

## List of Figures

---

---

<b>Figure No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
2.1	Schematic diagram of colorectal cancer from stage 0 to stage 4	11
2.2	Passive targeting, the EPR effect; (Tumor tissues are known to have leaky vasculature and results in a passive accumulation of nanoparticles and this phenomenon is referred to as EPR)	47
2.3	Active targeting: Nanoparticles with ligands or molecules attached to their surface can target tumor cells preferentially over healthy cells	49
2.4	Chemical structure of curcumin	54
2.5	Chemical structure of naringenin	59
2.6	Structure of lipopolysaccharide (Soluthin MD®); SMD consists of following regions: from the bottom, lipophilic part, hydrophilic part (glycerol, phosphate, choline) including maltodextrin, which consists of repeating units (denoted in brackets, with an “n”) of polysaccharides	64
2.7	Chemical structure of Eudragit® E 100	65
5.1	UV-Visible absorbance spectra of pure CUR in PBS, pH 7.4	88
5.2	Calibration curve of CUR in PBS, pH 7.4	89
5.3	Typical HPLC chromatogram of blank plasma and blank plasma spiked with CUR and IS.	93
5.4	A representative standard curve for CUR in rat plasma extending from 5 to 1000 ng/ml	95
5.5	Solubility profile of pure CUR in different media at 25±2°C (Vertical bars represent ±SD; n=3)	96
6.1	Schematic diagram showing (a) formation of C-LPNCs (b) aqueous dispersion of C-LPNCs and (c) particle size distribution	98
6.2	Marginal mean graphs of the mean for (a) PS and (b) EE	115
6.3	FTIR spectra of (a) pure CUR (b) SMD (c) PM and (d) optimized C-LPNCs	117
6.4	DSC thermograms of (a) pure CUR (b) SMD (c) PM and (d) optimized C-LPNCs	118

6.5	<i>p</i> XRD curves of (a) pure CUR (b) SMD (c) PM and (d) optimized C-LPNCs	119
6.6	(a) HR-TEM micrographs at ×20,000 magnification (bar=500nm) and (b) electron diffraction pattern of optimized C-LPNCs.	120
6.7	AFM micrographs of the optimized C-LPNCs (a) 2D image (b) corresponding 3D image	121
6.8	CLSM images illustrating the encapsulation and distribution of CUR (green fluorescence) within the C-LPNCs. a and d DIC image, b and e fluorescent image, c and f merged of fluorescent and DIC image at magnification 20X and 40X, respectively.	122
6.9	Ultraviolet-Visible absorbance spectra of (a) pure CUR and (b) optimized C-LPNCs in PBS, pH 7.4.	123
6.10	<i>In-vitro</i> release profile of pure CUR and optimized C-LPNCs (batch C-SMD3) in PBS, pH 7.4 for 24 hr before and after 3 months storage (Vertical bars represent ±SD, n=3)	125
6.11	Stability data of the optimized C-LPNCs during storage at room temperature (all experiments were performed in triplicate and the vertical bars represent ±SD, n=3)	126
6.12	Plasma concentrations-time profile after oral administration of pure CUR, PM and optimized C-LPNCs (dose 50 mg/kg in each case); Vertical bars represent ±SEM; n=6; <sup>a</sup> <i>p</i> <0.05, compared to the control (pure CUR); <sup>b</sup> <i>p</i> <0.05, compared to PM (One-way ANOVA; Tukey's multiple comparison test)	127
6.13	<i>In-vitro</i> cytotoxicity profile of normal control, pure CUR, PM and optimized C-LPNCs (batch C-SMD3) in colon-26 cancer cell line; Vertical bars represent ±SD; n=3; <sup>a</sup> <i>p</i> <0.001 compared to normal control; <sup>b</sup> <i>p</i> <0.001 compared to pure CUR; <sup>c</sup> <i>p</i> <0.001 compared to PM (Two-way ANOVA; Bonferroni post hoc tests)	129
6.14	The bar chart indicating the concentrations of pure CUR, PM and batch C-SMD3 at GI <sub>50</sub> ; (Vertical bars represent ±SD; n=3)	130
6.15	(a) Tumor progression curves for tumor-bearing mice which were orally administered with control, pure CUR, PM and optimized C-LPNCs ([CUR]=50 mg/kg) when the tumor volume reached about ~8 mm <sup>3</sup> (5 <sup>th</sup> day after inoculating with colon-26 cells to mice). (b) Bar diagram of data from day 30 onwards from "a" part of Figure 6.15; Vertical bars represent ±SEM; n=6. (** <i>p</i> <0.001, * <i>p</i> <0.05; a vs control, b vs pure CUR and c vs PM; One-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's multiple comparison test)	131

6.16	Alteration in body weight after incubation of colon-26 cells to mice and treatment with CUR formulations; (Vertical bars represent $\pm$ SEM; n=6)	132
6.17	Photographs of representative tumor-bearing mice belonging to control and treatment groups at the end of 30 days of inoculation with colon-26 cells. Tumors were indicated within black circles	133
6.18	Kaplan-Meier survival curve of tumor-bearing mice treated with control and various CUR formulations	133
6.19	Tumor weight of each groups at the end of the test (i.e. after 30 days of dose administration observation); Vertical bars represent $\pm$ SEM; n=6. (** $p$ <0.001, * $p$ <0.05; a vs control, b vs pure CUR and c vs PM; One-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's multiple comparison test)	134
6.20	Schematic diagram showing formation of CUR loaded Eudragit E 100 nanoparticles (CENPs)	137
6.21	Marginal mean graphs of the mean for (a) PS and (b) EE	147
6.22	FTIR spectra of (a) pure CUR (b) EE100 (c) PM and (d) optimized CENPs	149
6.23	DSC thermograms of (a) pure CUR (b) EE100 (c) PM and (d) optimized CENPs	150
6.24	$p$ XRD curves of (a) pure CUR (b) EE100 (c) PM and (d) optimized CENPs	151
6.25	(a) HR-TEM micrographs at $\times$ 15,000 magnification (bar=1 $\mu$ m) and (b) electron diffraction pattern of optimized CENPs	152
6.26	(a) Morphology of the CENPs measured by AFM (2D image), (b) corresponding 3D image and (c) Mean particle size of CENPs measured by particle size analyzer (average diameter=248.4 $\pm$ 3.89nm, n=3)	152
6.27	CLSM images illustrating the encapsulation and distribution of CUR (green fluorescence) within the CENPs. a and d DIC image, b and e fluorescent image, c and f merged fluorescent and DIC image at magnification 20X and 63X, respectively.	154
6.28	Ultraviolet-visible absorbance spectra of (a) pure CUR and (b) optimized CENPs in PBS, pH 7.4	155
6.29	<i>In-vitro</i> release profile of pure CUR and optimized CENPs (batch CEEIII) in PBS, pH 7.4 for 24 hr before and after 3 months storage; (Vertical bars represent $\pm$ SD, n=3)	157
6.30	Stability data of the optimized CENPs during storage at room	157

	temperature (all experiments were performed in triplicate and the vertical bars represent $\pm$ SD, n=3)	
6.31	Plasma concentrations-time profile after oral administration of pure CUR, PM and optimized CENPs (dose 50 mg/kg in each case); Vertical bars represent $\pm$ SEM; n=6; <sup>a</sup> <i>p</i> <0.05, compared to the control (pure CUR); <sup>b</sup> <i>p</i> <0.05, compared to PM; (One-way ANOVA; Tukey's multiple comparison test)	159
6.32	<i>In-vitro</i> cytotoxicity profile of normal control, pure CUR, PM and optimized CENPs (batch CEEIII) in colon-26 cancer cell line; Vertical bars represent $\pm$ SD; n=3; <sup>a</sup> <i>p</i> <0.001 compared to normal control; <sup>b</sup> <i>p</i> <0.001 compared to pure CUR; <sup>c</sup> <i>p</i> <0.001 compared to PM (Two-way ANOVA; Bonferroni post hoc tests)	161
6.33	The bar chart indicating the concentrations of pure CUR, PM and optimized CENPs at GI <sub>50</sub> ; (Vertical bars represent $\pm$ SD; n=3)	161
6.34	(a) Tumor progression curves for tumor-bearing mice which were orally administered with control, pure CUR, PM and optimized CENPs ([CUR]=50 mg/kg) when the tumor volume reached about $\sim$ 8 mm <sup>3</sup> (5 <sup>th</sup> day after inoculating with colon-26 cells to mice); (b) Bar diagram of data from day 30 onwards from "a" part of Figure 6.34; Vertical bars represent $\pm$ SEM; n=6. (** <i>p</i> <0.001, ** <i>p</i> <0.01, * <i>p</i> <0.05 a vs control, b vs pure CUR and c vs PM; One-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's multiple comparison test)	162
6.35	Alteration in body weight after incubation of colon-26 cells to mice and treatment with CUR formulations; (Vertical bars represent $\pm$ SEM; n=6)	164
6.36	Photographs of representative tumor-bearing mice belonging to control and treatment groups at the end of 30 days of inoculation with colon-26 cells. Tumors were indicated within black circles	164
6.37	Kaplan-Meier survival curve of tumor-bearing mice treated with control and various CUR formulations	165
6.38	Tumor weight of each groups at the end of the test (i.e. after 30 days of dose administration observation); Vertical bars represent $\pm$ SEM; n=6. (** <i>p</i> <0.001, ** <i>p</i> <0.01, * <i>p</i> <0.05; a vs control, b vs pure CUR and c vs PM; One-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's multiple comparison test)	166
7.1	UV-Visible absorbance spectra of pure NAR in PBS, pH 7.4	173
7.2	Calibration curve of NAR in PBS, pH 7.4	174
7.3	Typical HPLC chromatogram of blank plasma and blank plasma spiked with NAR and IS	177

7.4	A representative standard curve for NAR in rat plasma extending from 5 to 1000 ng/ml	179
7.5	Solubility profile of pure NAR in different media at 25±2°C; (Vertical bars represent ±SD; n=3)	180
8.1	Schematic diagram showing (a) formation of N-LPNCs (b) aqueous dispersion of N-LPNCs and (c) particle size distribution	182
8.2	Marginal mean graphs of the S/N ratios for (a) PS and (b) EE	199
8.3	FTIR spectra of (a) pure NAR (b) SMD (c) PM and (d) optimized N-LPNCs	201
8.4	DSC thermograms of (a) pure NAR (b) SMD (c) PM and (d) optimized N-LPNCs	202
8.5	<i>p</i> XRD curves of (a) pure NAR (b) SMD (c) PM and (d) optimized N-LPNCs	203
8.6	(a) HR-TEM micrographs at ×15,000 magnification (bar=1 μm) and (b) electron diffraction pattern of optimized N-LPNCs	204
8.7	AFM micrographs of the optimized N-LPNCs (a) 2D image (b) corresponding 3D image	205
8.8	<i>In-vitro</i> release profile of pure NAR and optimized N-LPNCs (batch N-SMD3) in PBS, pH 7.4 for 24 hr before and after 3 months storage; (Vertical bars represent ±SD, n=3)	207
8.9	Stability data of the optimized N-LPNCs during storage at room temperature (all experiments were performed in triplicate and the vertical bars represent ±SD, n=3)	208
8.10	Plasma concentrations-time profile after oral administration of pure NAR, PM and Optimized N-LPNCs (dose 40 mg/kg in each case); Vertical bars represent ±SEM; n=6; <sup>a</sup> <i>p</i> <0.05, compared to the control (pure NAR); <sup>b</sup> <i>p</i> <0.05, compared to PM; (One-way ANOVA; Tukey's multiple comparison test)	209
8.11	<i>In-vitro</i> cytotoxicity profile of normal control, pure NAR, PM and optimized N-LPNCs (batch N-SMD3) in colon-26 cancer cell line; Vertical bars represent ±SD; n=3; <sup>a</sup> <i>p</i> <0.001 compared to normal control; <sup>b</sup> <i>p</i> <0.001 compared to pure NAR; <sup>c</sup> <i>p</i> <0.001 compared to PM (Two-way ANOVA; Bonferroni post hoc tests)	211
8.12	The bar chart indicating the concentrations of pure NAR, PM and optimized N-LPNCs at GI <sub>50</sub> ; (Vertical bars represent ±SD; n=3)	212
8.13	(a) Tumor progression curves for tumor-bearing mice which were orally administered with control, pure NAR, PM and	213

	<p>optimized N-LPNCs ([NAR]=40 mg/kg) when the tumor volume reached about <math>\sim 8 \text{ mm}^3</math> (5<sup>th</sup> day after inoculating with colon-26 cells to mice). (b) Bar diagram of data from day 30 onwards from “a” part of Figure 8.13; Vertical bars represent <math>\pm</math>SEM; n=6. (**<math>p &lt; 0.001</math>, **<math>p &lt; 0.01</math>, *<math>p &lt; 0.05</math> a vs control, b vs pure NAR and c vs PM; One-way ANOVA followed by Tukey’s multiple comparison test)</p>	
8.14	Alteration in body weight after incubation of colon-26 cells to mice and treatment with NAR formulations; (Vertical bars represent $\pm$ SEM; n=6)	214
8.15	Photographs of representative tumor-bearing mice belonging to control and treatment groups at the end of 30 days of inoculation with colon-26 cells. Tumors were indicated within blue circles	215
8.16	Kaplan-Meier survival curve of tumor-bearing mice treated with control and various NAR formulations	215
8.17	Tumor weight of each groups at the end of the test (i.e. after 30 days of dose administration observation); Vertical bars represent $\pm$ SEM; n=6; (** $p < 0.001$ , ** $p < 0.01$ ; a vs control, b vs pure NAR and c vs PM; One-way ANOVA followed by Tukey’s multiple comparison test)	216
8.18	Schematic diagram showing formation of NENPs	219
8.19	Marginal mean graphs of the S/N ratio for (a) PS and (b) EE	229
8.20	FTIR spectra of (a) pure NAR (b) EE100 (c) PM and (d) optimized NENPs	231
8.21	DSC thermograms of (a) pure NAR (b) EE100 (c) PM and (d) optimized NENPs	232
8.22	<i>p</i> XRD curves of (a) pure NAR (b) EE100 (c) PM and (d) optimized NENPs	233
8.23	(a) HR-TEM micrographs at $\times 20,000$ magnification (bar=200 nm) and (b) electron diffraction pattern of optimized NENPs	234
8.24	(a) Morphology of the NENPs measured by AFM (2D image), (b) corresponding 3D image and (c) Mean particle size of NENPs measured by particle size analyzer (average diameter = $430.42 \pm 5.78 \text{ nm}$ , n=3)	235
8.25	<i>In-vitro</i> release profile of pure NAR and optimized NENPs (batch NEE3) in PBS, pH 7.4 for 24 hr before and after 3 months storage; (Vertical bars represent $\pm$ SD, n=3)	237
8.26	Stability data of the optimized NENPs during storage at room temperature (all data were performed in triplicate and the	238

	vertical bars represent $\pm$ SD, n=3)	
8.27	Plasma concentrations-time profile after oral administration of pure NAR, PM and Optimized NENPs (dose 40 mg/kg in each case); Vertical bars represent $\pm$ SEM; n=6; <sup>a</sup> $p$ <0.05, compared to the control (pure NAR); <sup>b</sup> $p$ <0.05, compared to PM; (One-way ANOVA; Tukey's multiple comparison test)	240
8.28	<i>In-vitro</i> cytotoxicity profile of normal control, pure NAR, PM and optimized NENPs (batch NEE3) in colon-26 cancer cell line; Vertical bars represent $\pm$ SD; n=3; <sup>a</sup> $p$ <0.001 compared to normal control; <sup>b</sup> $p$ <0.001 compared to pure NAR; <sup>c</sup> $p$ <0.001 compared to PM (Two-way ANOVA; Bonferroni post hoc tests)	242
8.29	The bar chart indicating the concentrations of pure NAR, PM and optimized NENPs at GI <sub>50</sub> ; (Vertical bars represent $\pm$ SD; n=3)	242
8.30	(a) Tumor progression curves for tumor-bearing mice which were orally administered with control, pure NAR, PM and optimized NENPs ([NAR]=40 mg/kg) when the tumor volume reached about $\sim$ 8 mm <sup>3</sup> (5 <sup>th</sup> day after inoculating with colon-26 cells to mice). (b) Bar diagram of data from day 30 onwards from "a" part of Figure 8.30; Vertical bars represent $\pm$ SEM; n=6. (** $p$ <0.001, ** $p$ <0.01, * $p$ <0.05 a vs control, b vs pure NAR and c vs PM; One-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's multiple comparison test).	243
8.31	Alteration in body weight after incubation of colon-26 cells to mice and treatment with NAR formulations; (Vertical bars represent $\pm$ SEM; n=6)	245
8.32	Photographs of representative tumor-bearing mice belonging to control and treatment groups at the end of 30 days of inoculation with colon-26 cells. Tumors were indicated within blue circles	245
8.33	Kaplan-Meier survival curve of tumor-bearing mice treated with control and various NAR formulations	246
8.34	Tumor weight of each groups at the end of the test (i.e. after 30 days of dose administration observation); Vertical bars represent $\pm$ SEM; n=6; (** $p$ <0.001, * $p$ <0.05; a vs control, b vs pure NAR and c vs PM; One-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's multiple comparison test)	247

## List of Tables

<b>Table No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
2.1	List of curcumin and naringenin formulations	33
4.1	List of chemicals	72
4.2	List of equipments and software	75
4.3	List of animals and cancer cell line	77
5.1	Acceptance criteria for percentage mean recovery	82
5.2	Scanned $\lambda_{\max}$ and absorbance value of CUR prepared in PBS, pH 7.4	88
5.3	Absorbance for plot of calibration curve of CUR using PBS, pH 7.4	89
5.4	Recovery studies of CUR from PBS, pH 7.4	90
5.5	The Intra-day precision of the method	91
5.6	The Inter-day precision of the method	92
5.7	Other validation parameters for calibration curve prepared in PBS, pH 7.4	92
5.8	Recovery of CUR from rat plasma	94
5.9	The intra-day (n=6) and inter-day (n=6) precision of the method	94
6.1	Independent factors and their corresponding levels of TOED (4- factors, 3-levels)	102
6.2	Taguchi L <sub>9</sub> (3 <sup>4</sup> ) orthogonal Arrays	102
6.3	Physicochemical parameters; PS, ZP, PDI, %EE and %DL of various batches (All values reported are mean $\pm$ SD; n = 3)	113
6.4	Experimental mean value for the response parameters at different levels of the prepared C-LPNCs according to TOED	114
6.5	ANOVA table for the response parameters of PS and EE	115



6.6	Release parameters for optimized C-LPNCs (batch C-SMD3) obtained after fitting in-vitro drug release data to five different mathematical models for drug release kinetics	124
6.7	Pharmacokinetic parameters after oral administration of PM and optimized C-LPNCs (batch C-SMD3), compared with aqueous suspension of pure CUR (dose 50 mg/kg); All values reported are $\pm$ SEM (n=6)	128
6.8	Independent factors and their corresponding levels of TOED (4- factors, 3-levels)	138
6.9	Taguchi L <sub>9</sub> (3 <sup>4</sup> ) orthogonal Arrays	139
6.10	Physicochemical parameters; PS, ZP, PDI, %EE and %DL of various batches (All values reported are mean $\pm$ SD; n = 3)	145
6.11	Experimental mean value for the response parameters at different levels of prepared CENPs according to TOED	146
6.12	ANOVA table for the response parameters of PS and EE	147
6.13	Release parameters for optimized CENPs (batch CEEIII) obtained after fitting in-vitro drug release data to five different mathematical models for drug release kinetics	156
6.14	Pharmacokinetic parameters after oral administration of PM and CENPs to rats, compared with aqueous suspension of pure CUR (dose 50 mg/kg); All values reported are mean $\pm$ SEM; (n=6)	159
7.1	Scanned $\lambda_{\max}$ and absorbance value of NAR prepared in PBS, pH 7.4	172
7.2	Absorbance for plot of calibration curve of NAR using PBS, pH 7.4	173
7.3	Recovery studies of NAR from PBS, pH 7.4	174
7.4	The Intra-day precision of the method	175
7.5	The Inter-day precision of the method	176
7.6	Other validation parameters for calibration curve prepared in PBS, pH 7.4	176
7.7	Recovery of NAR from rat plasma	178
7.8	The intra-day (n=6) and inter-day (n=6) precision of the method	178

8.1	Independent factors and their corresponding levels of TOED (4- factors, 3-levels)	187
8.2	Taguchi L <sub>9</sub> (3 <sup>4</sup> ) orthogonal Arrays	187
8.3	Physicochemical parameters; PS, ZP, PDI, %EE and %DL of various batches (All values reported are mean±SD; n = 3)	197
8.4	Experimental S/N (Signal to Noise) ratio for the response parameters at different levels of prepared N-LPNCs according to TOED	199
8.5	ANOVA table for the response parameters of PS and EE	200
8.6	Release parameters for optimized N-LPNCs (batch N-SMD3) obtained after fitting in-vitro drug release data to five different mathematical models for drug release kinetics	207
8.7	Pharmacokinetic parameters after oral administration of PM and optimized N-LPNCs (batch N-SMD3), compared with aqueous suspension of pure CUR (dose 40 mg/kg); All values reported are ±SEM (n=6)	210
8.8	Independent factors and their corresponding levels of TOED (4- factors, 3-levels)	220
8.9	Taguchi L <sub>9</sub> (3 <sup>4</sup> ) orthogonal Arrays	221
8.10	Physicochemical parameters; PS, ZP, PDI, %EE and %DL of various batches (All values reported are mean±SD; n = 3)	227
8.11	Experimental S/N (Signal to Noise) ratio for the response parameters at different levels of prepared NENPs according to TOED	228
8.12	ANOVA table for the response parameters of PS and EE	229
8.13	Release parameters for optimized NENPs (batch NEE3) obtained after fitting in-vitro drug release data to five different mathematical models for drug release kinetics	237
8.14	Pharmacokinetic parameters after oral administration of PM and NENPs to rats, compared with aqueous suspension of pure NAR (dose 40 mg/kg); All values reported are mean±SEM; (n=6)	240

## List of Abbreviations and Symbols

---

---

Curcumin	- CUR
Colorectal cancer	- CRC
Naringenin	- NAR
Soluthin MD®	- SMD
Eudragit E® 100	- EE100
Lipopolysaccharide nanocarriers	- LPNCs
Curcumin encapsulated lipopolysaccharide nanocarriers	- C-LPNCs
Naringenin encapsulated lipopolysaccharide nanocarriers	- N-LPNCs
Curcumin encapsulated eudragit E100 nanoparticles	- CENPs
Naringenin encapsulated eudragit E100 nanoparticles	- NENPs
Taguchi orthogonal experimental design	- TOED
Signal-to-noise ratio	- S/N
Poloxamer 188	- PLX188
Physical mixture	- PM
Mean particle size	- PS
Polydispersity index	- PDI
Zeta potential	- ZP
Percent entrapment efficiency	- %EE
Percent drug loading	- %DL
Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy	- FTIR
Differential scanning calorimetry	- DSC
Powder X-ray diffraction	- <i>p</i> XRD
Area under the curve	- AUC
Minimum inhibitory concentration	- MIC
Potassium bromide	- KBr
Glass transition temperature	- T <sub>g</sub>
Differential scanning calorimetry	- DSC
Atomic force microscopy	- AFM

High resolution transmission electron microscopy	- HR-TEM
Differential interference contrast	- DIC
Correlation coefficient	- R <sup>2</sup>
Absorbance unit	- AU
Relative standard deviation	- RSD
Standard deviation	- SD
Standard errors mean	- SEM
High performance liquid chromatography	- HPLC
Limit of detection	- LOD
Limit of quantification	- LOQ
Coefficient of variance	- CV
Mean Residence Time	- MRT
Retention Time	- RT
Peak Plasma Concentration	- C <sub>max</sub>
Time for Peak Concentration	- T <sub>max</sub>
Biological half life	- t <sub>1/2</sub>
Dimethylsulphoxide	- DMSO
Trichloroacetic Acid	- TCA
Acetonitrile	- ACN
Butylated hydroxyl toluene	- BHT
Fetal Calf Serum	- FCS
Internal standard	- IS
Sulphorhodamine B	- SRB
Analysis of variance	- ANOVA
Degree of freedom	- DoF
Sum of squares	- SS
Mean of squares	- MS
Percent contribution	- %PC
Fischer test	- F
Optical density	- OD
Acid dissociation Constant	- pKa

Hour	- hr
Percentage	- %
Microgram	- $\mu\text{g}$
Microliter	- $\mu\text{l}$
Milligram	- mg
Kilogram	- Kg
Nanogram	- ng
Milliliter	- ml
Revolution per minute	- rpm
Degree	- $^{\circ}$
Celsius	- C
Centimeter	- cm
Millimeter	- mm
Nanometer	- nm
Kilo volt	- kV
Miliampere	- mA
Angstrom	- $\text{\AA}$
Wavelength	- $\lambda$
Growth inhibition to kill 50% of the cells	- $\text{GI}_{50}$
Phosphate buffer solution	- PBS
Volume by volume	- v/v
Weight by volume	- w/v
Minute	- min
Hertz	- Hz

# PREFACE

---

---

Colorectal cancer (CRC) is the most common form of cancer. The incidence of CRC worldwide can vary up to 20-fold with the highest prevalence in areas such as North America, Europe, Australia, and New Zealand. The lowest incidence is seen in India and lesser developed areas such as South America and Africa. Epidemiological studies suggest that economic development and dietary habits are implicated in CRC incidence. Several areas of nutrition that have been suggested to increase CRC risk are low fiber intake, high fat diet, and low calcium/micronutrient intake.

The modern anticancer agents such as 5-fluorouracil, oxaliplatin, leucovorin, and irinotecan have been used for several decades as a standard treatment for CRC but their toxicity issues and severe side effects overcome the efficacy of these drugs and remain one of the serious challenges in cancer treatment. Especially, life-threatening symptoms associated with oxaliplatin such as gastrointestinal tract toxicity, hematologic toxicity, hearing damage and neurotoxicity limits its extensive use. Therefore, to avoid these side effects, there is an urgent need to discover more potent anticancer agents with no side effects on normal organs/tissues.

The idea of the work done in the present thesis was conceived on the above discussed problems of available therapy of CRC and was designed with an objective to develop a new nano delivery system of drugs to effectively deliver to the CRC cells. In this context, a thorough literature survey was conducted with special emphasis on passive targeted drug delivery systems. An extra effort was made to collect details on the drugs- curcumin and naringenin in order to know about its therapeutic benefits and its relative efficacy over other established drugs.

The entire research work has been carried out systematically in four sequential steps. First, curcumin encapsulated lipopolysaccharide nanocarriers, second, curcumin encapsulated eudragit E 100 nanoparticles, third, naringenin

encapsulated lipopolysaccharide nanocarriers and fourth, naringenin encapsulated eudragit E 100 nanoparticles were prepared. All the formulations were optimized and have been subjected to detailed physicochemical characterizations, pharmacokinetic, cytotoxicity and anticancer efficacy studies in animals and the results have been discussed in-depth.

The purpose of this research opens new era of successful utilization of novel lipopolysaccharide and non-biodegradable polymer as a potential carrier to improve oral bioavailability as well as anticancer efficacy of hydrophobic chemotherapeutic drug(s) in the treatment of cancer, especially CRC.