

CONTENTS

List of tables

List of figures

Abbreviations

Preface

Chapters	Page No.
1. Introduction.....	1-18
2. Literature Review.....	19-54
2.1. Treatment of lung cancer.....	19
2.1.1. Surgery.....	19
2.1.2. Radiation therapy.....	20
2.1.3. Photodynamic therapy.....	22
2.1.4. Chemotherapy.....	23
2.2. Docetaxel.....	23
2.2.1. Chemical structure.....	24
2.2.2. IUPAC Name.....	24
2.2.3. Solubility.....	24
2.2.4. Molecular weight.....	24
2.2.5. Pharmacokinetics.....	24
2.2.6. Mechanism of action.....	25
2.2.7. Safety.....	25
2.2.8. Recent studies.....	26
2.3. Targeted therapy of lung cancer.....	28
2.3.1. VEGFR inhibitors.....	28
2.3.1.1. Bevacizumab.....	29
2.3.1.2. Ramucirumab.....	29
2.3.2. EGFR inhibitors.....	31
2.3.2.1. Cetuximab.....	31
2.3.3. ALK inhibitors.....	34
2.3.4. Drugs that target cells with BRAF gene changes.....	34
2.4. Nanomedicine in the treatment of NSCLC.....	35
2.4.1. Advantages of nanomedicine.....	36
2.4.2. Polymers used in nanomedicine.....	37
2.4.3. Chitosan as a polymer material for nanoformulation.....	39
2.4.3.1. Chemical structure.....	39
2.4.3.2. Synonyms.....	39
2.4.3.3. Molecular formula and molecular weight.....	39
2.4.3.4. IUPAC name.....	39

2.4.3.5. Applications in nanomedicine.....	40
2.5. Methods of producing polymeric nanoparticles.....	41
2.5.1. Solvent evaporation.....	42
2.5.2. Dialysis method.....	42
2.5.3. Coacervation/Precipitation.....	43
2.5.4. Emulsion-droplet coalescence.....	44
2.5.5. Reverse micellization.....	45
2.5.6. Ionotropic gelation.....	46
2.6. TPGS as surfactant/emulsifier in nanoformulation.....	48
2.6.1. Chemical structure.....	48
2.6.2. IUPAC name.....	48
2.6.3. Synonyms.....	48
2.6.4. Molecular formula and molecular weight.....	48
2.6.5. Advantages.....	49
2.6.6. Recent studies.....	50
2.7. Cancer cell lines for anticancer studies.....	51
2.8. Lung carcinogenesis using chemical carcinogens.....	53
3. Bioadhesive chitosan nanoparticles for lung cancer therapy.....	55-92
3.1. Objective.....	55
3.2. Plan of study.....	55
3.3. Material.....	56
3.4. Methods.....	56
3.4.1. Cause–effect relationship: Ishikawa fishbone.....	57
3.4.2. Risk assessment: Plackett–Burman design.....	57
3.4.3. Optimization of nanoformulation: 3 ³ factorial design.....	61
3.4.4. Nanoparticle preparation.....	61
3.4.5. NP characterization.....	63
3.4.5.1. Solid-state characterization by X-ray diffraction (XRD)	63
3.4.5.2. Surface chemistry by XPS.....	63
3.4.5.3. Physicochemical characterization.....	64
3.4.5.4. Scanning electron microscopy (SEM).....	64
3.4.5.5. Transmission electron microscopy (TEM).....	64
3.4.5.6. Atomic force microscopy (AFM).....	64
3.4.5.7. Estimation of entrapment efficiency.....	64
3.4.5.8. The extent of CTX conjugation.....	65
3.4.6. <i>In-vitro</i> studies	65
3.4.6.1. Drug release studies.....	65
3.4.6.2. Cellular bioadhesion study.....	66
3.4.6.3. Cellular uptake study.....	66
3.4.6.4. Time-dependent cellular uptake study.....	66
3.4.6.5. Cytotoxicity study in A549 cells.....	67
3.4.6.6. Wound-healing assessment.....	67
3.4.6.7. Cellular apoptosis study.....	68

3.4.7. Stability studies of prepared nanoformulations.....	68
3.4.7.1. Freeze-drying & reconstitution.....	68
3.4.7.2. Stability in plasma.....	68
3.4.7.3. Stability in serum.....	69
3.4.7.4. Effect of storage.....	69
3.4.8. <i>In-vivo</i> studies.....	69
3.4.8.1. Pharmacokinetic study in rats.....	69
3.4.8.2. Histopathology study in rats.....	70
3.4.8.3. Evaluation of anticancer efficacy of NP.....	71
3.4.9. Statistical analysis.....	72
3.5. Results & discussion.....	72
3.5.1. Risk identification & risk assessment screening.....	72
3.5.2. 3 ³ Factorial design.....	72
3.5.3. NP characterization.....	74
3.5.3.1. Solid-state characterization by XRD.....	74
3.5.3.2. Surface chemistry by XPS.....	74
3.5.3.3. Electron microscopy (SEM, TEM & AFM).....	75
3.5.3.4. Bioadhesion study of NP.....	76
3.5.3.5. Drug entrapment efficiency.....	76
3.5.3.6. The extent of CTX conjugation.....	76
3.5.4. <i>In-vitro</i> studies.....	78
3.5.4.1. Drug release study.....	78
3.5.4.2. Qualitative cellular uptake study.....	78
3.5.4.3. Time-dependent cellular uptake study.....	79
3.5.4.4. Cytotoxicity study in A549 cells.....	82
3.5.4.5. Wound healing assessment.....	82
3.5.4.6. Cellular apoptosis assay.....	82
3.5.5. Stability studies.....	84
3.5.6. <i>In-vivo</i> studies.....	84
3.5.6.1. Pharmacokinetic study.....	84
3.5.6.2. Histopathology study in rats.....	87
3.5.6.3. Anticancer efficacy of nanoformulations.....	87
3.6. Conclusion.....	91
4. Redox sensitive TPGS-SH nanoparticles for lung cancer therapy.....	93-131
4.1. Objective of the study.....	93
4.2. Plan of the study.....	93
4.3. Material.....	94
4.4. Methods.....	94
4.4.1. Cause–effect relationship: Ishikawa fishbone.....	94
4.4.2. Risk assessment: Plackett–Burman design.....	95
4.4.3. Optimization of nanoformulation: 3 ³ factorial design.....	98
4.4.4. Synthesis of thiolated TPGS (TPGS-SH).....	98
4.4.5. Chemical characterization of TPGS-SH.....	100

4.4.6. Preparation of redox sensitive nanoparticles.....	100
4.4.7. Evaluation of physicochemical characteristics of NP.....	101
4.4.7.1. Particle size and polydispersity.....	101
4.4.7.2. Zeta potential measurement.....	101
4.4.7.3. Electron microscopy (SEM & TEM).....	101
4.4.7.4. Surface texture by atomic force microscope (AFM).....	101
4.4.7.5. Entrapment efficiency (EE).....	103
4.4.7.6. Evaluation of CTX concentration.....	103
4.4.8. <i>In-vitro</i> studies.....	103
4.4.8.1. Drug release study.....	103
4.4.8.2. pH/redox sensitivity studies.....	104
4.4.8.3. Cellular uptake study.....	104
4.4.8.4. Cytotoxicity study.....	105
4.4.8.5. Apoptosis study.....	105
4.4.8.6. Wound-healing assay.....	106
4.4.9. Stability studies.....	106
4.4.10. <i>In-vivo</i> studies.....	107
4.4.10.1. Pharmacokinetic studies of NP in rats.....	107
4.4.10.2. Histopathology studies.....	107
4.4.10.3. Evaluation of anticancer efficacy of NP.....	108
4.4.11. Statistical evaluation.....	109
4.5. Results and discussion.....	109
4.5.1. Risk identification & risk assessment screening.....	109
4.5.2.33 Factorial design.....	109
4.5.3. Characterization of TPGS-SH.....	110
4.5.3.1. Characterization of TPGS-SH by FTIR.....	110
4.5.3.2. Characterization of TPGS-SH by NMR.....	110
4.5.4. Physicochemical characterization.....	113
4.5.4.1. DLS analysis.....	113
4.5.4.2. SEM, TEM and AFM studies.....	113
4.5.4.3. Entrapment efficiency.....	115
4.5.4.4. The extent of CTX conjugation.....	115
4.5.5. <i>In-vitro</i> studies.....	117
4.5.5.1. Drug release studies.....	117
4.5.5.2. pH/redox sensitivity of nanoparticles.....	117
4.5.5.3. Qualitative cellular uptake study.....	118
4.5.5.4. Cytotoxicity study.....	118
4.5.5.5. Wound healing assessment.....	121
4.5.5.6. Apoptosis assay.....	121
4.5.6. Stability studies.....	123
4.5.7. <i>In-vivo</i> studies.....	125
4.5.7.1. Pharmacokinetic evaluation.....	125
4.5.7.2. Histopathology studies.....	125
4.5.7.3. Anticancer efficacy of redox sensitive NP.....	127
4.6. Conclusion.....	130

5. Summary and conclusions.....	133
6. References.....	141
7. Publications.....	165
8. Curriculum Vitae.....	167

List of Tables

Table No.	Description	Page No.
3.1	Composition of docetaxel loaded chitosan NP with the levels of various factors and the results of observed mean values of various responses by Plackett–Burman design & list of the selected three factors and their levels for the 3 ³ factorial design along with the responses	59
3.2	The 3 ³ factorial design matrix and results of observed mean values of various responses & The predicted and the actual values of the selected responses considered for optimized formulation	62
3.3	Physicochemical and <i>in-vitro</i> release data of non-targeted and targeted NP	78
3.4	Comparison of various critical pharmacokinetic parameters of non-targeted and targeted NP with respect to Docel TM	86
4.1	Composition of docetaxel loaded redox sensitive NP with the levels of various factors and the results of observed mean values of various responses by Plackett–Burman design & list of the selected three factors and their levels for the 3 ³ factorial design along with the responses.	96
4.2	The 3 ³ factorial design matrix and results of observed mean values of various responses & the predicted and the actual values of the selected responses considered for optimized formulation	99
4.3	Formulation of different redox sensitive TPGS-SH NP	100
4.4	Physicochemical evaluation parameters of different redox sensitive NP	115
4.5	Pharmacokinetic parameters of non-targeted and targeted redox sensitive TPGS-SH NP	127

List of Figures

Figure No.	Description	Page No.
1.1	Schematic representation of different nanomedicine approaches in lung cancer therapy	11
1.2	Schematic illustration of doxorubicin-loaded MSNs-DOX@PDA-TPGS	17
2.1	3D structure of cetuximab	32
3.1	Ishikawa fishbone diagram showing the cause-effect relationship between variables for the critical quality attributes of DTX loaded chitosan nanoparticles and risk analysis by failure mode and effects analysis (FMEA) method	58
3.2	Pareto charts showing the influence of significant factors on responses (particle size, zeta potential and percentage entrapment efficiency) of DTX loaded chitosan NP	60
3.3	The 3D response surface plots and the contour plots showing the effect of polymer concentration (PC), temperature (T) and crosslinker concentration (CC) on particle size [A & D] , zeta potential [B & E] and % entrapment efficiency [C & F].	73
3.4	i) XRD overlay spectrum of pure DTX and non-targeted and CTX decorated targeted NP; ii) XPS spectra of non-targeted and CTX decorated targeted NP	75
3.5	SEM micrographs [A&B] and TEM micrographs [C&D] of non-targeted NP and targeted NP respectively; AFM 3D micrographs [E&F] of non-targeted NP and targeted NP and SEM micrographs [G&H] of A549 cells treated with PBS control and CTX decorated targeted NP revealing the excellent bioadhesive behavior of targeted NP on the cell surface	77
3.6	Comparative <i>in-vitro</i> drug release from non-targeted and targeted NP at pH 5.5 and pH 7.4	79
3.7	Fluorescence micrographs showing A) qualitative uptake of free CM6, CM6 loaded non-targeted and targeted NP by DAPI stained A549 cells; B) time-dependent uptake of free CM6, CM6 loaded non-targeted and targeted NP by A549 cells for the duration of 60 min	80
3.8	A) comparison of mean fluorescence intensity produced by A549 cells after uptake of free CM6, CM6 loaded non-targeted and targeted NP, B) Graph showing comparative percent cell viability against different equivalent concentrations of DTX for Docel TM , non-targeted and targeted NP	81

3.9	A) Light microscopic images of wound healing assessment of A549 cells treated with control (PBS), non-targeted and targeted NP; B) Fluorescent images of morphology assay of A549 cells treated with control (PBS), Docel TM , non-targeted and targeted NP	83
3.10	Graphs showing the effect of A) lyophilization, B) plasma incubation, C) serum incubation and D) storage on particle size, polydispersity, zeta potential of NP	85
3.11	Plasma level-time profile of Docel TM , non-targeted and targeted NP constructed from plasma samples analyzed by reverse-phase HPLC	86
3.12	Histological images after H&E staining of the sections of vital organs such as heart, lung, liver, and kidney of rats after treatment with control, Docel TM , non-targeted & targeted formulations	88
3.13	Colour deconvoluted images of the H&E stained histological sections of lung cancer tissues by ImageJ [®] after treatment with control, Docel TM , non-targeted & targeted formulations	89
3.14	A) Graph showing the comparative <i>in-vivo</i> tumor inhibition by Docel TM , non-targeted and targeted formulations in comparison to saline control and Model control. (***) <i>p</i> <0.0001, * <i>p</i> <0.05), B) Kaplan-Meier survival analysis of mice treated with negative control, model control, non-targeted, targeted NP and Docel TM .	90
4.1	Ishikawa fishbone diagram showing the cause-effect relationship between variables for the critical quality attributes of DTX loaded redox sensitive nanoparticles	95
4.2	Pareto charts showing the influence of factors on responses (particle size, zeta potential and percentage entrapment efficiency) of DTX loaded redox sensitive NP	97
4.3	Scheme for the preparation of targeted redox sensitive NP	102
4.4	The 3D response surface plots and the contour plots showing the effect of polymer concentration (PC), temperature (T) and crosslinker concentration (CC) on particle size [A & D] , zeta potential [B & E] and % entrapment efficiency [C & F].	111
4.5	FTIR spectra of TPGS-COOH , 4-ATP and TPGH-SH	112
4.6	¹ H-NMR spectra of A) TPGS-COOH and B) TPGS-SH; ¹³ C-NMR spectra of C) TPGS-COOH and D) TPGS-SH	114
4.7	A) SEM micrographs, B) TEM micrographs, C) & D) 2D and 3D AFM images of non-targeted and targeted redox sensitive nanoparticles	116
4.8	<i>In-vitro</i> drug release study in media containing different GSH concentrations in A) pH 5.5 and B) pH 7.4 buffer	119
4.9	A) fluorescence microphotographs of A549 cells treated with plain CM6, CM6 loaded non-targeted and targeted redox sensitive TPGS-SH nanoparticles following counterstaining with DAPI; B) <i>in-vitro</i> cytotoxicity assay of Docel TM , non-targeted and targeted	120

	redox sensitive TPGS-SH NP in A549 cell lines at different concentrations of DTX	
4.10	A) Brightfield microscopy images showing extent of migration of and B) fluorescent images of in-vitro morphology assay on A549 cells following treatment with saline control, Docel™, non-targeted and targeted redox sensitive nanoparticles	122
4.11	<i>In-vitro</i> stability studies particle size, zeta potential and polydispersity index before and after A) lyophilization; B) incubation with plasma; C) incubation with serum; D) effect of storage on the stability of targeted redox sensitive TPGS-SH nanoparticles	124
4.12	A) Plasma level-time profile after i.v. administration of the formulations; B) H&E stained images from histopathological evaluation of vital organs such as heart, lung, liver and kidney after i.v. administration Docel™, non-targeted and targeted redox sensitive TPGS-SH NP	126
4.13	Colour deconvoluted images of the H&E stained histological sections of lung cancer tissues by ImageJ® after treatment with control, Docel™, non-targeted & targeted redox sensitive TPGS-SH formulations	128
4.14	A) Graph showing the comparative <i>in-vivo</i> tumor inhibition by Docel™, non-targeted and targeted redox sensitive TPGS-SH formulations in comparison to saline control and Model control. (**p<0.001, *p<0.05), B) Kaplan-Meier survival analysis of mice treated with negative control, model control non-targeted and targeted redox sensitive TPGS-SH formulations and Docel™.	129