IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

A REVIEW ON CRITICAL FORMULATION VARIABLES GOVERNING CONTROLLED-RELEASE MATRIX TABLETS OF ANTIHYPERTENSIVE DRUGS

[1]Khomeshwari Dhawle*, [1]Nadeem Farooqui, [2]Neha Kamalpuria , [3]Nimita Manocha

[1]Student , [1]Head of Department and Guide, [2]Co-Guide,[3]Principal

Department of Pharmaceutics

Indore Institute of Pharmacy, Opposite IIM, Rau-Pithampur Road, Rau, Indore, MP, India, 453331

Abstract: Controlled-release matrix tablets remain the dominant oral platform for antihypertensive drug delivery, favored for manufacturing simplicity and scalability over reservoir, osmotic, and multiparticulate alternatives. Formulation development, however, has largely proceeded one variable at a time, leaving the field without a cross-class understanding of how polymer, process, and drug-specific variables interact. This review argues that antihypertensive matrix tablet performance is governed by the interaction of critical material attributes (CMAs) and critical process parameters (CPPs) rather than any single variable, and develops a Quality by Design (QbD) framework CMAs, CPPs, and critical quality attributes (CQAs) assessed jointly as a more rational formulation basis. Evidence spanning calcium channel blockers, beta-blockers, an ACE inhibitor, and an ARB shows drug class does not reliably predict formulation strategy: solubility, not pharmacological category, governs polymer selection, while chemical stability (captopril) or manufacturing route (carvedilol) can dominate over release-rate concerns. A single polymer such as HPMC shifts its dominant release mechanism depending on the drug and co-excipients involved, and ethanol co-ingestion can suppress rather than dump a formulation's release (hydrochlorothiazide), underscoring that robustness requires verification beyond standard dissolution testing. Flattening drug exposure and timing it to the morning blood pressure surge emerge as distinct, sometimes competing, clinical objectives. These findings support treating antihypertensive matrix tablet design as a systems-level, interaction-aware problem, offering formulation scientists a structured framework to anticipate rather than discover such interactions after the fact.

Index Terms - Controlled-release matrix tablets; antihypertensive drugs; Quality by Design; critical material attributes; polymer-drug interactions

I. INTRODUCTION

Hypertension affects roughly one in three adults worldwide, and the WHO's first global report on the condition found that only about one in five affected adults have their blood pressure adequately controlled, despite treatment being widely available and inexpensive [1]. This gap is partly pharmacokinetic: conventional immediate-release antihypertensives produce sharp peak-to-trough plasma fluctuations, and a low trough-to-peak ratio is associated with poorer 24-hour blood pressure control [2]. Extended-release nifedipine, for example, shows roughly a four-fold lower fluctuation index than its immediate-release counterpart at steady state [3]. Even a fully adherent patient can therefore spend part of each day under-treated and part over-treated, a problem dosing compliance alone cannot fix.

Controlled-release matrix tablets address this by embedding drug within a rate-controlling polymer network, governing release through diffusion, swelling, or erosion rather than dosing frequency. Among oral controlled-release architectures, matrix systems dominate the antihypertensive literature because they use conventional tableting equipment, scale predictably, and avoid the coating or orifice-drilling complexity of reservoir or osmotic systems [4].

Yet formulation development in this space has proceeded largely one variable at a time polymer type, viscosity, drug-to-polymer ratio, and manufacturing method each optimized against a single drug in isolation, with little cross-class understanding of how these variables interact. A recent review of matrix tablet optimization notes explicitly that conventional one-factor-at-a-time approaches cannot capture such interaction effects [5]. This is the problem this review addresses: not whether individual variables matter, but whether treating them independently, drug by drug, has left the field without a working cross-class formulation logic. This review argues it has, and proposes reading the literature through a Quality by Design (QbD) lens critical material attributes, critical process parameters, and critical quality attributes considered jointly as a more rational basis for antihypertensive matrix tablet development, evaluated here across calcium channel blockers, beta-blockers, an ACE inhibitor, and an ARB, with particular attention to where formulation variables interact rather than act independently.

II. MECHANISMS OF DRUG RELEASE

Drug release from a matrix tablet follows Fickian diffusion logic: drug moves from a region of high concentration inside the matrix toward the lower concentration of the surrounding dissolution medium. In hydrophilic matrices such as HPMC, the dissolution medium penetrates the tablet, hydrates the polymer, and forms a gel layer at the periphery; release is then governed by the dynamic competition between drug diffusion through this gel layer, polymer chain relaxation, and gradual erosion of the gel's outer boundary [6],[7],[8]. In inert or insoluble matrices (e.g., ethyl cellulose, PVC), the polymer skeleton never dissolves; drug instead diffuses through pores left behind as surface drug particles dissolve and leach out. This behavior is commonly described by the Higuchi model, discussed further below.

Osmotic effects contribute only as a minor, supporting mechanism. In diltiazem hydrochloride HPMC matrices, increasing the proportion of a water-soluble filler (lactose) enhanced osmotic-driven water uptake, producing greater swelling, micro-cavity formation, and faster erosion than matrices built with insoluble fillers such as microcrystalline cellulose or dicalcium phosphate at equivalent concentration [9]. This should be distinguished from true osmotic pump systems, where a semipermeable membrane and drilled orifice make osmotic pressure the primary, engineered release driver rather than an incidental contributor a distinction returned to later when matrix tablets are compared against alternative platforms.

III. CRITICAL FORMULATION VARIABLES (QbD FRAMING)

3.1 Polymer Attributes (CMA)

Quality by Design, as codified in ICH Q8(R2), organizes formulation understanding into critical material attributes (CMAs, e.g., polymer chemistry, viscosity, particle size), critical process parameters (CPPs, e.g., compression force, manufacturing method), and critical quality attributes (CQAs, e.g., release rate, hardness, stability) that CMAs and CPPs jointly determine [10],[11]. This review adopts that structure because formulation variables rarely act independently on a single CQA.

Polymer chemistry has the broadest single influence on release. Hydrophilic polymers such as HPMC swell into the gel layer described above; hydrophobic polymers such as ethyl cellulose rely on an insoluble, pore-forming matrix; and pH-responsive polymers such as Carbopol carry ionizable groups whose gel viscosity changes with local pH [12]. A controlled comparison of guar gum, xanthan gum, and HPMC in propranolol matrices found HPMC alone produced near zero-order, erosion-dominant release, xanthan alone produced diffusion-dominant release, and guar alone could not adequately control release until combined at a much higher drug-to-polymer ratio demonstrating that polymer chemistry changes not just release rate but which mechanism dominates [13]. Viscosity grade functions as an independent tuning variable layered on top of chemistry: HPMC K4M, K15M, and K100M produced measurably different tablet porosity and release from otherwise identical formulations [14]. Polymer-to-drug ratio interacts directly with dose: high-dose calcium channel blockers such as diltiazem hydrochloride typically require co-retardants (poloxamer, stearyl alcohol) layered onto HPMC to achieve adequate retardation without an oversized tablet [15], whereas low-dose, long-half-life drugs such as amlodipine may need no release-retarding polymer at all [16]. A polymer ratio that works for a low-dose ARB will not transfer directly to a high-dose beta-blocker without re-optimization.

3.2 Drug Physicochemical Attributes (CMA)

A drug's own solubility and dose are as much a CMA as anything the formulator adds. The Biopharmaceutics Classification System sorts drugs by solubility and permeability [17], and this distinction determines which release mechanism operates: a highly soluble drug is diffusion- or erosion-limited, while a poorly soluble drug can be dissolution-rate-limited instead. This resolves a genuine inconsistency in the antihypertensive literature: several papers describe nifedipine as highly water-soluble, when it is in fact a poorly soluble BCS Class II compound requiring solubility-enhancing strategies before a conventional matrix can perform predictably [18]. Particle size and solid-state form compound this. Reducing felodipine particle size modestly improved dissolution, though less than adding a solubilizing surfactant, indicating particle size reduction alone is rarely sufficient for a poorly soluble drug [19]. Solid-state form adds a competing consideration: amorphous nifedipine degrades under light roughly 1.8 times faster than its crystalline form, meaning a strategy chosen to improve solubility (partial amorphization) can simultaneously undermine photostability [20]. These attributes must be evaluated together solubility, dose, particle size, and solid-state form jointly determine formulation feasibility, not sequentially, and treating any one in isolation risks solving the wrong formulation problem, exactly as the nifedipine solubility mislabeling illustrates.

3.3 Excipients and Release Modifiers (CMA)

Fillers and release modifiers serve distinct functional roles. Soluble fillers (lactose, mannitol) dissolve after hydration, easing water penetration; insoluble fillers (microcrystalline cellulose, dicalcium phosphate) reinforce matrix integrity. In carvedilol HPMC matrices, soluble fillers generally produced faster release than insoluble ones, though not universally some insoluble fillers have caused premature matrix failure in certain formulations, meaning filler behavior interacts with the specific polymer-drug system rather than acting as a fixed property [21]. Release modifiers are added with different intent to correct rather than merely bulk a formulation. In verapamil hydrochloride, solid dispersions in Kollidon SR extended release to roughly 8 hours, while the same drug-to-polymer ratio using Eudragit RLPO instead extended release to 12 hours, showing the choice of co-retardant, not just its presence, determines achievable duration [22].

3.4 Process Variables (CPP)

Compression force and manufacturing method interact directly with the CMAs above. Increasing compression force generally reduces porosity and slows release, but this is not linear across its full range: tablets compressed at the lowest tested pressure in one plant-extract matrix system produced more intensive burst release than tablets compressed at higher pressure, because the loose matrix structure allowed water to penetrate before a cohesive gel layer had time to form [23].

Manufacturing method shows an even larger effect: in carvedilol HPMC matrices, granulation method influenced release more than the polymer grade itself, with direct compression producing the fastest release, followed by dry and then wet granulation, driven by differences in granule density and resulting tablet porosity [24]. Because both act through the same structural pathway tablet porosity neither can be optimized independently of the other or of the polymer system already selected.

3.5 Physiological Interactions

Every CMA and CPP above is characterized under fixed in vitro conditions; the gastrointestinal tract offers no such guarantees. Formulations below a threshold polymer concentration show measurably greater fasted-versus-fed pharmacokinetic variability than formulations above it, even when in vitro dissolution looks identical [25]. A felodipine magnetic marker monitoring study found consistent, linear in vitro dissolution still produced variable plasma concentrations in vivo, traced to where and when the tablet emptied from the stomach [26]. Ethanol co-ingestion illustrates the same disconnect most sharply: for hydrochlorothiazide in a Carbopol matrix, release actually decreased rather than dumped across most ethanol concentrations tested, because the polymer's own ethanol-driven swelling behavior dominated over the drug's increased solubility [27]. In vitro optimization is not the same as physiological robustness, and the two must be verified separately.

IV. CROSS-CLASS COMPARATIVE SYNTHESIS

Table 1. Cross-Class Comparison of Formulation Strategies in Antihypertensive Controlled-Release Matrix Tablets

Drug (Class)	Key Physicochemical Properties	Key Formulation Challenge	Preferred Polymer System	Dominant Release Mechanism	Key Formulation Insight
Nifedipine (CCB)	BCS II, poor (~20 µg/mL); short (~2 h)	Dissolution-rate-limited; polymorph/photostability sensitive	HPMC + solubility enhancer	Dissolution-rate-limited	Solubility must be corrected before matrix design
Diltiazem HCl (CCB)	BCS I, high; short, historically 3–4×/day	High dose + short half-life needs strong retardation without oversized tablet	HPMC + poloxamer-188 + stearyl alcohol	Erosion/diffusion + minor osmotic contribution	High-dose, high-solubility drugs need co-retardants layered onto base polymer
Verapamil HCl (CCB)	High solubility; short	Needs twice-daily control from a single polymer system	Kollidon SR or Eudragit RLPO	Diffusion through plastic/insoluble matrix	Which retardant polymer is chosen sets the achievable duration
Propranolol HCl (beta-blocker)	BCS I, high; short (~4 h), high first-pass	Needs robust once-daily control from soluble, short-half-life drug	HPMC or guar/xanthan gum	HPMC: erosion-dominant; xanthan: diffusion-dominant	Same drug, different polymer chemistry, different dominant mechanism
Carvedilol (beta-blocker)	BCS II, poor; short–moderate (~6–10 h)	Release highly sensitive to manufacturing route, not just formula	HPMC K4M	Manufacturing-method-dependent	Identical formulation, different manufacturing route, substantially different release
Hydrochlorothiazide (thiazide)	BCS IV, poor solubility + permeability; moderate (~10–12 h)	Potential ethanol-induced alteration in release profile	Carbopol 71G	Erosion, ethanol/pH-responsive	Polymer-solvent interaction can override expected drug-solubility outcome

Drug (Class)	Key Physicochemical Properties	Key Formulation Challenge	Preferred Polymer System	Dominant Release Mechanism	Key Formulation Insight
Captopril (ACE inhibitor)	High solubility, pH-unstable (thiol oxidation); very short (~1.7–2 h)	Chemical instability, not release rate, is primary CQA risk	HPMC + ethylcellulose + antioxidant	Swelling/diffusion, QbD/DoE-optimized	Some CQAs (stability) require tools entirely outside the release-rate toolkit
Losartan potassium (ARB)	BCS III, high solubility/low permeability; short (~1.5–2 h)	HPMC alone could not adequately control release	HPMC K15M/K100M + Eudragit RS100	Diffusion (hydrophilic) + erosion (hydrophobic), blended	Hydrophilic polymer alone may be insufficient; blending with a hydrophobic polymer improves control

Across calcium channel blockers, beta-blockers, an ACE inhibitor, and an ARB, three patterns emerge that support this review's central argument.

First, drug class does not reliably predict formulation strategy solubility does. Calcium channel blockers alone span the full solubility range: nifedipine is poorly soluble and dissolution-limited, while diltiazem and verapamil are freely soluble and diffusion-governed from the outset, each requiring a functionally distinct strategy despite sharing a class. Captopril sharpens this further: despite the shortest half-life compared here, its dominant formulation problem is not release rate but pH-dependent chemical degradation via its reactive thiol group, requiring an antioxidant alongside release-retarding polymers [28].

Second, CMA and CPP effects are context-dependent rather than fixed. HPMC alone is insufficient to control losartan release, requiring a hydrophobic co-polymer (Eudragit RS100) even though HPMC performs adequately alone for several other drugs compared here [29]. Manufacturing method, similarly, shifted carvedilol's release substantially despite an unchanged HPMC-based formulation, and the same propranolol/HPMC-versus-xanthan comparison discussed under polymer attributes shows a single polymer chemistry choice can move a formulation between erosion-dominant and diffusion-dominant behavior entirely, not merely change its rate.

Third, robustness requires verification beyond nominal-condition dissolution testing. The hydrochlorothiazide ethanol finding is the clearest illustration: a Carbopol matrix chosen appropriately for HCTZ's target profile behaved counterintuitively under a real-world condition precisely because of the same polymer chemistry that made it a reasonable choice in the first place. Captopril's stability-driven formulation strategy makes a related point from a different angle a formulation can satisfy every release-rate CQA and still fail on a CQA the release-kinetics toolkit was never built to address. Taken together, no single CMA or CPP in Table 1 produces a consistent effect independent of the drug it is applied to, which is why a QbD framework treating these interactions as the object of design rather than complications discovered afterward earns its place in this review.

V. FORMULATION DESIGN VS. THE CHRONOTHERAPEUTIC PROBLEM

The morning blood pressure surge is a genuine clinical concern: cardiovascular events cluster in early morning hours, and an exaggerated surge is associated with increased cardiovascular mortality risk independent of average blood pressure [30]. A flattened, continuously eroding matrix tablet delivers its lowest concentration furthest from dosing for a morning dose, this places the trough close to the following morning's surge rather than covering it, meaning flattening exposure and timing exposure to this circadian window are distinct, sometimes competing, design goals.

Pulsatile and coat-core systems address timing directly through a deliberate lag phase followed by rapid release. In lisinopril, a press-coated tablet using carrageenan, xanthan gum, or HPMC as the barrier layer achieved lag times in the 3-hour range depending on the barrier polymer chosen, explicitly designed to deliver the drug at the right time in the early morning [31]. This barrier-polymer choice functions exactly as polymer type functions elsewhere in this review a variable set deliberately to hit a target, not a fixed property of the pulsatile approach. A flattened matrix tablet remains the more appropriate choice for most patients without a demonstrated morning surge, since added manufacturing complexity is unwarranted where a conventional trough already sits well above the minimum effective concentration; timed-release strategies earn their added complexity specifically where ambulatory blood pressure monitoring shows a clinically significant surge combined with a drug whose half-life leaves a conventional matrix's trough falling within that window.

VI. KINETIC MODELING AND CHARACTERIZATION

Release kinetics are typically fit to five models: zero-order (constant rate, the target flattened-exposure profile), first-order (rate proportional to remaining drug), Higuchi (diffusion-controlled, proportional to √time), Hixson-Crowell (erosion-governed, tracking shrinking tablet geometry), and Korsmeyer-Peppas, whose fitted exponent (n) indicates which mechanism dominates: $n \leq 0.45$ for Fickian diffusion, 0.45–0.89 for combined diffusion/erosion, and $n \geq 0.89$ for erosion/relaxation-dominated transport (Table 2) [32],[33]. This is not an abstract classification: in captopril HPMC/ethylcellulose matrices, the size of water-filled gel pores and degree of crosslinking related directly to the fitted n-value, meaning the exponent is traceable to the same CMA-driven physical structure discussed throughout this review [34]. No single model applies universally; the best-fit model for a given formulation is itself diagnostic of which interaction currently governs its behavior.

Table 2. Kinetic Models and Characterization Techniques

Tool / Model	What It Tells You
Zero-order	Constant, rate-independent release
Higuchi	Diffusion-controlled release
Korsmeyer-Peppas	Mechanistic indication via exponent n (diffusion vs. erosion)
Hixson-Crowell	Surface-area/erosion-driven release
FTIR / DSC / XRD	Drug-polymer compatibility, solid-state form
Dissolution testing	In vitro release performance / CQA confirmation
PK / IVIVC	In vivo relevance, biowaiver potential

Characterization confirms these mechanisms experimentally. FTIR, DSC, and XRD assess drug-polymer compatibility and solid-state form; content uniformity and dissolution testing confirm CQAs are met; and in vivo/pharmacokinetic evaluation remains the most informative but most often skipped step the felodipine magnetic marker study discussed above showed consistent in vitro dissolution and variable in vivo plasma concentration can coexist, meaning dissolution testing characterizes the formulation, not its behavior in a specific patient.

VII. FAILURE MODES AND *IVIVC*

Robust formulation requires validation beyond standard laboratory conditions (Table 3). Dose dumping is most associated with ethanol, though the hydrochlorothiazide example above shows this is drug- and polymer-specific rather than universal; it can also occur under ordinary aqueous conditions if polymer concentration falls below a robust threshold [25]. Tailing and incomplete release is frequently a polymer-ratio problem: reducing HPMC below a critical level in one water-soluble-drug matrix produced sustained but incomplete release, with less than full dose recovered even after 24 hours [35]. Batch-to-batch polymer variability arises from HPMC's cellulose origin and supplier-specific processing; rank-ordering studies of commercial HPMC batches found hydroxypropyl substitution and viscosity to be the most significant sources of performance variability even within compendial specification [36].

Table 3. Documented Failure Modes in Antihypertensive Controlled-Release Matrix Tablets

Failure Mode	Primary Cause	Consequence	Mitigation
Dose dumping	Solvent/mechanical failure of gel layer	Uncontrolled release	Verify robustness above threshold polymer concentration
Incomplete release	Polymer-to-drug ratio below network-forming threshold	Sub-label dose delivered	Confirm minimum polymer threshold experimentally
Batch-to-batch variability	Natural/supplier-driven polymer FRC variation	Inconsistent dissolution	Characterize FRCs per lot and supplier
Food effect	Fed-state motility/transit variability	PK variability despite consistent in vitro data	Confirm with fed/fasted in vivo studies

IVIVC status for antihypertensive matrix tablets specifically remains thin. Where Level A correlation has been established, it demonstrates real value: a propranolol extended-release matrix study achieved external validation with prediction errors of 0.86% for Cmax and 5.95% for AUC, both comfortably within regulatory thresholds [37]. A validated IVIVC model allows in vitro dissolution to substitute for further in vivo bioequivalence testing for subsequent formulation changes, reducing development cost while minimizing the need for additional animal and human studies but for the many antihypertensive matrix tablets characterized by dissolution testing alone, no such biowaiver pathway exists, meaning any later process or raw-material change would strictly require fresh in vivo confirmation. IVIVC development is therefore itself a formulation investment, not a regulatory afterthought, and it pays off specifically when the underlying CMAs and CPPs are characterized well enough that a dissolution change can be trusted to predict a pharmacokinetic one.

VIII. PLATFORM COMPARISON AND NATURAL POLYMERS

Matrix systems are one of three broad oral controlled-release architectures alongside reservoir/membrane-coated and osmotic pump systems, each trading release precision against manufacturing complexity (Table 4) [4]. Nifedipine offers a direct antihypertensive test: a bioequivalence study comparing a hydrophilic matrix tablet against a push-pull osmotic pump (GITS) found both delivered nearly constant release over 24 hours, with Cmax and AUC within standard bioequivalence bounds the matrix system achieved clinically comparable sustained release to the osmotic system without its membrane/orifice manufacturing burden [38]. Nifedipine GITS remains marketed specifically for the osmotic system's food-independence, illustrating that platform choice should match a drug's physiological sensitivity rather than follow any platform's abstract superiority.

Table 4. Comparison of Oral Controlled-Release Architectures

Feature	Matrix Tablets	Reservoir Systems	Osmotic Pumps
Release mechanism	Diffusion/Erosion	Membrane-controlled	Osmotic pressure
Manufacturing complexity	Low	Moderate	High
Food/pH sensitivity	Moderate	Moderate	Low
Dose-dumping risk	Lower	Membrane-defect dependent	Very low
Relative cost	Low	Moderate	High

Natural gums (xanthan, guar, karaya) are increasingly explored as sustainable HPMC substitutes. Guar gum matrices of diltiazem hydrochloride achieved release comparable to a marketed sustained-release product [39], confirming natural gums can substitute for synthetic retardants even in demanding, high-dose formulations rather than only in easier, low-dose cases. The limiting factor is not formulation feasibility but batch-standardization evidence: natural gums carry agro-climatic sourcing variability beyond even HPMC's supplier-driven variability, and most studies characterize only a single production batch, leaving natural polymer adoption at QbD-validated commercial scale less evidence-supported than for HPMC despite the underlying formulation science already being demonstrated.

IX. FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

Closing the gap between demonstrated optimization and real-world robustness will require distinct contributions from each stakeholder going forward: academic groups generating the cross-drug comparative data this review shows is largely absent, industry sharing functionality-related characteristic data across polymer batches and suppliers, and regulatory science treating a documented QbD design space rather than a single validated formulation as the unit of review.

Future progress will likely depend less on identifying a universally superior polymer or platform than on systematically integrating cross-class comparative studies, biorelevant dissolution and physiological testing, QbD/DoE-based interaction-aware optimization, emerging technologies such as 3D-printed personalized and chronotherapeutic dosing [40], and standardized reporting of natural-polymer batch variability into a single, coherent development framework.

X. CONCLUSION

This review has argued that antihypertensive controlled-release matrix tablet performance is governed by interactions among drug physicochemical properties, CMAs, CPPs, and CQAs, rather than by optimization of individual variables in isolation a pattern demonstrated across mechanisms, formulation variables, cross-class comparison, chronotherapeutic design, kinetics, failure modes, and platform choice alike. Calcium channel blockers alone span the full solubility range, meaning no uniform class playbook exists; the same material attribute shifts its mechanistic role depending on what it is combined with; and robustness against ethanol, food effects, and batch variability requires verification separate from standard dissolution optimization. A QbD framework CMAs, CPPs, and CQAs assessed jointly provides the structure needed to design for these interactions deliberately.

The central message of this review is that formulation optimization and real-world robustness are not the same achievement: a formulation can be rigorously optimized against standard dissolution testing and still fail under conditions that optimization never targeted, whether that condition is ethanol co-ingestion, fed-state motility, or an unremarked change in polymer supplier. Recognizing this distinction, rather than treating CMAs and CPPs as independently optimizable variables, is the key takeaway this review offers for antihypertensive matrix tablet design.

REFERENCES

[1] World Health Organization. 2023. First WHO report details devastating impact of hypertension and ways to stop it. Geneva, Switzerland.

[2] Zannad, F. 1995. Practical relevance of the 24-hour trough:peak ratio of antihypertensive drugs. J Hypertens Suppl, 13(2): S109-S112.

[3] Nifedipine extended-release tablets, USP [package insert]. National Library of Medicine, DailyMed, Bethesda, MD.

[4] Nokhodchi, A., Raja, S., Patel, P., and Asare-Addo, K. 2012. The role of oral controlled release matrix tablets in drug delivery systems. Bioimpacts, 2(4): 175-187.

[5] Shinde, K., Gorde, N., Phalak, S., Birajdar, P., and Bodke, V. 2026. Design of experiments in the formulation and optimization of sustained release matrix tablets: a review. Int J Sci Res Technol, 3(1): 126-139.

[6] Khan, N.A., Khan, A., Ullah, R., Ullah, M., Alotaibi, A., Ullah, R., and Haider, A. 2022. Preparation and characterization of hydrophilic polymer based sustained-release matrix tablets of a high dose hydrophobic drug. Polymers (Basel), 14(10): 1985.

[7] Tiwari, S.B. and Rajabi-Siahboomi, A.R. 2008. Modulation of drug release from hydrophilic matrices. Pharm Technol Eur, 20: 24-32.

[8] Ghori, M.U. and Conway, B.R. 2015. Hydrophilic matrices for oral control drug delivery. Am J Pharmacol Sci, 3(5): 103-109.

[9] Bendgude, N.T., Iyer, V.R., and Poddar, S.I.S. 2010. The effects of lactose, microcrystalline cellulose and dicalcium phosphate on swelling and erosion of compressed HPMC matrix tablets: texture analyzer. Iran J Pharm Res, 9(4): 349-358.

[10] International Council for Harmonisation. 2009. ICH harmonised guideline: pharmaceutical development Q8(R2). Geneva, Switzerland.

[11] Yang, S., Hu, X., Zhu, J., Zheng, B., Bi, W., Wang, X., Wu, J., Mi, Z., and Wu, Y. 2025. Aspects and implementation of pharmaceutical quality by design from conceptual frameworks to industrial applications. Pharmaceutics, 17(5): 623.

[12] Simancas-Herbada, R., Fernández-Carballido, A., Aparicio-Blanco, J., Slowing, K., Rubio-Retama, J., López-Cabarcos, E., and Torres-Suárez, A.I. 2020. Controlled release of highly hydrophilic drugs from novel poly(magnesium acrylate) matrix tablets. Pharmaceutics, 12(2): 174.

[13] Mughal, M.A., Iqbal, Z., and Neau, S.H. 2011. Guar gum, xanthan gum, and HPMC can define release mechanisms and sustain release of propranolol hydrochloride. AAPS PharmSciTech, 12(1): 77-87.

[14] Hirun, N. and Kraisit, P. 2022. Drug-polymers composite matrix tablets: effect of hydroxypropyl methylcellulose (HPMC) K-series on porosity, compatibility, and release behavior of the tablet containing a BCS class I drug. Polymers (Basel), 14(16): 3406.

[15] Arafat, M., Sarfraz, M., Bostanudin, M.F., Esmaeil, A., Salam, A., and AbuRuz, S. 2021. In vitro and in vivo evaluation of oral controlled release formulation of BCS class I drug using polymer matrix system. Pharmaceuticals (Basel), 14(9): 929.

[16] Nguyen, T.L.T., Le, Q.N., Nguyen, D.T., and Le, P.H. 2021. Development of a scalable process of film-coated bi-layer tablet containing sustained-release metoprolol succinate and immediate-release amlodipine besylate. Pharmaceutics, 13(11): 1797.

[17] Amidon, G.L., Lennernäs, H., Shah, V.P., and Crison, J.R. 1995. A theoretical basis for a biopharmaceutic drug classification: the correlation of in vitro drug product dissolution and in vivo bioavailability. Pharm Res, 12(3): 413-420.

[18] Vippagunta, S.R., Maul, K.A., Tallavajhala, S., and Grant, D.J.W. 2002. Solid-state characterization of nifedipine solid dispersions. Int J Pharm, 236(1-2): 111-123.

[19] Lee, K.R., Kim, E.J., Seo, S.W., and Choi, H.K. 2008. Effect of poloxamer on the dissolution of felodipine and preparation of controlled release matrix tablets containing felodipine. Arch Pharm Res, 31(8): 1023-1028.

[20] Grooff, D., Francis, F., De Villiers, M.M., and Ferg, E. 2013. Photostability of crystalline versus amorphous nifedipine and nimodipine. J Pharm Sci, 102(6): 1883-1894.

[21] Ojsteršek, T., Hudovornik, G., and Vrečer, F. 2023. Comparative study of selected excipients' influence on carvedilol release from hypromellose matrix tablets. Pharmaceutics, 15(5): 1525.

[22] Sahoo, J., Murthy, P.N., Biswal, S., and Manik. 2009. Formulation of sustained-release dosage form of verapamil hydrochloride by solid dispersion technique using Eudragit RLPO or Kollidon SR. AAPS PharmSciTech, 10(1): 27-33.

[23] Penkov, D., Lukova, P., Manev, H., Dimitrova, S., and Kassarova, M. 2023. Polymer tablet matrix systems for the controlled release of dry Betula pendula leaf extract. Polymers (Basel), 15(17): 3558.

[24] Košir, D. and Vrečer, F. 2017. The performance of HPMC matrix tablets using various agglomeration manufacturing processes. Drug Dev Ind Pharm, 43(2): 329-337.

[25] Klančar, U., Baumgartner, S., Legen, I., Smrdel, P., Jeraj Kampuš, N., Krajcar, D., Markun, B., and Kočevar, K. 2015. Determining the polymer threshold amount for achieving robust drug release from HPMC and HPC matrix tablets containing a high-dose BCS class I model drug: in vitro and in vivo studies. AAPS PharmSciTech, 16(2): 398-406.

[26] Weitschies, W., Wedemeyer, R.S., Kosch, O., Fach, K., Nagel, S., Söderlind, E., Trahms, L., Abrahamsson, B., and Mönnikes, H. 2005. Impact of the intragastric location of extended release tablets on food interactions. J Control Release, 108(2-3): 375-385.

[27] Emeje, M.O., Nwabunike, P.I., Isimi, C.Y., Kunle, O.O., and Ofoefule, S.I. 2008. Hydro-alcoholic media: an emerging in vitro tool for predicting dose dumping from controlled release matrices. J Pharmacol Toxicol, 3(2): 84-92.

[28] Patel, P., Dand, N., Somwanshi, A., Kadam, V.J., and Hirlekar, R.S. 2008. Design and evaluation of a sustained release gastroretentive dosage form of captopril: a technical note. AAPS PharmSciTech, 9(3): 836-839.

[29] Vohra, D.D., Pagi, K.S., and Rajesh, K.S. 2012. Losartan potassium loaded sustained release matrix tablets: influence of various hydrophilic and hydrophobic polymers on behaviour. J Pharm Bioallied Sci, 4(Suppl 1): S79-S80.

[30] Bilo, G., Grillo, A., Guida, V., and Parati, G. 2018. Morning blood pressure surge: pathophysiology, clinical relevance and therapeutic aspects. Integr Blood Press Control, 11: 47-56.

[31] Jagdale, S.C., Suryawanshi, V.M., Pandya, S.V., Kuchekar, B.S., and Chabukswar, A.R. 2014. Development of press-coated, floating-pulsatile drug delivery of lisinopril. Sci Pharm, 82(2): 423-440.

[32] Dash, S., Murthy, P.N., Nath, L., and Chowdhury, P. 2010. Kinetic modeling on drug release from controlled drug delivery systems. Acta Pol Pharm, 67(3): 217-223.

[33] Hixson, A.W. and Crowell, J.H. 1931. Dependence of reaction velocity upon surface and agitation. Ind Eng Chem, 23(8): 923-931.

[34] Sauri, J., Millán, D., Suñé-Negre, J.M., Colom, H., Ticó, J.R., Miñarro, M., Pérez-Lozano, P., and García-Montoya, E. 2014. Quality by Design approach to understand the physicochemical phenomena involved in controlled release of captopril SR matrix tablets. Int J Pharm, 477(1-2): 431-441.

[35] Mamani, P.L., Ruiz-Caro, R., and Veiga, M.D. 2012. Matrix tablets: the effect of hydroxypropyl methylcellulose/anhydrous dibasic calcium phosphate ratio on the release rate of a water-soluble drug through the gastrointestinal tract I. In vitro tests. AAPS PharmSciTech, 13(4): 1073-1083.

[36] Knarr, M., Rogers, T.L., Petermann, O., and Adden, R. 2025. Investigation and rank-ordering of hydroxypropyl methylcellulose (HPMC) properties impacting controlled release performance. J Drug Deliv Sci Technol, 104: 106425.

[37] Cheng, C., Wu, P.C., Lee, H.Y., and Hsu, K.Y. 2014. Development and validation of an in vitro-in vivo correlation (IVIVC) model for propranolol hydrochloride extended-release matrix formulations. J Food Drug Anal, 22(2): 257-263.

[38] Abrahamsson, B., Alpsten, M., Bake, B., Jonsson, U.E., Eriksson-Lepkowska, M., and Larsson, A. 1998. Drug absorption from nifedipine hydrophilic matrix extended-release (ER) tablet-comparison with an osmotic pump tablet and effect of food. J Control Release, 52(3): 301-310.

[39] Al-Saidan, S.M., Krishnaiah, Y.S.R., Patro, S.S., and Satyanarayana, V. 2005. In vitro and in vivo evaluation of guar gum matrix tablets for oral controlled release of water-soluble diltiazem hydrochloride. AAPS PharmSciTech, 6(1): E14-E21.

[40] Zgouro, P., Katsamenis, O.L., Moschakis, T., Eleftheriadis, G.K., Kyriakidis, A.S., Chachlioutaki, K., Monou, P.K., Ntorkou, M., Zacharis, C.K., Bouropoulos, N., Fatouros, D.G., Karavasili, C., and Gioumouxouzis, C.I. 2024. A floating 3D printed polypill formulation for the coadministration and sustained release of antihypertensive drugs. Int J Pharm, 655: 124058.