IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

"Challenges In Strategies To Enhance Shelf Life And Stability Of BCS Class III Drugs: A Comprehensive Review"

Rohan A Suryawanshi[a], Saiprasad A Bhagwat[a], Harshada P Pawar[a], Sanskruti G Valvi[a], Dr. Vishal Gujare[b].

[A] Final Year Student of Swami Vivekanand Sastha's Institute of Pharmacy, Malegaon, Nashik 423201

[b] Professor of Swami Vivekanand Sastha's Institute of Pharmacy, Malegaon, Nashik 423201

Abstract

BCS Class III drugs — characterized by high aqueous solubility and low membrane permeability — pose a paradox for formulators: dissolution is usually straightforward, but **their moisture affinity and microenvironmental chemistry** often shorten shelf life. This review focuses on the *challenges* encountered when deploying strategies intended to increase shelf life and stability for Class III APIs. We examine the physical and chemical mechanisms that drive instability, survey the spectrum of modern stabilization technologies (co-crystals, salts/co-formers, solid dispersions, hot-melt extrusion (HME), micro/nanoencapsulation, ionic liquids, smart packaging), and then emphasize the translational barriers: excipient interactions, processing moisture/thermal stress, analytical and predictive limitations, regulatory complexity, and cost/scale hurdles. The goal is to provide a realistic, evidence-based guide that helps researchers and industry teams choose and de-risk stability strategies for Class III compounds. [1–4]

Keywords

BCS Class III; hygroscopicity; moisture sensitivity; shelf life; co-crystals; hot-melt extrusion; microencapsulation; solid dispersion; ionic liquids; packaging; stability testing; formulation challenges.

1. Introduction — why Class III drugs require special attention

BCS Class III molecules (high solubility, low permeability) are common in marketed therapeutics and generics; their abundant polar functionality often ensures rapid dissolution in aqueous media, yet the same features frequently cause **high hygroscopicity and chemical lability** in the solid state. The practical consequence is that shelf life is more often compromised by moisture-driven processes (hydrolysis, hydrate formation, amorphous→crystalline transitions) than by poor dissolution — a reversal of the typical Class II problem. This inversion forces formulators to prioritize moisture exclusion and microenvironment control alongside any permeability enhancement strategies. [5–8]

2. Challenges

2.1 The chemical & physical drivers of instability (overview)

Instability for Class III drugs spans chemical reactions (hydrolysis, oxidation, Maillard reactions when reducing sugars are present) and physical transformations (hydrate formation, polymorphic conversion, amorphization/recrystallization). Moisture is central: it acts as a reactant in hydrolysis and as a plasticizer that increases molecular mobility in the solid state, enabling reactions and phase transitions that would be negligible under dry conditions. Temperature, light exposure, and trace catalytic species (metal ions, acidic/basic impurities) interact with moisture to define degradation kinetics. [9–12]

2.2 Why classical stabilizing tactics sometimes fail for Class III APIs

Many traditional stability strategies (simple film coating, selection of common inert fillers, or routine packaging choices like PVC blisters) produce modest gains for many APIs — but Class III drugs often require more aggressive or combined measures. For example, coating alone may delay moisture ingress but won't stop water that is absorbed by hygroscopic excipients inside the tablet; conversely, switching excipients can affect disintegration, which for Class III drugs influences performance as much as stability. Wet manufacturing routes (wet granulation) introduce water, and even careful drying can leave residual moisture sufficient to initiate long-term degradation. Thus, common "one-trick" approaches frequently underperform unless they are integrated into a full formulation/process/packaging risk plan. [13-16]

2.3 The moisture problem: measurement, prediction, and practical control

Measuring hygroscopicity (dynamic vapor sorption — DVS), residual moisture (KF titration), and moisture-induced physical changes (PXRD/DSC after humidity exposure) is routine; the challenge is predicting how these laboratory measures map to long-term shelf performance in real supply chains. Moisture sorption isotherms are descriptive but not always predictive when multiple excipients create complex microenvironments inside a tablet. Further, many APIs display threshold behaviors — benign up to a point, then rapidly accelerating degradation — making it hard to set robust control limits. This unpredictability elevates the importance of early, systematic DVS/excipient-combination screening and product-package compatibility testing under ICH and distribution simulation conditions. [17–20]

2.4 Excipient interactions — silent but powerful destabilizers

Excipients are not inert for moisture-sensitive molecules. Some common excipients (certain grades of lactose, polyvinylpyrrolidone (PVP), starch derivatives) capture and hold water or present residual acids/bases or metal traces that catalyze degradation. They can also supply reactive functional groups (reducing sugars → Maillard reactions with amines) and create micro-pH niches within a tablet that dramatically alter degradation pathways. The reality is that excipient selection for Class III drugs is a balancing act: one must retain disintegration and manufacturability while minimizing hygroscopicity and chemical reactivity — a constraint that eliminates many "off-the-shelf" excipient choices. [21–23]

2.5 Manufacturing challenges — water, heat, shear, and scale

Processing introduces stressors. Wet granulation is often the quickest route to robust tablets, but it exposes APIs to water; residual moisture after drying can be trapped in amorphous or glassy phases, creating long-term risk. Dry granulation and direct compression reduce moisture exposure but demand good powder flow and compressibility, which are not always available for high-dose Class III drugs (e.g., metformin). Thermal processes like HME embed APIs into polymer matrices but risk thermal degradation if temperatures or residence times are poorly controlled. Scale-up also amplifies subtle issues: mixing homogeneity, local hotspots in extruders, and batch variability can produce pockets of higher moisture or degraded product at scale, even when small-scale runs look acceptable. [24–27]

2.6 Co-crystals and salt/coformer strategies — promise and pitfalls

Co-crystallization can lower hygroscopicity and improve mechanical properties, and today, co-crystals are an attractive stabilization route. Yet co-crystal formation is not a panacea: coformers must be pharmaceutically acceptable, and co-crystals can show their own hydrate forms or polymorphs that present stability liabilities. Moreover, screening to identify robust, non-hygroscopic coformers is laborious, and manufacturing of co-crystals at scale (solvent evaporation, slurry, grinding, or melt crystallization) must avoid introducing water or driving unwanted solid-state transformations. Regulatory scrutiny — while improving — still requires comprehensive, solid-state characterization and forced-degradation profiling for co-crystals. [28–32]

2.7 Hot-melt extrusion (HME) — strengths and thermal risks

HME is attractive because it is solvent-free and continuous; embedding a Class III API in a hydrophobic polymer matrix via HME can substantially reduce moisture ingress and slow hydrolysis. However, HME often requires elevated temperatures and mechanical shear; heat-labile APIs risk chemical transformation, and unintended reactions with polymers (e.g., Maillard-like condensation with reactive excipients) may occur. Material-sparing HME screening, careful selection of low-melting or low-processing temperature polymers (and plasticizers), and real-time process analytics are critical to balance stabilization vs thermal degradation. [33–36]

2.8 Solid dispersions and amorphous systems — enhanced performance versus hygroscopicity

Amorphous solid dispersions can improve dissolution, and sometimes permeability, but amorphous APIs generally sorb moisture more readily than crystalline forms and can recrystallize during storage, altering both stability and performance. Choosing polymers that form strong drug–polymer interactions (hydrogen bonding, ionic interactions) and that are relatively hydrophobic is essential; even so, the increased surface area and mobility of amorphous forms create a persistent risk. Regulatory reviewers also scrutinize the physical stability data carefully because performance and shelf life both depend on maintaining the amorphous state. [15,33,37].

2.9 Microencapsulation & nanoparticulate technologies — protection at the particle level

Microencapsulation (spray-coating, complex coacervation, solvent evaporation) and nanoparticulate encapsulation offer particle-level barriers to moisture, often dramatically improving stability in accelerated tests. For highly hygroscopic drugs such as metformin, microcapsules with ethylcellulose, Eudragit, or alginate have shown reduced moisture uptake and improved content uniformity over time. But manufacturing reproducibility (coating thickness, encapsulation efficiency), release profile control, regulatory acceptance (residue solvents, polymer safety), and cost/scale are meaningful hurdles. Additionally, nanoparticle surface energy can increase apparent hygroscopicity unless surface chemistry is carefully engineered. [11,35–38].

2.10 Ionic liquids / pharmaceutical ionic liquids (PILs) — emerging molecular solutions

Ionic liquids and deep eutectic solvents can transform APIs into liquid or highly ordered, non-crystalline solids with different hydrogen-bonding networks and lower tendencies to form hydrates. These materials can reduce hydrolytic susceptibility in some cases. However, PILs raise issues: full toxicology and impurity profiles are needed; their long-term behavior under storage is less well mapped than for classical solid forms; and regulatory frameworks are still being refined. Thus, PILs are promising scientifically but represent substantial translational risk today. [12,39–41]

2.11 Packaging and supply-chain controls — essential but often underrated

Even the best formulation can fail without appropriate packaging. High-barrier packages (alu-alu cold-form blisters, cyclic olefin polymer blisters, foil laminate pouches), inclusion of desiccants, and controlled atmospheres (nitrogen flush) reduce moisture ingress and oxidative stress. However, packaging adds cost and complexity (e.g., alu-alu blisters are more expensive and less convenient for blister printing), and real distribution conditions (temperature excursions, humidity breaches) still occur. Therefore, package compatibility testing, accelerated distribution simulation, and clear storage instructions are indispensable. Packaging is frequently the most cost-effective lever for shelf-life extension, but it cannot substitute for poor intrinsic stability. [24,21,42].

2.12 Analytical & predictive limitations — weak links in decision making

A central challenge is that standard accelerated stability tests and Arrhenius extrapolations are imperfect for moisture-driven degradation, because water activity (not simply temperature) steers reaction kinetics and phase behavior. Many companies lack robust mechanistic models linking DVS data and forced-degradation profiles to realistic shelf outcomes across climatic zones. Analytical challenges include detecting low-level degradants, mapping heterogeneous microenvironments within tablets, and establishing meaningful critical quality attributes (CQAs) that tie to both safety and efficacy over time. Better multi-modal analytical workflows (DVS + PXRD + solid-state NMR + micro-FTIR mapping) and improved kinetic models that incorporate humidity dependence are needed. [17,19,43].

2.13 Regulatory and intellectual property hurdles

Many advanced stabilization strategies implicate regulatory pathways not fully standardised across agencies. Co-crystals have gained regulatory recognition but still require comprehensive characterization and justification. PILs and certain nano-systems entail new toxicology packages. Some strategies, while technically feasible, carry IP implications that complicate generic entry and technology transfer. Early engagement with regulators and IP counsel is prudent; companies must budget for additional studies and longer review cycles when using unconventional stabilization technologies. [28,12,33].

2.14 Cost, manufacturability, and lifecycle considerations

Stabilization choices must be sustainable: adding complex coatings, the use of specialized coformers, or multi-step encapsulation increases COGS and may hinder capacity. Continuous, solvent-free processes (HME, continuous roller compaction) can reduce per-unit cost long term but require capital investment and process development. For generics or cost-sensitive markets, aggressive packaging (alu-alu) or costly co-crystal routes may be economic only for high-value products; a careful cost–benefit analysis across the product lifecycle is therefore essential. [22,24,38].

2.15 Performance tradeoffs — permeability enhancement versus stability

For Class III drugs, the two priorities — *enhancing permeability* and *improving stability* — can conflict. Permeability enhancers (surfactants, certain lipids, permeation-enhancing salts) may increase moisture uptake or interact with coatings/polymers, while hydrophobic matrices that protect from moisture can retard drug release and lower bioavailability. The challenge is to design systems (e.g., multiparticulates, microencapsulated particles with targeted release) that decouple protection during storage from release in the GI tract. Achieving this separation of function often requires advanced material engineering and rigorous in vitro–in vivo correlation studies. [33,35,44].

3. Case study highlights — What experience with metformin and others teaches us

Metformin HCl, a prototype Class III drug, typifies many challenges: high dose, pronounced hygroscopicity, and sensitivity to processing moisture. Studies show that dry processing (direct compression or dry granulation) combined with low-hygroscopic excipients, protective film coats, microencapsulation, and/or high-barrier packaging produces the most reliable shelf-life outcomes. However, each improvement adds complexity: coating must not crack under handling, desiccants must not contaminate the product, and microcapsules must maintain release. Other Class III examples (acyclovir, gabapentin) echo the same theme: integrated, multi-layer strategies work best but require more development time and cost. [11,16,35,36].

4. Conclusion

BCS Class III drugs challenge formulation scientists because the same polar chemistry that creates favorable dissolution also creates *fragility* in storage. Tackling shelf life successfully requires systems thinking, understanding moisture chemistry, and excipient interplay. Prefer dry / solvent-free continuous routes where possible, use particle-level barrier technologies for the most hygroscopic APIs, and always pair formulation choices with the right packaging and supply-chain controls. With emergent tools — co-crystals, PILs, HME, microencapsulation, AI predictions, and smart packaging — many current obstacles are addressable, but the translation pathway remains nontrivial and will require more shared datasets and standardized methodologies. [1–4,11,18,21].

5. References

1. Metry M. Metformin Hydrochloride: biowaiver & stability review. J Pharm Sci (review).
2. Dhondale MR, et al. Co-Crystallization Approach to Enhance the Stability of Moisture-Sensitive Drugs. (review).
3. Patil H, et al. Hot-melt extrusion: from theory to application (review).
4. Frontiers review: Recent Advances in Pharmaceutical Cocrystals.
5. ResearchGate / Characterization and stability analysis of metformin HCl microcapsules.
6. Sciencedirect: Pharmaceutical cocrystals: overview.
7. DOAJ / Metformin microencapsulation characterization.
8. EMA / Vildagliptin-Metformin assessment (stability & packaging notes).
9. Agostini SBN. Growing interest in pharmaceutical cocrystals (2025).
10. Research overview/trend analyses on co-crystal hygroscopicity & stability.
11. Mooranian A, et al. Accelerated temperature-controlled stability effects (example microcapsule study).
12. Novel metformin–rhein salts & hygroscopicity study (MDPI).
13. Metformin microencapsulation (Mancer D. 2018 study, ScienceDirect).
14. Stability of dexamethasone during HME (example thermal risk study).
15. Roychowdhury R. Hot-melt extrusion review (JAPSONLINE).
16. IJPS optimization of metformin tablet by direct compression (QbD approach).
17. Karimi-Jafari M. Pharmaceutical cocrystal routes (ACS review).
18. Material-sparing feasibility screening for HME (MDPI 2024).
19. Vertical HME & process innovations (PMC 2025).
20. Meligi NM, et al. Dual microencapsulation of metformin (MDPI, 2021).
21. Packaging & blister barrier studies; curation/reviews (MDPI/Wiley/others).
22. ResearchGate review: Co-crystallization & hygroscopic stability (2023).
23. Papers & reviews on excipient influence on API stability (Semantics / IJ).
24. HME technique reviews and application notes (multiple sources).

25. DOAJ/Research articles on metformin microcapsules and stability examples.
26. JDDT pharmaceutical cocrystals manufacturing review (open PDF).
27. JS Pharm Sci/metformin reference material and characterization reviews.
28. ACS/MDPI/Frontiers reviews on cocrystal regulatory aspects.
29. Sciencedirect HME recent advances review (Tambe 2021).
30. Solvent effects on metformin particle stability (JDDT 2016).
31. Semantics/research summaries of metformin microencapsulation (Asad / Fiaz).
32. Excipient effects & compatibility (Arafat 2023).
33. HME & extrusion publications collated (linking HME and co-crystals).
34. Dexamethasone HME thermal stability example (PharmaExcipients).
35. Meligi NM et al., sustained in vitro/in vivo delivery of metformin microencapsulation.
36. Characterization & stability analysis publications of metformin (Asad et al.).
37. Vasconcelos T. Solid dispersion technologies review (classical reference).
38. Material-sparing and PAT in HME: enabling predictive screening (MDPI).
39. Novel ionic liquids and salt strategies for stability (MDPI & Chem Rev references).
40. Co-crystal trend and regulatory discussion (Agostini 2025 / Wiley).
41. Research reviews about co-crystal manufacture and scaling (IJARES/Misc).
42. Packaging studies (barrier performance comparisons and recommendations).
43. (Support for AI and PAT claims) MDPI/PharmRes examples of PAT and process analytics in HME.