

1 **Converting Nanosuspension into Inhalable and Redispersible Nanoparticles by**
2 **Combined *In-situ* Thermal Gelation and Spray Drying**

3 Ka Yee Wan¹, Jingwen Weng², Si Nga Wong², Philip Chi Lip Kwok³, Shing Fung Chow^{2,*},
4 Albert Hee Lum Chow^{1,*,#},

5 ¹School of Pharmacy, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Sha Tin, Hong Kong

6 ²Department of Pharmacology and Pharmacy, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The
7 University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam, Hong Kong

8 ³Advanced Drug Delivery Group, School of Pharmacy, Faculty of Medicine and Health,
9 The University of Sydney, New South Wales 2006, Australia

10 * *Corresponding authors*

Shing Fung Chow

Department of Pharmacology and Pharmacy

Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine

The University of Hong Kong

L2-08B, Laboratory Block,

21 Sassoon Road, Pokfulam, Hong Kong

Email: asfchow@hku.hk

Tel: 852 39179026

Fax: 852 28170859

Albert H. L. Chow

School of Pharmacy

The Chinese University of Hong Kong,

Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong

11 #Present Address

12 Aptorum Pharmaceutical Development Limited, Unit232, 2/F, Building 12W, Hong
13 Kong Science and Technology Park, Ma Liu Shui, N.T., Hong Kong

14 Email: albert.chow@aptorumgroup.com

15 Tel 852 36119401; Fax: 852 35905690

16

17 **ABSTRACT**

18 While nanoparticulate drugs for deep lung delivery hold promise for particular disease
19 treatments, their size-related physical instability and tendency of being exhaled during
20 breathing remain major challenges to their inhaled formulation development. Here we
21 report a viable method for converting drug nanosuspensions into inhalable, stable and
22 redispersible nano-agglomerates through combined *in-situ* thermal gelation and spray
23 drying. Itraconazole (ITZ) nanosuspensions were prepared by flash nanoprecipitation, and
24 co-spray dried with two different grades of the gel-forming polymer, methylcellulose (MC
25 M20 and MC M450) as protectants. MC M20 was found superior in protecting ITZ
26 nanoparticles against thermal stress (through nanoparticle entrapment within its gel
27 network structure) during spray drying. In terms of redispersibility, an S_f/S_i ratio (i.e., ratio
28 of nanoparticle sizes after and before spray drying) of unity (1.02 ± 0.03), reflecting full
29 particle size preservation, was achieved by optimizing the suspending medium content and
30 spray drying parameters. Formulation components, nanosuspension concentration and
31 spray drying parameters all showed a significant impact on the aerosol performance of the
32 resulting agglomerates, but an absence of defined trends or correlations. Overall, the MC-
33 protected nano-agglomerates displayed excellent *in-vitro* aerosol performance with fine
34 particle fractions higher than 50% and mass median aerodynamic diameters within the 2-
35 $3\mu\text{m}$ range, which are ideal for deep lung delivery.

36 **Keywords:** Itraconazole, nanoparticles, gelation, spray drying, inhalable and redispersible
37 nano-agglomerates, aerosol performance, deep lung delivery

38

39

40

41

42 1. INTRODUCTION

43 Recent advances in nanotechnology have led to a resurgence of research interest in
44 the development of novel pulmonary drug delivery systems for treatment of various
45 diseases.¹⁻² In addition to solubility and bioavailability enhancement, nanoparticles hold
46 promise for specialized drug delivery via the lungs, including deep lung delivery, sustained
47 drug release, and active drug targeting.³ Upon arrival at the alveoli, inhaled particles in the
48 micron-size range tend to retain on the epithelial surface, whereas their nanosized
49 counterparts are capable of penetrating through alveolar epithelium into the interstitium⁴.
50 Interestingly, a fraction of these nanoparticles can return to the epithelial surface, and such
51 continuous penetration and re-entrainment cycles serve to maintain a steady drug
52 concentration throughout the alveoli.⁵ Moreover, translocation of the deposited particles
53 from the alveolar space to the systemic circulation is only possible for particles in the
54 nanosize range.⁶ All these unique properties render nanotherapeutics particularly useful
55 for treating certain respiratory diseases, e.g., invasive aspergillosis, tuberculosis and lung
56 cancers; all of which can readily spread to other parts of the body if left untreated.

57 Despite the aforementioned merits, the utilization of solid nanoparticles in
58 inhalation therapy is not without issues compared to their liquid injectable counterparts.
59 Currently, there are three main types of aerosol-generating devices, namely, nebulizer,
60 pressurized metered-dose inhaler (pMDI) and dry powder inhaler (DPI).⁷ With regards to
61 the first two types of devices, although drugs formulated as nanosuspensions can be
62 atomized into respirable mists, the metastable nature of nanoparticles as well as the shear
63 stress induced during atomization could destabilize the emitted aerosols. In comparison to
64 their liquid counterparts, dry powders formulated for use with DPI offers superior stability
65 both physically and chemically. In addition, unlike pMDI that requires propellants for
66 aerosolization, DPI is a portable self-actuated inhalation device which is free of any ozone-
67 depleting propellants, e.g., chlorofluorocarbons and hydrofluoroalkanes. Nevertheless,
68 regardless of the method of aerosol administration, strict control of particle size to within
69 the aerodynamic diameter (d_A) range of 1-5 μm is necessary for optimal pulmonary
70 delivery. Particles with $d_A > 5 \mu\text{m}$ are mostly deposited on the walls of the upper respiratory
71 tract by inertial impaction while particles with $d_A < 1 \mu\text{m}$ tend to remain air-borne in the
72 airways and are exhaled during the normal breathing cycle. Consequently, to ensure

73 delivery into the lungs, nanoparticles need to be agglomerated into this respirable particle
74 size range by an appropriate technology, for which spray drying would appear to be a
75 pragmatic and efficient choice.

76 Over the past decade, spray drying has become increasingly popular for
77 manufacturing DPI formulations owing to its ease of operation and capability of offering
78 tight particle size control. However, the application of this technology to drying of
79 nanosuspensions (or agglomeration of nanoparticles) is deemed challenging as the physical
80 stability and primary particle size of nanosuspensions can significantly influence the
81 redispersibility of the final products. In addition, the selection of protectants and their
82 quantities used in nanosuspensions are often required to be determined in a trial-and-error
83 manner. This could be attributed to the relatively passive protection mechanism of the
84 protectants whose sole functions are to shield the nanoparticles from heating stress and
85 minimize their physical contact with one another. Here we present a novel drying method
86 for converting a drug nanosuspension into a redispersible nanoagglomerate powder
87 through a one-step process termed “combined *in-situ* thermal gelation and spray drying”.
88 In this process, a gel-forming polymer is employed to actively agglomerate nanoparticles
89 via thermal gelation to the optimal aerodynamic particle size during spray drying.
90 Itraconazole (ITZ), a poorly water-soluble BCS II drug, was chosen as the model
91 compound in the present study because of its well-established therapeutic effectiveness
92 against fungal infections and documented potentials for combating influenza and lung
93 cancers⁸⁻¹⁰. In addition, we have previously demonstrated that stable ITZ nanosuspensions
94 can be successfully prepared by flash nanoprecipitation (FNP) with the aid of d- α -
95 tocopheryl polyethylene glycol 1000 succinate as primary stabilizer and cholesterol as co-
96 stabilizer.¹¹

97 Accordingly, the purpose of this study was three-fold: (a) to evaluate the protective
98 effects of two different grades of the gel-forming polymer, methylcellulose (MC M20 and
99 MC M450) on the integrity of ITZ nanoparticles spray-dried from an optimized FNP-
100 produced nanosuspension; (b) to examine the impact of critical formulation and processing
101 parameters on the redispersibility and aerosol performance of the spray-dried ITZ

102 nanoagglomerates; and (c) to establish an optimal gelation and spray drying protocol for
103 generating redispersible nanoparticle agglomerates in the respirable particle size range.

104

105 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

106 **2.1. Materials**

107 Itraconazole (ITZ) with purity >99% was purchased from Yick-Vic Chemicals and
108 Pharmaceuticals Limited (Hong Kong SAR, China). Cholesterol (CLT), d- α -tocopheryl
109 polyethylene glycol 1000 succinate (TPGS), D-mannitol (mannitol), fructose, trehalose
110 dihydrate and α -lactose monohydrate (lactose) were supplied by Sigma Aldrich (USA).
111 Hydroxypropyl β -cyclodextrin (HPBCD) was supplied by Roquette (France), and
112 methylcellulose (MC) of two different grades (MC M20 and MC M450) and sucrose were
113 obtained from Wing Hing (Hong Kong SAR, China). Sodium chloride (NaCl) was
114 purchased from BDH Laboratory Supplies (UK). Dimethylformamide (DMF) and
115 tetrahydrofuran (THF) of analytical grade were received from RCI Labscan Limited
116 (Thailand). Acetonitrile (ACN) of HPLC grade and acetic acid of analytical grade were
117 purchased from Duksan Pure Chemicals (Korea) and BDH Laboratory Supplies (UK),
118 respectively. All chemicals and solvents were used as received. Water used was collected
119 from a Millipore water purification system (Direct-QTM, USA).

120

121 **2.2. Preparation of ITZ Nanosuspension**

122 ITZ nanosuspension with TPGS as a primary stabilizer and CLT as a hydrophobic
123 co-stabilizer (ITZ: TPGS: CLT = 1:1:0.2 w/w/w; ITZ = 0.25 mg/ml) was prepared by flash
124 nanoprecipitation using a four-stream multi-inlet vortex mixer, as reported previously.¹¹

125 **2.3. Centrifugal Ultrafiltration**

126 Fifteen mL of ITZ nanosuspension was centrifuged in an Amicon® ultra-15 30K
127 centrifugal filter device (Millipore Corp., Billerica, MA, USA) under 4000 \times g. For the
128 removal of DMF, the centrifugal ultrafiltration was conducted twice, each with
129 replacement with pure cold water, whereas for the adjustment of the nanoparticle
130 concentration with maintenance of the same DMF concentration, the centrifugal
131 ultrafiltration was performed only once, followed by replacement with cold water

132 containing 5% v/v DMF (Fig. A1). The concentration of nanoparticles was adjusted by
133 varying the volume of the replacement fluid as required. The effectiveness of the above
134 ultrafiltration protocol was verified by monitoring the change in particle size with a
135 nanoparticle size analyzer (see Section 2.7) and the change in drug concentration by HPLC
136 (see Section 2.13).

137 **2.4.Spray Drying**

138 Selected protectants including mannitol, sucrose, lactose, and HPBCD were each
139 dissolved in separate ITZ nanosuspensions (ITZ: protectant = 1: 80 w/w) kept in an ice
140 bath. Each sample was then fed into a spray-dryer (B-191, Büchi, Switzerland). The
141 aspirator of spray dryer was fixed at 100% for all formulations, and the air flow was set at
142 600L/h. Unless otherwise specified, the inlet temperature of spray dryer and suspension
143 feed rate were maintained at 110°C and 2.5 ml/min respectively. The dried powder was
144 collected in a product vessel.

145

146 **2.5. Gelation**

147 MC M20 solution (containing 5 mg/ml MC M20 and 5% v/v DMF) was mixed with
148 ITZ nanosuspension in 1:1 volumetric ratio at room temperature. Agglomeration was
149 achieved by mixing the diluted nanosuspension (ITZ: MC = 1:20 w/w; 5% v/v DMF) with
150 a concentrated sodium chloride solution (250 mg/ml) in a 1 to 3 volume ratio. The
151 suspension was allowed to stand for 30 min before vacuum-filtration through a filter paper
152 of pore size of 0.8µm. The resulting powder was collected and dried in a desiccator.

153 **2.6. Combined *In-Situ* Thermal Gelation and Spray Drying**

154 MC solution with known concentrations of MC and DMF was mixed with the ITZ
155 nanosuspension in 1:1 volumetric ratio under ice-cold condition. The resulting
156 nanosuspension was spray-dried using the same parameter settings as described in Section
157 2.4.

158 **2.7. Determination of Particle Size Change of ITZ Nanosuspension**

159 The change in intensity-weighted particle size of ITZ nanosuspension was
160 monitored by a Delsa™ Nano C particle size analyzer (Beckman Coulter Inc., USA) upon
161 completion of each step in the drying process and in the subsequent testing of the dried

162 products, e.g., after addition of protectant and redispersion of the product. Nanoparticle
163 redispersibility was tested by reconstitution of the dried products with water at room
164 temperature.

165 **2.8. Determination of Geometric Particle Size of the Nanoparticle Agglomerates**

166 A laser diffraction particle size analyzer equipped with a tornado dry powder
167 dispersion system and a vacuum generator (LS13 320, Beckman Coulter, USA) was used
168 to determine the particle size distribution of the dried nanoparticle agglomerates. The
169 vacuum process generates an air flow to disperse the sample powder and direct the powder
170 to a suction channel and then a measuring cell. In the measuring cell, the dispersed sample
171 interacts with an illuminating light beam mainly generated by a 5mW laser diode with a
172 wavelength of 750 nm and a fiber optic spatial filter. The resulting scattered light intensity
173 patterns are then collected and analyzed using Fraunhofer theory to obtain volume particle
174 size distribution. Median geometric diameter is the particle size at which 50% volume
175 fraction of particles are undersize.

176

177 **2.9. Differential Scanning Calorimetry (DSC)**

178 The thermal properties of the dried powder product were characterized by DSC
179 (DSC 250, TA Systems, USA). The equipment was calibrated with pure indium before use.
180 Accurately weighed sample (1-5 mg) was placed in a hermetically sealed aluminum pan
181 and scanned at 10°C/min under nitrogen purge from 25 to 250°C.

182 **2.10. Powder X-ray Diffraction (PXRD)**

183 The dried powder product was packed in an aluminum holder and analyzed using a
184 powder X-ray diffractometer (PW1830, Philips, Netherlands) operating with a 3kW Cu
185 anode over a 2θ interval of 3° to 40°. The step size was 0.02° and the dwell time was 2
186 seconds per step.

187 **2.11. Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM)**

188 The morphology and surface features of the dried powder were studied by scanning
189 electron microscopy (SEM). Samples were placed on double-sided adhesive tapes stuck on
190 aluminum stubs. Samples were gold-coated in an ion sputter coater (SC 502, Polaron) at
191 an electrical potential of 2.0 mV, 20 mA. The coated samples were examined under a

192 scanning electron microscope (JSM 6300F, JEOL, Japan) operating under vacuum at an
193 accelerating voltage of 10-20 kV.

194 **2.12. *In Vitro* Evaluation of Aerosol Performance**

195 A Next Generation Impactor (NGI, Copley Scientific, UK), consisting of an
196 induction port, 7 stages and a micro-orifice contactor (MOC), was employed to assess the
197 aerosol performance of the dried nanoagglomerates. Silicone grease (LPS Laboratories,
198 USA) was deposited on all cups of the NGI to minimize bouncing of particles. Accurately
199 weighed sample (~8 mg) was separately loaded into three size-3 hydroxypropyl
200 methylcellulose capsules (Capsugel, Australia). The first capsule was mounted and pierced
201 in an inhaler (Osmohaler, Plastiaple, Italy), which was connected to the NGI through a
202 mouthpiece adapter. The sample was dispersed from the pierced capsule and aerosolized
203 at a flowrate of 90 L/min for 2.7 s so that 4 L of air passed through the inhaler with a
204 pressure drop of 4 kPa. The process was repeated for the other two capsules. Each part of
205 NGI and capsules were then individually washed with acetonitrile/water (60:40 v/v)
206 solution. This slightly different procedure was performed to avoid the acetonitrile from
207 corroding the plastic inhaler. Water was used to rinse the inhaler and adapter separately,
208 followed by dilution with acetonitrile to a final acetonitrile/water volume ratio of 60:40.
209 The amount of drug collected in each rinse or wash was determined by HPLC.

210 For the calculations, recovered dose (RD) is defined as the total amount of drug
211 recovered from capsules, inhaler, adapter, throat and all cups of NGI while emitted dose
212 (ED) is the total amount of drug recovered excluding those from the capsules and inhaler.
213 Powder emission efficiency is defined as ED with respect to RD. Stage cut-off diameters
214 and cumulative mass fraction of drug less than the stated aerodynamic diameters were
215 calculated according to the method in the latest edition of the British Pharmacopoeia.
216 Cumulative drug mass fractions under size were plotted against aerodynamic diameters on
217 a log probability scale, and the data were analyzed by the best-fit linear line. The fine
218 particle fraction (FPF) is the mass of dose for the particles whose aerodynamic size is less
219 than 5 μm with respect to the RD. Mass median aerodynamic diameter (MMAD) is the
220 aerodynamic diameter for which 50 wt% of particles are below or above the MMAD.

221

222 **2.13. High-Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC)**

223 ITZ was assayed by HPLC using a previously reported method ¹². The calibration
224 curve of ITZ constructed with different drug concentrations exhibited excellent linearity
225 with $R^2 > 0.999$. The retention time of ITZ was ~ 10 min. Quality control samples with
226 known ITZ concentrations were injected in between and after analyses to ensure data
227 accuracy.

228 **2.14. Statistical Analysis**

229 All material testing and measurements were conducted in triplicate with separate
230 batches of samples, and the collected data were analyzed statistically by unpaired Student's
231 t-test at a significant level of 0.05.

232 **3. Results and Discussion**

233 **3.1. Spray Drying**

234 Saccharides are commonly used as protectants against shear force and elevated
235 temperature in spray drying. As TPGS (melting point $\sim 38^\circ\text{C}$) was employed as the primary
236 stabilizer for the ITZ nanoparticles, it would be expected that it could not withstand the
237 high-temperature environment during spray drying. Selection of protectants with high
238 melting points might mitigate the issue as they could protect the primary nanoparticles
239 from the heating stress and minimize the physical contact between primary nanoparticles.
240 For this purpose, lactose, mannitol, sucrose and HPBCD were selected as they have
241 relatively high melting points compared with the studied inlet temperature of spray dryer.

242 It was found that without removal of the DMF from the nanosuspension, the spray-
243 dried products containing ITZ-TPGS-CLT nanoparticles with various selected protectants
244 could not be redispersed back into individual nanoparticles upon reconstitution with water.
245 To eliminate the effect of organic solvent, DMF was removed by centrifugal ultrafiltration.
246 As shown in Fig. A2 and Table A1, the ultrafiltration process had minimal impact on the
247 integrity and stability of the nanoparticles, as the particle size, encapsulation efficiency,
248 and drug loading remained essentially unchanged after the process.

249 For the spray drying of the nanosuspension without DMF but with a protectant
250 added, only HPBCD was effective for producing redispersible powder (Table A2). The
251 particle size of spray-dried powder with HPBCD was confirmed by SEM to fall within the
252 micron-size respirable range (Fig. A3). In addition, DSC and PXRD results confirmed its

253 amorphous nature (Fig. A4). However, the ratio of the size of primary nanoparticles
254 following spray drying and reconstitution (S_f) to the initial particle size of the
255 nanosuspension before spray drying (S_i) was significantly larger than the generally
256 accepted range for nanoparticle stability (i.e., 1.47 ± 0.09 vs 0.7-1.3).¹³⁻¹⁴ Hence, it was
257 necessary to seek a better formulation strategy to minimize the particle size increase of
258 primary nanoparticles during spray drying.

259 **3.2. Gelation**

260 It has been shown that conventional protectants are not sufficiently effective for
261 protecting drug nanoparticles during spray drying, indicative of their relatively passive
262 protection mechanism at an early stage of the spray drying process. To resolve the issue,
263 alternative protectants capable of offering the nanoparticles active protection need to be
264 sought. The desired protectant should actively and efficiently encase the nanoparticles at
265 the initial stage of the spray drying process instead of remaining uniformly dispersed in the
266 nanosuspension droplets. The protectant should also exhibit stronger and more specific
267 interactions with the surface of the nanoparticles so as to lower the amount of the protectant
268 required for protecting the nanoparticles. Ideally, such a protectant should actively bind the
269 nanoparticles together to form stable agglomerates so that the total exposed surface area of
270 nanoparticles is minimized to a level sufficient for long-term stability. The agglomerates
271 are also required to dissociate back into individual nanoparticles after arrival at the alveoli.

272 Gel-forming polymers with sol-gel transition temperature (T_{gel}) above body
273 temperature (37°C) are potential protectants that fulfill the aforementioned requirements.
274 A typical example of such polymers is methylcellulose (MC) with T_{gel} falling within the
275 range of 40°C to 50°C . MC is generally considered safe for human consumption, and has
276 been approved by regulatory authorities (e.g., US-FDA) for use as an excipient in various
277 pharmaceutical formulations. With a suitable T_{gel} , gelation of MC can start upon heating
278 inside the heating chamber of a spray dryer. The T_{gel} of MC depends on the degree of
279 substitution (DS) of the hydroxyl groups. The higher the DS, the lower the T_{gel} . At the
280 molecular level, MC joins via their hydrophobic moieties to form a gel. Since the surface
281 of the ITZ nanoparticles has been shown to be not fully covered by hydrophiles right after
282 production,¹² the nanoparticles might also attach to the hydrophobic segments of MC,

283 resulting in nanoparticles being entrapped inside a gel network. As an agglomerating agent
284 for drug nanoparticles designed for delivery to the alveoli, MC possesses the advantage of
285 being readily degraded in the alveolar fluid once dissolved.¹⁵ The desired MC should be
286 one which is not only soluble at body temperature to release the agglomerated nanoparticles
287 in the alveoli, but is also able to undergo gelation upon heating in a spray dryer. MC M20
288 (DS = 1.6) with a T_{gel} of 48°C¹⁶ was selected for further evaluation in this part of the study.

289 In order to verify if the gel-forming MC is capable of entrapping the nanoparticles,
290 it is important to determine the nanoparticle content in the gel immediately after its
291 formation from the nanosuspension prior to drying. However, for MC to form a gel, such
292 a study has to be conducted at an elevated temperature, i.e., T_{gel} (40-50°C) of MC, which
293 can potentially destabilize the nanoparticles, depending on the duration of the study. To
294 circumvent this temperature-dependent stability problem, an electrolyte can be added to
295 the MC solution to effect gelation at room temperature (i.e., salting-out effect). It has been
296 reported that the T_{gel} of MC can be lowered by addition of sodium chloride.¹⁷ Gelation of
297 MC can then occur at ambient conditions when T_{gel} is adjusted to room temperature or
298 below. The aqueous solubility of MC is generally moderate due to the substitution of some
299 polar hydroxyl groups with methoxide groups. To determine the entrapment of
300 nanoparticles by the gel-forming MC M20, the present study has employed a drug-to-MC
301 M20 ratio of 1:20 w/w, which denotes a much lower proportion of MC compared with the
302 conventional protectants used in spray drying. After addition of the MC M20 solution to
303 the nanosuspension, the size of the nanoparticles remained unchanged, suggesting that MC
304 M20 exerts no significant adverse impact on the nanoparticles. When the nanosuspension
305 with dissolved MC was added to sodium chloride solution at room temperature, sizable
306 gels were formed and then collected by conventional filtration after 30 minutes. The
307 nanoparticles which were not entrapped in gels should pass through the filter membrane in
308 conventional filtration. No particle was detected in the collected filtrate by DLS particle
309 sizing, suggesting all the nanoparticles were entrapped inside the gels. Upon contact with
310 water (without salt), the gels were de-agglomerated. The size of primary nanoparticles after
311 de-agglomeration of gels was found to increase by 1.46 ± 0.02 times, indicative of
312 redispersibility of primary nanoparticles. The size increase of primary nanoparticles may
313 be attributed to partial destabilization of the nanoparticles by the high electrolyte

314 concentration in the aqueous suspending medium which can alter the aqueous solubilities
315 of the nanoparticle components.¹⁸ Since gelation of MC appeared effective for entrapment
316 of nanoparticles, subsequent studies had focused on the utilization of spray drying in
317 conjunction with gelation to produce nanoparticle agglomerates with improved
318 redispersibility, stability and aerosol performance.

319 **3.3.Production of nanoparticle agglomerates by combined gelation and spray drying**

320 It has been demonstrated that gelation with MC is capable of actively entrapping
321 nanoparticles to form redispersible nanoparticle agglomerates. Hence combined spray
322 drying and gelation would appear to hold promise for the production of redispersible
323 nanoparticle agglomerates within the proper particle size range for deep lung delivery. This
324 section focuses on the development of a suitable combined spray drying and gelation
325 protocol for the production of nanoparticle agglomerates. A systematic approach was
326 adopted to investigate the impact of the properties of MC, concentration of the primary
327 nanoparticles and MC, concentration of organic solvent, as well as spray drying conditions
328 on the properties and aerosol performance of resulting nanoparticle agglomerates. In these
329 spray drying studies, an equivalent volume of MC solution was added to each ITZ-TPGS-
330 CLT nanosuspension so that the original concentration of the latter was reduced by half
331 (ITZ concentration = 0.125 mg/ml after dilution) prior to spray drying. The ratio of drug to
332 MC in the nanosuspensions was fixed at 1:20 w/w initially. A summary of different tested
333 agglomerate formulations with their median geometric diameters, redispersibility, MMAD
334 and FPF is provided in Table 1.

335 **3.3.1. Effect of viscosity of MC**

336 Apart from MC M20 [viscosity ~20 mPaS for 2% aqueous solution at 20°C;
337 DS~1.6]¹⁶, MC M450 [viscosity ~ 450 mPaS for 2% aqueous solution at 20°C, DS~1.5]¹⁹
338 of similar DS but higher viscosity was also assessed for its ability to protect primary
339 nanoparticles in spray drying. It could be seen from Fig. 1 that the particle size of primary
340 nanoparticles after redispersion of the agglomerates with MC M20 was significantly
341 smaller than that using MC M450 regardless of the DMF content ($p<0.05$), implying that
342 a lower viscosity of MC offers better protection to primary nanoparticles. This can be
343 linked to the higher molecular mobility or diffusivity of the less viscous MC M20. Having

344 a higher diffusivity, MC M20 can move faster to encapsulate the nanoparticles during spray
345 drying, thus reducing the exposure time of unprotected nanoparticles to the hot
346 environment, and therefore, it was selected for further assessment in subsequent studies.

347 **3.3.2. Effect of concentration of organic solvent**

348 In the presence of DMF, co-spray drying of the nanosuspensions with conventional
349 protectants failed to yield redispersible agglomerates, whereas similar spray drying
350 treatment with the gel-forming agent, MC, instead yielded stable and redispersible dried
351 nano-agglomerates. This suggests that MC offered the nanoparticles better protection or
352 stronger resistance against the destabilization by DMF during spray drying. Increasing the
353 DMF content in the range of 0-5% v/v in the nanosuspension was seen to reduce the growth
354 of primary nanoparticles during spray drying (Fig. 2). With the nanoparticles being
355 protected within the MC gel and the presence of DMF which possesses relatively low
356 surface tension and viscosity in the nanosuspension, the exposure of nanoparticles towards
357 shear stresses during atomization would be alleviated. A previous study demonstrated
358 DMF could form intermolecular hydrogen bonds with MC and interact with the methoxy
359 groups of MC via a dipole-dipole interaction,²⁰ suggesting the presence of DMF could
360 reduce the overall system enthalpy. Another work also revealed that the incorporation of a
361 small amount of DMF (even at a 0.05-0.1 mole fraction) in water could significantly lower
362 the molal heat capacity of a DMF-water mixture.²¹ Thus, the drying time of sprayed
363 droplets as well as the exposure time of nanoparticles towards various drying stresses
364 would be reduced. However, the protective effect of MC on the nanoparticles (produced at
365 ITZ:MC M20 = 1:10 w/w) began to subside when the DMF content in the nanosuspension
366 was raised beyond 5% v/v, as shown by an increase in S_f/S_i thereafter ($p < 0.05$; Fig. 6.2).

367 **3.3.3. Effect of drug to MC ratio**

368 For the spray drying studies employing DMF-free nanosuspensions, an increase in
369 the ITZ:MC M20 ratio from 1:20 w/w to 1:10 w/w (i.e., decreasing MC M20 concentration)
370 increased the S_f/S_i ratio from 1.53 ± 0.02 to 2.43 ± 0.10 (Fig. 2). In contrast, repetition of
371 the above study for DMF-containing nanosuspensions revealed a decrease in the S_f/S_i value
372 from 1.51 ± 0.06 to 1.29 ± 0.02 (at 2.5% v/v DMF) and from 1.33 ± 0.08 to 1.13 ± 0.05 (at
373 5% v/v DMF) upon raising the ITZ:MC M20 ratio from 1:20 w/w to 1:10 w/w. It is

374 important to note that the concentration of MC M20 exerts a significant impact on the
375 drying time of sprayed droplets and hence the exposure time of nanoparticles to various
376 drying stresses. This effect poses stability threat to the nanoparticles regardless of the
377 presence of DMF. Higher concentration of MC affords higher viscosity of the medium
378 during gel formation, thereby prolonging the drying time of the droplets and exposure time
379 of nanoparticles to drying stresses. In the case of DMF-free nanosuspensions, as the initial
380 evaporation rate of sprayed droplets was indeed low, the viscosity effect induced by
381 different ratios of ITZ to MC M20 did not significantly retard the initial evaporation rate.
382 However, less amount of MC M20 relative to nanoparticles (i.e., ITZ:MC M20 = 1:10 w/w)
383 would imply less protection being provided for the primary nanoparticles, resulting in a
384 larger final size of the nanoparticles. In the case of nanosuspensions containing 2.5% v/v
385 and 5% v/v DMF, the initial evaporation rate was accelerated by the presence of DMF.
386 While the nanosuspension formulated with ITZ to MC M20 ratio of 1:10 w/w did not afford
387 unacceptably high viscosity, the extension on the solvent evaporation time by MC M20 at
388 a higher concentration in the nanosuspension with ITZ to MC M20 ratio of 1:20 w/w could
389 be significant. Thus in the presence of DMF, the nanosuspensions containing a higher
390 proportion of MC M20 (i.e., with ITZ to MC M20 ratio of 1:20 w/w) consistently displayed
391 poorer stability of the nanoparticles redispersed from the spray-dried agglomerates (Fig. 2).
392 However, in the extreme case when the ITZ to MC M20 ratio in the nanosuspensions was
393 further raised to 1:5 w/w in the presence or absence of DMF (5% v/v), non-redispersible
394 products were obtained, indicative of an insufficiency in the amount of protectant required
395 for nanoparticle stabilization.

396 **3.3.4. Effect of ITZ nanosuspension concentration**

397 The ITZ to MC M20 ratio was fixed at 1:10 w/w for all studies reported in this
398 section. The concentrations of both nanoparticles and MC M20 in the nanosuspensions
399 with 5% v/v DMF were adjusted to double to significantly amplify the effect of water
400 content, if any, on the final size of primary nanoparticles. As shown in Fig. 3, the final size
401 of primary nanoparticles remained unchanged ($p > 0.05$) with increases in both ITZ and
402 MC M20 concentrations. Since the evaporation rate of droplets was indeed high due to the
403 presence of DMF, any further reduction in the drying time by increasing the
404 nanosuspension concentration or reducing the water content might not have any additional

405 benefit. In addition, the positive effect of the latter could be offset by an increased tendency
406 to particle aggregation in the more concentrated nanosuspension. To further substantiate
407 the significance of drying time reduction, similar studies were conducted on DMF-free
408 nanosuspensions, which would display a slower solvent evaporation rate compared with
409 the DMF-containing counterparts. Moreover, S_f/S_i was lower for the more concentrated
410 DMF-free nanosuspension ($p < 0.05$), reflective of the importance of drying time reduction
411 in maintaining the stability of nanoparticles.

412 **3.3.5. Effect of inlet temperature of spray drying**

413 Nanosuspensions containing ITZ and MC M20 in the ratio of 1:10 w/w and DMF
414 content at 5% v/v were employed to determine the optimal spray drying conditions for
415 producing redispersible nanoparticle agglomerates based on the calculated S_f/S_i ratios.
416 Higher inlet temperature of spray dryer can increase droplet evaporation rate and thereby
417 reduce the drying time, but it can also augment the heating stress on nanoparticles. Hence
418 there exists an optimal drying temperature at which a desirably high drying efficiency can
419 be achieved for the agglomerates with no or minimal damage to the nanoparticles. The final
420 size of primary nanoparticles was improved when the inlet temperature increased from
421 100°C to 110°C ($p < 0.05$), but further increase in inlet temperature to 120°C (Fig. 4)
422 offered no further improvement in reducing the final size of primary nanoparticles ($p >$
423 0.05). Hence, 110°C was taken as the optimal inlet temperature.

424 **3.3.6. Effect of feed rate of the ITZ nanosuspension into spray dryer**

425 A descending trend for S_f/S_i was observed with a decrease in feed rate of the
426 nanosuspension into the spray dryer (Fig. 5). This can be explained by generation of smaller
427 droplets with a slower feed rate. The drying time was shorter with a smaller droplet size,
428 resulting in smaller final particle size. With an S_f/S_i ratio close to unity obtained at the feed
429 rate of ~1 and ~1.5ml/min (the S_f/S_i values at these two feed rates were statistically
430 indistinguishable; $p > 0.05$), the feed rate of ~1.5ml/min was deemed optimal since it could
431 significantly reduce the processing time. In summary, the optimal protocol for constraining
432 the size change of primary nanoparticles ($S_f/S_i = 1.02 \pm 0.03$) was spray drying of the
433 nanosuspension at an inlet temperature of 110°C and a feed rate of ~1.5ml/min.

434 **3.4. Structure and morphology of nanoparticle agglomerates**

435 Nanoparticle agglomerates can exist as either solid or hollow structure. The
436 structure depends on the movement of primary nanoparticles together with other
437 components present in droplets during spray drying. The primary nanoparticles with
438 dissolved saccharides or HPBCD as protectants are uniformly distributed in the atomized
439 spherical droplets initially. Evaporation of the liquid medium starts at the surface of the
440 droplet, leading to a high local concentration of primary nanoparticles and protectants on
441 the surface. A concentration gradient is then developed which drives the movement of
442 primary nanoparticles and protectants by diffusion towards the center of the droplet (inward
443 motion). Meanwhile, when the liquid medium evaporates, the droplet surface recedes and
444 a thermophoretic flow towards the surface is created to replenish the volume of fluid lost
445 (outward motion).²²⁻²³ This flow keeps the primary nanoparticles and protectants stationing
446 on the receding surface. The net inward movement of the primary nanoparticles and
447 protectants depends on the difference in magnitude between the inward force and the
448 outward force. A Peclet number (Pe), a dimensionless mass transport number, can be used
449 to describe this situation (Eq. 1).²⁴⁻²⁵ This number shows the relative significance of the
450 time required for the drying of the droplet (τ_d) and diffusion of the primary nanoparticles
451 or protectants (R^2/D).

$$452 \quad Pe = \frac{R^2}{\tau_d D} \quad (\text{Eq. 1})$$

453 where τ_d is the drying time, R is the droplet radius, and D is the diffusion coefficient of the
454 nanoparticle or protectant.

455 Fig. 6 illustrates the position of primary nanoparticles in a droplet at different Pe
456 values. When the evaporation flux is small, the outward force is small. The net inward
457 movement of the primary nanoparticles and protectants is faster than the radial velocity of
458 the receding droplet surface ($Pe \ll 1$). The materials inside the droplet remain uniformly
459 distributed. The end-time of the evaporation is nearly the same as when solidification starts.
460 Solid-structured particles are formed. When the evaporation rate is high, the outward force
461 is large. The net inward movement of the primary nanoparticles and protectants is slower
462 than the movement of the surface ($Pe \gg 1$), and thus the primary nanoparticles and
463 protectants accumulate on the surface of the droplet. The concentrations of the protectants

464 on the surface quickly reach saturation, and the protectants become solidified.
465 Simultaneously, the primary nanoparticles are driven together by capillary force.²³ This
466 leads to the formation of a solid composite shell consisting of the primary nanoparticles
467 and protectants and enclosing remaining liquid medium. The enclosed liquid medium is
468 heated in the next instant and evaporates within the shell. The ability for the evaporating
469 liquid to escape from the shell depends on the permeability of the shell. The presence of
470 gaps on the shell increases the permeability. When the permeability is low, the rate of liquid
471 vapour moving out from the shell is lower than the generation rate of liquid vapour inside
472 the shell. Pressure is developed inside the droplets and pushes the remaining primary
473 nanoparticles in the liquid medium onto the inner surface of the shell. If the pressure is
474 increased to such a level that the shell cannot withstand, the evaporating liquid medium
475 will puncture the shell, resulting in holes in the shell or rupturing of the shell. This process
476 is termed thermal expansion.²⁵⁻²⁶ When the permeability is high, the liquid vapour can
477 escape easily from the shell through the gaps between the primary nanoparticles. As the
478 shrinkage of the droplet continues, the liquid-vapour interfaces in the gaps reverse their
479 curvature (from convex to concave, as illustrated in Fig. 7). This creates a tension force
480 pulling the gaps towards the outer surface of the shell and pushing the spherical shell
481 inward to form buckles.²⁷⁻²⁸ Both of the above cases produce hollow nanoparticle
482 agglomerates.

483 It should be noted that in using MC to entrap nanoparticles in liquid medium prior
484 to spray drying, active aggregation of MC to form a gel during the drying process also
485 needs to be taken into consideration. Mobility of MC will be dramatically decreased after
486 gel formation. Since gel formation of MC on droplet surface initiates actively and rapidly
487 upon heating in spray drying, inward movement of MC will soon slow down and
488 solidification of MC on droplet surface will commence near the onset of heating, and will
489 be quicker compared with conventional protectants. As it has been shown in the preceding
490 section that primary nanoparticles are actively taken up into MC gels during gel formation,
491 migration of primary nanoparticles towards droplet center will be seriously retarded by MC
492 gels. Hence, hollow nanoparticle agglomerates will most likely form if MC is employed as
493 a carrier or agglomerating agent for primary nanoparticles. This has been substantiated in
494 the present study by the production of nanoparticle agglomerates in the form of buckled,

495 dimpled spheres when co-spraying the nanosuspension with MC M20 (Fig. A5). Hence,
496 combined spray drying and gelation has proven effective for generating hollow aerosols. It
497 could be seen that the agglomerates in Fig. A5 exhibited a smooth surface with no exposed
498 or discernable individual nanoparticles. This is probably because all the nanoparticles were
499 fully entrapped or covered by the MC which was present in a much larger quantity.

500 Hollow nanoparticle agglomerates have advantages over their solid counterparts. It
501 has been shown that non-hollow polymer- and lipid-based nanoparticle agglomerates are
502 not readily redispersible in water.²⁹⁻³⁰ This is because the outer layer of nanoparticles needs
503 to be wetted and redispersed first before wetting and redispersion of the inner layer can
504 proceed. This will require a long period of time for wetting the whole solid nanoparticle
505 agglomerates. In contrast, with a similar concentration of primary nanoparticles, hollow
506 nanoparticle agglomerates have relatively large geometric diameters and few layers of
507 primary nanoparticles in the agglomerate shell, resulting in a high redispersion rate of
508 primary nanoparticles.³¹⁻³² Since the aggregate strength decreases with an increase in
509 geometric diameter, hollow aerosols should also show better powder dispersion. Buckled
510 spheres of the nanoparticle agglomerates can further decrease contact area between
511 aerosols, leading to superior powder dispersion performance.³³

512 **3.5. *In vitro* aerosol performance**

513 Aerosol performance of nanoparticle agglomerates is critical for effective delivery
514 of drug nanoparticles to the deep lungs, and can be assessed with an NGI. All formulations
515 containing MC M20 showed extremely high powder emission efficiency (>90%; Fig. 8 and
516 Fig.9), indicating that the aerosols were effectively discharged from the inhaler. FPFs were
517 generally higher than 50% and reached up to 71%, which are considered high compared
518 with other aerosol studies.³⁴ The superior aerosol performance can be attributed to a
519 decrease in interparticulate contact area for buckling and hollow structure of the ITZ
520 nanoparticle agglomerates.³⁵ The majority of the nanoparticle agglomerates produced
521 using different spray drying parameters and suspension concentrations have an MMAD of
522 2-3 μ m, which is most ideal for targeting the alveoli.

523 As far as the formulation of nanosuspensions is concerned, no defined trend exists
524 for both MMAD and FPF with an increase in organic solvent content or drug to protectant

525 ratio of the nanosuspension (Fig. 8). It has been reported that excipient (DPPC and albumin)
526 concentration in nanoformulation of albumin-lactose-DPPC system exerts a great impact
527 on aerosol performance although no obvious correlation between them was observed.³⁶
528 Tsapis and coworkers demonstrated that spray drying of DPPC-DMPE-lactose-
529 nanoparticles in ethanol/water system with different nanoparticle concentrations did not
530 show any significant influence on the aerodynamic diameter of the resulting product.²⁵
531 Similar lack of correlation between formulation component concentration and aerosol
532 performance has been observed for nanoparticle agglomerates formulated with
533 polyacrylate and silica.³⁷ Increasing nanosuspension concentration may have a positive or
534 negative impact on aerosol performance. To investigate the effect of nanosuspension
535 concentration on the aerosol performance of ITZ nanoparticle agglomerates with MC, the
536 concentration of ITZ nanosuspension with MC and DMF was doubled and spray-dried. As
537 shown in Fig. 9a, doubling the nanosuspension concentration (both ITZ nanoparticles and
538 MC M20 concentrations) significantly worsened the aerosol performance of the
539 agglomerates (i.e., larger MMAD and smaller FPF; $p < 0.05$).

540 With regard to the spray dryer parameters, feed rate also showed no correlation with
541 aerosol performance (Fig. 9b), but an increase in inlet temperature afforded an increase in
542 MMAD ($p < 0.05$; Fig. 9c) while having no significant impact on FPF. The ascending
543 MMAD trend with increasing inlet temperature may only be valid for the formulations in
544 the present study since other studies showed that the influence of inlet temperature on
545 aerodynamic diameter of dried agglomerates was also affected by the weight ratio and size
546 of primary nanoparticles.³⁸ It is worth noting that regardless of the widely documented
547 impact of formulation and manufacturing variables on FPF and MMAD, a higher FPF
548 should always be associated with a lower MMAD although this relationship might not be
549 apparent in certain cases.³⁹ The detailed results on geometric diameters, MMAD, FPF and
550 redispersibility of samples prepared by different tested formulation and processing
551 conditions are provided in Table 1.

552 Based on the aerosol performance and redispersibility data, the optimized
553 conditions for the production of nanoparticle agglomerates were as follows:
554 Nanosuspensions containing ITZ and MC M20 at a mass ratio of 1:10 together with 5%

555 v/v DMF; spray-dried at an inlet temperature of 110°C and a feed rate of 1.5 ml/min. The
556 optimized agglomerates powder (i.e., formulation k in Table 1) exhibited excellent *in-vitro*
557 aerosol performance and redispersibility with FPF of 65.35 (\pm 1.68) %, MMAD of 2.16 (\pm
558 0.02) μ m and an S_f/S_i ratio of 1.02(\pm 0.03). The PXRD pattern of the optimized
559 agglomerates powder displayed no significant diffraction peak but a halo diffused pattern
560 instead, indicative of the amorphous nature of the sample (Fig. 10a). This finding was also
561 supported by an absence of melting events in the DSC analysis (Fig. 10b).

562 **CONCLUSION**

563 The problems of nanoparticle instability and poor redispersibility by direct spray
564 drying of nanosuspension with conventional protectants could be resolved by employing
565 *in-situ* gelation with MC in conjunction with spray drying. In the present study, we have
566 shown that this novel drying approach could generate readily redispersible nanoparticle
567 agglomerates in the desired aerodynamic particle size range, which is ideal for deep lung
568 deposition. Formulation component, concentration of nanosuspension as well as spray
569 drying parameters all showed a significant impact on the aerosol performance of resulting
570 nanoparticle agglomerates, but an absence of defined trends or correlations. The present
571 study offers an effective approach for simultaneously overcoming two major challenges in
572 inhaled nanoparticle formulation development, viz. generation of inhalable and
573 redispersible nano-agglomerates, and maintenance of the integrity and stability of
574 individual nanoparticles.

575

576 **Acknowledgements**

577 This work was supported by the Chinese University of Hong Kong [Postgraduate
578 Studentship for K.Y.W.] and the University of Hong Kong [Project number: 204600519].

579 **Declaration of interest: none**

580

581 **Appendix A. Supplementary material**

582 This paper includes supplementary material which has been uploaded separately
583 during submission.

584 **References**

- 585 1. Seydoux, E.; Rodriguez-Lorenzo, L.; Blom, R. A.; Stumbles, P. A.; Petri-Fink, A.;
586 Rothen-Rutishauser, B. M.; Blank, F.; von Garnier, C., Pulmonary delivery of cationic gold
587 nanoparticles boost antigen-specific CD4(+) T Cell Proliferation. *Nanomedicine* **2016**, *12*
588 (7), 1815-1826.
- 589 2. Azarmi, S.; Roa, W. H.; Lobenberg, R., Targeted delivery of nanoparticles for the
590 treatment of lung diseases. *Adv Drug Deliv Rev* **2008**, *60* (8), 863-75.
- 591 3. Al-Qadi, S.; Grenha, A.; Carrion-Recio, D.; Seijo, B.; Remunan-Lopez, C.,
592 Microencapsulated chitosan nanoparticles for pulmonary protein delivery: in vivo
593 evaluation of insulin-loaded formulations. *J Control Release* **2012**, *157* (3), 383-90.
- 594 4. Furuyama, A.; Kanno, S.; Kobayashi, T.; Hirano, S., Extrapulmonary translocation
595 of intratracheally instilled fine and ultrafine particles via direct and alveolar macrophage-
596 associated routes. *Arch Toxicol* **2009**, *83* (5), 429-37.
- 597 5. Semmler-Behnke, M.; Takenaka, S.; Fertsch, S.; Wenk, A.; Seitz, J.; Mayer, P.;
598 Oberdorster, G.; Kreyling, W. G., Efficient elimination of inhaled nanoparticles from the
599 alveolar region: evidence for interstitial uptake and subsequent reentrainment onto airways
600 epithelium. *Environ Health Perspect* **2007**, *115* (5), 728-33.
- 601 6. Nemmar, A.; Hoet, P. H. M.; Vanquickenborne, B.; Dinsdale, D.; Thomeer, M.;
602 Hoylaerts, M. F.; Vanbilloen, H.; Mortelmans, L.; Nemery, B., Passage of inhaled particles
603 into the blood circulation in humans. *Circulation* **2002**, *105* (4), 411-414.
- 604 7. Zhou, Q. T.; Leung, S. S.; Tang, P.; Parumasivam, T.; Loh, Z. H.; Chan, H. K.,
605 Inhaled formulations and pulmonary drug delivery systems for respiratory infections. *Adv*
606 *Drug Deliv Rev* **2015**, *85*, 83-99.
- 607 8. Denning, D. W.; Tucker, R. M.; Hansen, L. H.; Stevens, D. A., Treatment of
608 invasive aspergillosis with itraconazole. *Am J Med* **1989**, *86* (6), 791-800.
- 609 9. Aftab, B. T.; Dobromilskaya, I.; Liu, J. O.; Rudin, C. M., Itraconazole Inhibits
610 Angiogenesis and Tumor Growth in Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer. *Cancer Res* **2011**, *71*
611 (21), 6764-6772.
- 612 10. Schloer, S.; Goretzko, J.; Kuhn, A.; Brunotte, L.; Ludwig, S.; Rescher, U., The
613 clinically licensed antifungal drug itraconazole inhibits influenza virus in vitro and in vivo.
614 *Emerg Microbes Infect* **2019**, *8* (1), 80-93.
- 615 11. Wan, K. Y.; Wong, S. N.; Wong, K. W.; Chow, S. F.; Chow, A. H. L., Interplay
616 between Amphiphilic Stabilizers and Cholesterol in the Stabilization of Itraconazole
617 Nanoparticles Prepared by Flash Nanoprecipitation. *Mol Pharm* **2019**, *16* (1), 195-204.
- 618 12. Wan, K. Y.; Wong, K. W.; Chow, A. H. L.; Chow, S. F., Impact of molecular
619 rearrangement of amphiphilic stabilizers on physical stability of itraconazole nanoparticles
620 prepared by flash nanoprecipitation. *Int J Pharm* **2018**, *542* (1-2), 221-231.
- 621 13. Guzman, M.; Molpeceres, J.; Garcia, F.; Aberturas, M. R., Preparation,
622 characterization and in vitro drug release of poly-epsilon-caprolactone and hydroxypropyl
623 methylcellulose phthalate ketoprofen loaded microspheres. *J Microencapsul* **1996**, *13* (1),
624 25-39.
- 625 14. Molpeceres, J.; Aberturas, M. R.; Chacon, M.; Berges, L.; Guzman, M., Stability
626 of cyclosporine-loaded poly-sigma-caprolactone nanoparticles. *J Microencapsul* **1997**, *14*
627 (6), 777-87.
- 628 15. Gupta, D.; Tator, C. H.; Shoichet, M. S., Fast-gelling injectable blend of hyaluronan
629 and methylcellulose for intrathecal, localized delivery to the injured spinal cord.
630 *Biomaterials* **2006**, *27* (11), 2370-9.

- 631 16. Ibbett, R. N.; Philp, K.; Price, D. M., C-13 Nmr-Studies of the Thermal-Behavior
632 of Aqueous-Solutions of Cellulose Ethers. *Polymer* **1992**, *33* (19), 4087-4094.
- 633 17. Xu, Y.; Li, L., Thermoreversible and salt-sensitive turbidity of methylcellulose in
634 aqueous solution. *Polymer* **2005**, *46* (18), 7410-7417.
- 635 18. Zhu, Z. X.; Margulis-Goshen, K.; Magdassi, S.; Talmon, Y.; Macosko, C. W.,
636 Polyelectrolyte Stabilized Drug Nanoparticles via Flash Nanoprecipitation: A Model Study
637 With beta-Carotene. *J Pharm Sci* **2010**, *99* (10), 4295-4306.
- 638 19. Li, H. Y.; Hao, X.; Xie, Y. J.; Yang, H. Y.; Liu, H.; Luo, J. H., Effect of beta-
639 Cyclodextrin Upon the Sol-gel Transition of Methylcellulose Solutions in the Presence of
640 Sodium Dodecyl Sulfate. *Chinese J Chem Phys* **2012**, *25* (2), 242-248.
- 641 20. Singh, R.P.; Kundu, P.P., Thermogelation of methylcellulose from solution in N, N-
642 Dimethylformamide and characterization of the transparent gels. *J. Appl. Polym* **2008**,
643 *110*, 3031-3037.
- 644 21. Visser, C. D.; Perron, G.; Desnoyers, J. E.; Heuvelsland, W. J. M.; Somsen, G.,
645 Volumes and heat-capacities of mixtures of N,N-Dimethylformamide and water at 298.15k.
646 *J Chem Eng Data* **1977**, *22* (1), 74-79.
- 647 22. Fischer, B. J., Particle convection in an evaporating colloidal droplet. *Langmuir*
648 **2002**, *18* (1), 60-67.
- 649 23. Vehring, R., Pharmaceutical particle engineering via spray drying. *Pharm Res* **2008**,
650 *25* (5), 999-1022.
- 651 24. Iskandar, F.; Gradon, L.; Okuyama, K., Control of the morphology of
652 nanostructured particles prepared by the spray drying of a nanoparticle sol. *J Colloid Interf*
653 *Sci* **2003**, *265* (2), 296-303.
- 654 25. Tsapis, N.; Bennett, D.; Jackson, B.; Weitz, D. A.; Edwards, D. A., Trojan particles:
655 Large porous carriers of nanoparticles for drug delivery. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **2002**, *99*
656 (19), 12001-12005.
- 657 26. Lin, J. C.; Gentry, J. W., Spray drying drop morphology: Experimental study.
658 *Aerosol Sci Tech* **2003**, *37* (1), 15-32.
- 659 27. Kam, S. I.; Rossen, W. R., Anomalous capillary pressure, stress, and stability of
660 solids-coated bubbles. *J Colloid Interf Sci* **1999**, *213* (2), 329-339.
- 661 28. Tsapis, N.; Dufresne, E. R.; Sinha, S. S.; Riera, C. S.; Hutchinson, J. W.;
662 Mahadevan, L.; Weitz, D. A., Onset of buckling in drying droplets of colloidal suspensions.
663 *Phys Rev Lett* **2005**, *94* (1).
- 664 29. Freitas, C.; Muller, R. H., Spray-drying of solid lipid nanoparticles (SLN (TM)).
665 *Eur J Pharm Biopharm* **1998**, *46* (2), 145-151.
- 666 30. Tewa-Tayne, P.; Briancon, S.; Fessi, H., Preparation of redispersible dry
667 nanocapsules by means of spray-drying: Development and characterisation. *Eur J Pharm*
668 *Sci* **2007**, *30* (2), 124-135.
- 669 31. Kho, K.; Hadinoto, K., Aqueous re-dispersibility characterization of spray-dried
670 hollow spherical silica nano-aggregates. *Powder Technol* **2010**, *198* (3), 354-363.
- 671 32. Hadinoto, K.; Zhu, K.; Tan, R. B. H., Drug release study of large hollow
672 nanoparticulate aggregates carrier particles for pulmonary delivery. *Int J Pharm* **2007**, *341*
673 (1-2), 195-206.
- 674 33. Chow, A. H.; Tong, H. H.; Chattopadhyay, P.; Shekunov, B. Y., Particle
675 engineering for pulmonary drug delivery. *Pharm Res* **2007**, *24* (3), 411-37.

- 676 34. Bosquillon, C.; Rouxhet, P. G.; Ahimou, F.; Simon, D.; Culot, C.; Preat, V.;
677 Vanbever, R., Aerosolization properties, surface composition and physical state of spray-
678 dried protein powders. *J Control Release* **2004**, *99* (3), 357-67.
- 679 35. Steckel, H.; Brandes, H. G., A novel spray-drying technique to produce low density
680 particles for pulmonary delivery. *Int J Pharm* **2004**, *278* (1), 187-195.
- 681 36. Bosquillon, C.; Lombry, C.; Preat, V.; Vanbever, R., Influence of formulation
682 excipients and physical characteristics of inhalation dry powders on their aerosolization
683 performance. *J Control Release* **2001**, *70* (3), 329-39.
- 684 37. Hadinoto, K.; Phanapavudhikul, P.; Kewu, Z.; Tan, R. B. H., Novel formulation of
685 large hollow nanoparticles aggregates as potential carriers in inhaled delivery of
686 nanoparticulate drugs. *Ind Eng Chem Res* **2006**, *45* (10), 3697-3706.
- 687 38. Tomoda, K.; Ohkoshi, T.; Nakajima, T.; Makino, K., Preparation and properties of
688 inhalable nanocomposite particles: effects of the size, weight ratio of the primary
689 nanoparticles in nanocomposite particles and temperature at a spray-dryer inlet upon
690 properties of nanocomposite particles. *Colloids Surf B Biointerfaces* **2008**, *64* (1), 70-6.
- 691 39. Vanbever, R.; Mintzes, J. D.; Wang, J.; Nice, J.; Chen, D.; Batycky, R.; Langer, R.;
692 Edwards, D. A., Formulation and physical characterization of large porous particles for
693 inhalation. *Pharm Res* **1999**, *16* (11), 1735-42.

694