List of Figures

Figure No.	Description	Page No.
4.1	FTIR spectrum of docetaxel (sample drug)	55
4.2	UV spectrum of Docetaxel in acetonitrile mixed with pH 7.4 PBS (30:70)	57
4.3	Preparation of PHBV PVA polymeric nanoparticles	64
4.4	Ishikawa fishbone diagram is showing risk assessment studies	65
4.5	Preparation of PHBV PF127 polymeric nanoparticles	70
4.6	Risk management flow chart containing material attributes and process parameters	71
4.7	Preparation of PHBV TPGS polymeric nanoparticles	76
4.8	Preparation of PHBV PLH PE-PEG polymeric nanoparticles	80
5.1	Calibration curve of docetaxel in acetonitrile and pH 7.4 saline phosphate buffer (70:30) at 231 nm	91
5.2	Graphical illustrations are representing the effect of independent variables (column temp., flow rate and % organic phase) on the number of theoretical plates. (A1 & A2) represents interaction effect of column temp. and flow rate on theoretical plate; (B1 & B2) describes interaction effect of column temp and % organic phase on theoretical plate; whereas (C1 & C2) represents interaction effect of flow rate and % organic phase on the theoretical plate	95
5.3	Optimized predicted values for factors as per Design Expert 10	96
5.4	Chromatogram of docetaxel at 5, 10, 25, 50 and 100 ppm	97
5.5	Results of linearity data and the calibration curve of docetaxel in acetonitrile and PBS pH 7.4 (30:70) at 235 nm	99
5.6	Degradation data for docetaxel at various environmental conditions for 72 h	101
5.7	Pareto chart showing the influence of variables on responses;	103

(A) influence of input variables on particle size, (B) influence of input variables on zeta potential, (C) influence of input variables on entrapment efficiency

5.8 Contour and 3-D Response Surface Methodology showing effect of independent variables on responses; (PS) effect of input variables on particle size, (ZP) effect of input variables on zeta potential and (EE) effect of input variables on % entrapment efficiency 105

5.9 (a) HR-TEM image; (b) SEM image at 10KX of optimized formulation and (c) AFM micrographs 110

5.10 Time course of days represents the in vitro percentage cumulative release of the drug from NPs in PBS pH 7.4 111

5.11 Pareto chart and half normal plot showing the influence of variables on responses; (A) influence of input variables on particle size, (B) influence of input variables on zeta potential, (C) influence of input variables on entrapment efficiency 113

5.12 Graphical illustrations of Contour and 3-D Response Surface Methodology showing the effect of independent variables on responses; (PS) effect of input variables on particle size, (ZP) effect of input variables on zeta potential and (EE) effect of input variables on percentage entrapment efficiency 117

5.13 (A) SEM micrographs; (B) HR-TEM image; (C) AFM image of the optimized formulation 119

5.14 Profile showing in vitro cumulative drug release percentage from PHBV NPs in PBS pH 7.4 120

5.15 Pareto chart showing the influence of input variables on particle size and influence of input variables on entrapment efficiency 123

5.16 Contour, 3-D Response Surface Methodology and All factor plot showing the effect of independent variables on responses (effect of homogenizer speed and polymer concentration on particle size; effect of sonication time and polymer concentration on % entrapment efficiency) 127

5.17 (A) SEM image; (B) AFM micrographs; (C) HR-TEM images of optimized nanoformulation 129

5.18 In vitro cumulative percentage of the drug release from PHBV NPs in PBS pH 7.4 130

5.19	Analysis of variance and lack of fit plots with error showing goodness of fit for optimized process	134
5.20	Optimized predicted set points of independent variables indicating the effects on particle size and entrapment efficiency and response distribution graph showing expected values of responses (particle size and entrapment efficiency)	134
5.21	3-D response surface plot showing the effects on responses (effect of homogenizer speed and polymer concentration on particle size; effect of sonication time and polymer concentration on % entrapment efficiency) and contour surface plot showing the effects of independent variables on particle size and entrapment efficiency with their corresponding optimized set points	135
5.22	Results of particle size, PDI and zeta potential analysis for F4 optimized formulation	138
5.23	Multi y plot for percentage entrapment efficiency and particle size of different optimized formulations	139
5.24	(A) SEM, (B) HR-TEM and (C) AFM micrographs of optimized nanoformulation	140
5.25	^{1}H NMR spectra of F4 formulation before and after PLH-PE-PEG coating carried out in the pulsed FT mode at a 500 MHz resonance frequency for protons after dissolving samples in deuterated DMSO-d6	141
5.26	Cumulative percentage drug release of all the formulations set against days	142
5.27	FTIR spectra of DTX, PHBV, F1, F2, F3 & F4 showing absorption bands	145
5.28	XRD analyses of DTX, PHBV, PM, F1, F2, F3 & F4 showing absorption bands	146
5.29	DSC thermograms of DTX, PHBV, F1, F2, F3 & F4 showing peaks	147
5.30	SDS-PAGE images of rat plasma with different optimized formulations along with rat plasma (RP), plasma containing drug (DRP), and free drug (D)	148
5.31	In vitro cytotoxicity study of negative control and optimized nanoparticles observed under the inverted microscope in	150

MCF7 cell lines

5.32 Percentage control growth versus concentration (µg/mL) followed in order of F4>F1>F2>F3 151

5.33 (A) Intracellular uptake of formulations tagged with dye (FITC) demonstrated by confocal microscopy imaging; (B) photographs representing trypan blue assay on rat lymphocytes for cell viability studies 152

5.34 Image of red blood cells (RBC) observed after hemolysis and platelet aggregation studies by optical microscopy 154

5.35 Percentage hemolysis against time (h) upon i.v. administration 154

5.36 Plot of observed plasma concentration-time profile of the drug and prepared formulations (F1, F2, F3 & F4) after i.v. administration in rat 156

5.37 Experimental and simulated plasma concentration-time profile of optimized formulations 158

5.38 Observed in vitro- in vivo correlation of drug loaded optimized formulations 159

5.39 (A) Average body weight (g) of mouse mammary tumor model C3H/J altered with respect to number of days; (B) Relative tumor volume data curve of mouse mammary tumor model of control, pure drug, standard (STD) and optimized formulations (25 mg/Kg i.v. weekly x 4 weeks) from day 1 to 30; (C) Survival data (%) using Kaplan-Meier curve of mouse bearing mammary tumor model treated with all seven treatment groups by log-rank test; (D) T/C values from RTV data of mouse mammary tumor model C3H/J demonstrated significant activity of optimized formulations 162

5.40 Photographs representing tumor bearing mice on first and last days of treatment with the optimized formulations 163

5.41 Stability study concerning particle size, zeta potential and % entrapment efficiency for 6 months' period 165