, and PLGA-V+R-ACNs. Results were analyzed by two way ANOVA followed by bonferroni posthoc test ; (***p< 0.0001),	136