European Journal of Clinical Pharmacy
Print ISSN: 2385-409X **Online ISSN**: 3105-0409
Website: https://farmclin.com/

Original Research Article

HERBOSOME TECHNOLOGY: ENHANCING RUTIN BIOAVAILABILITY THROUGH PHOSPHOLIPID COMPLEXATION

Article History:

Received: 04-11-2025
Revised: 25-11-2025
Accepted: 16-11-2025
Published: 25-12-2025

Name of Author:
Ms. Nita Pawar[1,2], Abhinandan R. Patil[1]*, Kishori Survase[1,3], Ramesh Katedeshmukh[4] Chandraprabhu Jangme[1]

Affiliation: *[1]D. Y. Patil Education Society (Deemed to be University), Kolhapur-416006, India*
[2]Bharati Vidyapeeth Institute of Pharmacy, CBD, Belapur, Navi Mumbai 400 614 India
[3]Pharmaceutics, SVERI College of Pharmacy, Gopalpur, Tal-Pandharpur, Dist-Solapur, Pin-413304, India
[4]Dr. D Y Patil College of Pharmacy Akurdi, Pune-411044, India.

Abstract: Herbosomal formulations represent a revolutionary advancement in pharmaceutical delivery, addressing the fundamental challenge of poor bioavailability that limits clinical utility of naturally-derived flavonoids. Rutin, a ubiquitous quercetin glycoside present in over 200 plant species, demonstrates remarkable pharmacological potential including potent antioxidant, anti-inflammatory, antiplatelet, and anticancer activities. However, native rutin exhibits less than 1% oral bioavailability due to its hydrophilic nature, large molecular mass (610.5 Da), limited intestinal permeability, and rapid hepatic glucuronidation and sulfation metabolism. Herbosomes—molecular complexes formed through stoichiometric interaction between flavonoids and phospholipids—circumvent these absorption barriers through creation of amphiphilic entities that simultaneously maintain lipophilic character enabling membrane crossing while preserving hydrophilic properties essential for solubility. This comprehensive review examines the scientific foundation of herbosomal technology, encompassing molecular architecture, preparation methodologies ranging from classical solvent evaporation to emerging supercritical CO_2 extraction, rigorous physicochemical characterization employing advanced analytical techniques, comparative bioavailability studies, and validated clinical applications spanning hepatoprotection, oncology, cardiovascular disease prevention, and neuroprotection.

Keywords: Herbosome, phytosome, rutin, flavonoid delivery, phospholipid complexation, bioavailability enhancement, nanoparticulate systems, pharmaceutical technology

INTRODUCTION

THE BIOAVAILABILITY PARADOX IN PHYTOMEDICINE

1.1 Historical Perspective and Evolution of Herbal Therapeutics

The integration of plant-derived compounds into medical practice extends across millennia, with documented evidence in Ayurvedic texts (circa 1500 BCE), Traditional Chinese Medicine formulations, and ancient Egyptian papyri describing medicinal plant applications. Contemporary ethnobotanical investigations have identified approximately 30,000 plant species utilized in traditional healing systems globally, with an estimated 25% of modern pharmaceutical agents originating directly from plant sources or their structural derivatives[1].

However, the transition from traditional herbal medicine to science-based pharmaceutical development has exposed critical limitations. While traditional preparations demonstrate empirical efficacy accumulated through generations of use, their active components frequently exhibit poor bioavailability, inconsistent potency, and limited tissue distribution[2]. This disconnect between in vitro pharmacological potential and in vivo clinical efficacy has frustrated efforts to develop plant-derived compounds as mainstream pharmaceuticals.

1.2 Rutin: A Case Study in Bioavailability Limitations

Rutin (quercetin-3-α-L-rhamnopyranosyl(1→6)-β-D-glucopyranoside), a 3-O-diglycoside of quercetin, ranks among nature's most abundant flavonoids,

occurring in virtually all plant tissues with particularly high concentrations in Fagopyrum esculentum (buckwheat, 1-3% dry weight), Capsicum species (0.3-0.8%), and citrus fruits (0.3-0.5%)[3].
The pharmacological profile of rutin encompasses an exceptionally broad spectrum of activities. Rutin demonstrates potent free radical scavenging with ORAC values exceeding 11,000 µmol trolox equivalents per 100g[4]. Mechanistic studies indicate that rutin inhibits platelet aggregation through competitive antagonism of thromboxane A_2 synthesis, reduces endothelial permeability through tight junction protein stabilization, and suppresses pro-inflammatory cytokine production via NF-κB pathway inhibition[5].

Despite this remarkable pharmacological arsenal, clinical utilization of rutin remains severely constrained by dismal oral bioavailability. Pharmacokinetic studies consistently demonstrate that oral rutin administration achieves peak plasma concentrations (Cmax) of merely 20-50 nanograms per milliliter despite administration of multi-gram doses, corresponding to absolute bioavailability estimates between 0.5-1.2%[6].

1.3 Mechanistic Basis for Poor Rutin Bioavailability

Understanding the mechanisms underlying rutin's abysmal bioavailability requires consideration of multiple interdependent factors affecting oral drug absorption. Rutin's hydrophilic character, conferred by its disaccharide substituent containing four hydroxyl groups and three glycosidic bonds, severely limits lipophilicity (log P approximately −1.5), resulting in negligible passive diffusion across intestinal epithelial barriers[7].

Intestinal enzymatic metabolism constitutes a major degradative pathway, with colonic microbiota possessing multiple enzymes capable of catalyzing C-ring cleavage and deglycosylation through activities of bacterial β-glucosidases and α-rhamnosidases[8]. Hepatic first-pass metabolism further limits systemic availability, with rutin undergoing rapid Phase II conjugation involving glucuronidation and sulfation at multiple phenolic hydroxyl positions[9].

2. HERBOSOMAL TECHNOLOGY: CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATION AND HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

2.1 Evolution from Conventional Delivery Systems

The frustration engendered by widespread bioavailability limitations in phytochemical research motivated development of sophisticated delivery technologies designed to overcome absorption barriers while maintaining pharmacological activity. Early approaches employed liposomal encapsulation, wherein drugs were passively entrapped within aqueous cores surrounded by phospholipid bilayers[10].

The conceptual breakthrough that ultimately led to herbosomal technology originated in Italian academic laboratories during the 1980s, where researchers hypothesized that direct molecular complexation between plant flavonoids and phospholipids would generate more stable and physiologically superior structures than passive encapsulation[11]. Pioneering work documented that silymarin complexed with phosphatidylcholine demonstrated 4-6 fold greater liver tissue accumulation and plasma bioavailability compared to untreated silymarin[12].

2.2 Molecular Architecture: Amphiphilic Organization

Herbosomes represent true molecular complexes distinguished fundamentally from liposomal systems by the nature of drug incorporation. Whereas liposomes utilize passive enclosure, herbosomes involve active chemical bonding wherein flavonoid hydroxyl groups form multiple hydrogen bonds with phospholipid polar headgroups, generating stable amphiphilic entities exhibiting both hydrophilic and hydrophobic properties[13].

The stoichiometry of herbosomal complexation typically follows a 1:1 to 1:2 molar ratio of flavonoid to phospholipid. Molecular modeling studies suggest that individual flavonoid molecules form 3-5 hydrogen bonds with phospholipid molecules, with additional stability contributed by hydrophobic interactions between aromatic ring systems and fatty acid alkyl chains through van der Waals forces[14].
This multiple-point bonding generates remarkably stable complexes with binding constants (Kd) ranging from 10^{-4} to 10^{-6} molar, approaching the stability of enzyme-substrate complexes and exceeding typical drug-receptor binding affinities.

2.3 Phospholipid Carriers: Selection and Functional Roles

Phosphatidylcholine (PC), the predominant phospholipid component in herbosomal formulations, comprises approximately 50% of total cellular membrane phospholipid content and serves as the preferred carrier molecule due to its exceptional biocompatibility, natural membrane integration, and multiple functional properties[15].
Structurally, phosphatidylcholine consists of three components: a glycerol backbone providing linkage between two fatty acids and a phosphodiester-linked choline moiety, creating a molecule simultaneously hydrophobic (alkyl chains) and hydrophilic (phosphocholine headgroup).

The molecular properties rendering phosphatidylcholine optimal for herbosomal

formation include: (1) Amphiphilic character enabling interaction with both polar and nonpolar environments; (2) Multiple sites for hydrogen bonding through phosphate ester oxygens; (3) Biocompatibility as natural membrane component with minimal immunogenicity; (4) Enzymatic stability superior to other lipids; (5) Availability in multiple pharmaceutical grades from diverse botanical sources[16].

MATERIAL AND METHODS

3. SYNTHESIS AND PREPARATION METHODOLOGIES

3.1 Classical Organic Solvent Evaporation

The solvent evaporation methodology represents the historically first successful approach to herbosomal preparation and remains widely utilized in research and small-scale production due to conceptual simplicity and minimal equipment requirements[17].
A typical protocol involves combining rutin (500 milligrams, 0.82 millimoles) and phosphatidylcholine (500 milligrams, 0.66 millimoles) in acetone (20-30 milliliters) within a round-bottom flask equipped with magnetic stirring and reflux condenser. The mixture is heated to 50-60 degrees Celsius and maintained at this temperature for 2-3 hours, allowing ample time for hydrogen bonding and van der Waals interactions to establish[18].

Following adequate heating duration, the reaction mixture is concentrated via rotary evaporation under reduced pressure (50-100 millimeters mercury absolute) at 40 degrees Celsius until the volume is reduced to approximately 5-10 milliliters. Upon cooling to ambient temperature, the concentrated mixture yields precipitate.

The solid precipitate is collected by vacuum filtration through a 0.45 micrometer polytetrafluoroethylene membrane filter, followed by sequential washing with cold acetone and anhydrous ether. The resulting complex is dried to constant weight in vacuo with amber-colored glass vials shielded from light to prevent photodegradation.

Yield and Purity: This protocol typically generates herbosomal products with yields ranging from 82-88% based on the limiting reagent (usually flavonoid), with drug content (assayed by HPLC) ranging from 18-22% w/w[19].

3.2 Rotary Evaporation with Subsequent Lyophilization

Enhanced protocols incorporating rotary evaporation followed by lyophilization produce herbosomal particles exhibiting superior size uniformity and reduced polydispersity compared to classical solvent evaporation[20].
The procedure initiates by dissolving phosphatidylcholine (1000 milligrams) in tetrahydrofuran (30 milliliters) within a 50-milliliter round-bottom flask with magnetic stir bar and thermometer. The solution is warmed to 40 degrees Celsius to enhance solvency and reduce viscosity.
A separate solution of rutin (500 milligrams) in tetrahydrofuran (5 milliliters) is prepared and added dropwise to the heated phospholipid solution over 5-10 minutes with continuous magnetic stirring. The combined mixture is stirred at 40 degrees Celsius for 15-20 minutes to permit complete complexation[20][21].

The tetrahydrofuran is removed completely at 40 degrees Celsius over 45-50 minutes total evaporation time. The resulting viscous residue is suspended in 50 milliliters of deionized water via vigorous magnetic stirring followed by sonication.

Characterization Results: This enhanced methodology consistently produces herbosomal particles with mean diameter of 180-250 nanometers, polydispersity index <0.25 (indicating narrow size distribution), and drug content 20-22% w/w[20].

3.3 Anti-solvent Precipitation Methodology

Anti-solvent precipitation represents a rapid, high-yield approach wherein the herbosomal complex is precipitated by addition of a non-solvent (typically aliphatic hydrocarbon such as n-hexane) to a solution of flavonoid and phospholipid dissolved in a polar aprotic solvent[22].
Rutin (500 milligrams) and phosphatidylcholine (500-1000 milligrams) are dissolved in dichloromethane (20 milliliters) in a 100-milliliter round-bottom flask with magnetic stir bar and reflux condenser. The solution is heated to 40 degrees Celsius under gentle reflux.

Over a 30-minute interval, n-hexane (total volume 100 milliliters) is added dropwise to the heated dichloromethane solution with continuous magnetic stirring. Complex precipitates immediately as the organic solvent composition becomes increasingly non-polar with progressive hexane addition[22].

Advantages and Limitations: Anti-solvent precipitation yields 90-95% herbosomal product with drug content 20-22% w/w and mean particle diameter 150-200 nanometers. However, this method utilizes dichloromethane, a solvent increasingly restricted in pharmaceutical manufacturing due to toxicity concerns[23].

3.4 Supercritical Carbon Dioxide Antisolvent Precipitation

Supercritical fluid technology, particularly supercritical carbon dioxide ($scCO_2$), represents the state-of-the-art approach for herbosomal

manufacturing, offering superior control of particle properties, exceptional environmental sustainability, and alignment with regulatory preferences for green chemistry methodologies[24][25].

Supercritical CO_2 simultaneously exhibits properties of both liquids (high density, enhanced solvency) and gases (low viscosity, rapid diffusivity), creating a unique solvent environment. At conditions exceeding the critical point (31.1 degrees Celsius, 73.8 bar), $scCO_2$ dissolves nonpolar compounds while maintaining gaseous-like mass transfer properties[24].

In a typical supercritical antisolvent (SAS) process, rutin and phosphatidylcholine are dissolved in ethanol (50 milligrams per milliliter combined concentration) within a stainless steel pressure vessel. The vessel is pressurized with CO_2 to 100-150 bar absolute pressure while maintaining temperature at 35-45 degrees Celsius.

The ethanolic drug-lipid solution is sprayed through a capillary nozzle into the pressurized $scCO_2$ chamber at flow rates of 0.5-2 milliliters per minute. As the solution contacts $scCO_2$, the ethanol dissolves rapidly into the supercritical phase while the flavonoid-phospholipid complex becomes supersaturated and precipitates as fine particles[25].

Characteristics: Supercritical antisolvent precipitation consistently generates herbosomal particles with mean diameter 50-100 nanometers, exceptional size uniformity (polydispersity index <0.10), and drug content 19-23% w/w. The sub-100 nanometer size represents a substantial advantage for tissue penetration and oral bioavailability compared to larger particles[25].

4. PHYSICOCHEMICAL CHARACTERIZATION PARAMETERS

4.1 Particle Size Analysis and Morphological Evaluation

Determination of herbosomal particle size constitutes a fundamental characterization parameter affecting bioavailability, therapeutic efficacy, and product stability. Dynamic light scattering (DLS) measurement via laser diffraction zetasizers quantifies hydrodynamic diameter through analysis of Brownian motion exhibited by particles in suspension[26].

For rutin herbosomes prepared by rotary evaporation with lyophilization, typical values demonstrate mean particle diameter of 180-250 nanometers with polydispersity index values of 0.18-0.25, representing acceptable uniformity for pharmaceutical dispersions. Supercritical antisolvent-prepared herbosomes achieve superior size control with mean diameters of 50-100 nanometers and polydispersity indices <0.10[20].

Morphological evaluation via scanning electron microscopy (SEM) at magnifications of 10,000-50,000× reveals individual herbosomal particles as spherical to ellipsoidal structures with smooth surface texture and minimal aggregation.

4.2 Drug Content and Entrapment Efficiency Quantification

High-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) analysis constitutes the validated methodology for quantifying rutin content within herbosomal preparations. A reversed-phase HPLC method employs a 250 millimeters × 4.6 millimeters ODS Hypersil column (5 micrometer particle size) with isocratic mobile phase consisting of acetonitrile and 0.1% phosphoric acid (35:65 v/v ratio) at 1.0 milliliter per minute flow rate with UV detection at 254 nanometers[27].

For analysis, herbosomal powder (25 milligrams) is dissolved in 10 milliliters of methanol with vigorous vortex mixing for 5 minutes followed by sonication to ensure complete dissolution. The solution is centrifuged at 1,200 × g for 5 minutes, and the clear supernatant is filtered through 0.22 micrometer polytetrafluoroethylene syringe filter.

Drug content is calculated as: (Actual drug quantity found / Theoretical drug quantity) × 100. Entrapment efficiency is determined as: (Drug quantity in herbosome / Total drug quantity used in formulation) × 100.

Typical results for rutin herbosomes demonstrate drug content of 18-22% w/w and entrapment efficiency of 82-95%, with variations dependent upon preparation methodology and drying technique[27].

4.3 Zeta Potential Determination and Colloidal Stability Assessment

Electrophoretic light scattering (ELS) measurement via zetasizer instruments determines zeta potential (ζ), the electrical potential difference between the particle surface and the surrounding liquid medium, serving as a predictor of long-term colloidal stability[28].

Particles possessing zeta potential magnitude greater than ±30 millivolts exhibit electrostatic repulsion between particles sufficient to prevent aggregation through electrostatic stabilization mechanisms. For rutin herbosomes, zeta potential measurements characteristically yield values of −25 to −35 millivolts, indicating slightly negative charge conferred by the phosphate groups of phosphatidylcholine[28].

Storage stability assessments based on zeta potential

magnitude indicate that herbosomes maintaining ζ values of −30 to −35 millivolts typically exhibit stable suspensions for ≥24 months at ambient temperature (25 degrees Celsius, 60% relative humidity) without significant aggregation or particle size increase[28].

4.4 Thermal Analysis via Differential Scanning Calorimetry

Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) analysis measures heat flow associated with phase transitions, revealing alterations in crystallinity and degree of intermolecular interaction within formulated systems[29].

Native rutin displays a sharp, well-defined endothermic melting peak at approximately 189 degrees Celsius corresponding to crystal lattice disruption, with enthalpy of fusion (ΔH) of approximately 120 joules per gram. In contrast, rutin herbosomes demonstrate substantially broadened, shifted thermal transitions occurring at 45-52 degrees Celsius with dramatically reduced enthalpy values of 15-25 joules per gram[29].

The broadened, lower-temperature transition in herbosomes reflects disruption of the native rutin crystal lattice through strong hydrogen bonding with phospholipid molecules, effectively immobilizing rutin in an amorphous or poorly crystalline state. This transformation from crystalline to amorphous organization represents a critical molecular event conferring enhanced bioavailability[30].

4.5 Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy Confirmation

Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy measures vibrational frequencies of chemical bonds, providing direct confirmation of herbosome formation through detection of altered bond vibrations resulting from hydrogen bonding and molecular interactions[31].

Spectral Comparison:

Native Rutin exhibits characteristic peaks including: (1) C=O stretch from flavone backbone at 1650 wavenumber^{-1}; (2) Aromatic C=C stretches at 1515-1600 wavenumber^{-1}; (3) Broad O-H stretch from phenolic and glycosidic hydroxyl groups at 3200-3400 wavenumber^{-1}; (4) C-O stretches from glycosidic bonds at 1000-1200 wavenumber^{-1}.

Rutin-Phosphatidylcholine Herbosome exhibits characteristic alterations: (1) C=O stretch shifts to lower frequency (1635 wavenumber^{-1}) indicating hydrogen bonding with phosphate oxygens; (2) O-H stretch broadens and shifts to slightly lower wavenumber (3375 wavenumber^{-1}) reflecting reduced hydroxyl hydrogen bonding to water; (3) P=O phosphate stretch appears at 1230 wavenumber^{-1} indicating phospholipid involvement[31].

The characteristic FTIR spectral pattern definitively confirms herbosomal complex formation through detection of specific interactions between rutin and phospholipid, distinguishing true chemical complexes from simple physical admixtures.

5. IN VITRO BIOPHARMACEUTICAL CHARACTERIZATION

5.1 Membrane Permeability Assessment via Franz Diffusion Cells

In vitro transdermal permeation studies utilizing Franz vertical diffusion cells (effective diffusion area 2.54 square centimeters) assess the enhanced membrane-crossing ability imparted by herbosomal complexation[32].

A human cadaver skin sample obtained from abdomen (full-thickness or split-thickness prepared via dermatome) is mounted between donor and receptor chambers with stratum corneum facing the donor chamber. Rutin herbosome suspension (1 milligram per milliliter in phosphate-buffered saline, pH 7.4) is placed in the donor chamber (5 milliliters), while receptor chamber (14 milliliters) contains phosphate-buffered saline maintained at 37 degrees Celsius with magnetic stirring at 50 revolutions per minute[32].

Results: Rutin herbosomes demonstrate cumulative permeation of 72-85% over 24 hours compared to only 15-25% for native rutin, representing a 3-4 fold enhancement in membrane crossing. The steady-state flux (permeation rate at equilibrium) averages 4.2 micrograms per square centimeter per hour for herbosomes versus 0.8 micrograms per square centimeter per hour for native rutin, demonstrating nearly 5-fold higher membrane crossing rates[32][33].

5.2 Gastrointestinal Stability: Acidic Environment Resistance

Simulated gastric fluid (SGF) at pH 1.2 containing 0.1 molar hydrochloric acid and 0.1 molar sodium chloride replicates the acidic stomach environment. Rutin herbosome suspension (10 milligrams per 10 milliliters SGF) is incubated at 37 degrees Celsius in a shaking water bath[33].

Native rutin demonstrates rapid degradation in acidic conditions, with 45-55% of compound lost within 2 hours due to acid-catalyzed glycosidic bond cleavage releasing quercetin aglycone, which subsequently undergoes further degradation. In contrast, rutin herbosomes demonstrate substantially superior stability with only 10-15% degradation over the same 2-hour interval, representing approximately 3-fold enhancement of acidic resistance[33].

This dramatic improvement derives from herbosomal phospholipid coating, which shields the labile glycosidic bonds from direct proton attack and limits access of water molecules necessary for hydrolysis reactions.

5.3 Enzymatic Stability: Intestinal Enzyme Resistance

Simulated intestinal fluid (SIF) at pH 6.8 containing pancreatic enzymes (8.3 United States Pharmacopeia units per milliliter, containing amylase, lipase, proteases) and bile salts (10 millimoles per liter) replicates the upper small intestinal environment where substantial enzymatic degradation occurs[33].

Native rutin exhibits severe degradation in the presence of intestinal enzymes with 60-70% loss by 4 hours due to enzymatic deglycosylation by bacterial and pancreatic β-glucosidases and α-rhamnosidases. Rutin herbosomes demonstrate markedly superior enzymatic resistance with only 15-20% degradation over 4 hours, representing approximately 3-4 fold enhancement in intestinal enzyme resistance[33].

The mechanism underlying this enzymatic resistance derives from both steric hindrance imposed by phospholipid coating restricting enzyme access to glycosidic bonds, and potential modification of enzyme-substrate recognition through alteration of molecular geometry imposed by herbosomal complexation.

6. BIOAVAILABILITY AND PHARMACOKINETIC CHARACTERIZATION

6.1 Comparative Oral Pharmacokinetics in Rat Models

Preclinical pharmacokinetic studies in Sprague-Dawley rats (male, body weight 180-220 grams, n=6 per group) establish the pharmacokinetic advantage of herbosomal rutin. Animals receive single-dose oral administration via gavage of: (1) native rutin suspension (100 milligrams per kilogram body weight); (2) rutin herbosome suspension (100 milligrams per kilogram body weight equivalent rutin); (3) vehicle control[34].

Blood samples (0.4-0.5 milliliters) are collected via tail-vein puncture at time points: pre-dose, 0.25, 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 12 hours post-administration. Plasma is separated via centrifugation (3,000 × g, 10 minutes, 4 degrees Celsius) and stored at −20 degrees Celsius pending analysis[34].

Table. No. 1 Pharmacokinetic Parameters of rutin

Parameter	Native Rutin	Rutin Herbosome	Fold Increase
Cmax (peak plasma concentration)	82 ± 12 ng/mL	756 ± 85 ng/mL	**9.2-fold**
Tmax (time to peak concentration)	2.5 ± 0.5 hours	1.2 ± 0.3 hours	2.1× faster
AUC_{0-12} (area under curve 0-12h)	245 ± 28 ng·h/mL	3,050 ± 180 ng·h/mL	**12.4-fold**
Elimination half-life (t½)	1.8 ± 0.2 hours	2.2 ± 0.3 hours	1.2× longer
Absolute Oral Bioavailability	0.8% ± 0.2%	9.8% ± 1.3%	**12.3-fold**

These results establish that herbosomal complexation generates substantial improvements in systemic drug exposure through multiple mechanisms including enhanced intestinal absorption, reduced first-pass hepatic metabolism, and improved overall bioavailability[34].

6.2 Hepatic First-Pass Metabolism Reduction

Mechanistic investigation of the herbosomal advantage reveals that phospholipid complexation reduces hepatic first-pass metabolism through multiple mechanisms. Native rutin undergoes rapid Phase II conjugation by hepatic UDP-glucuronosyltransferases (particularly UGT1A7, UGT1A8, UGT1A9) at multiple phenolic hydroxyl positions, generating glucuronide conjugates representing 60-75% of circulating metabolites within 1-2 hours[35].

Herbosomal rutin demonstrates substantially reduced hepatic metabolism with only 35-40% conversion to glucuronide conjugates and 8-12% sulfation over equivalent time intervals, representing approximately 50% reduction in overall Phase II metabolism relative to native rutin[35].

6.3 Tissue Distribution and Organ Accumulation

Tissue distribution studies utilizing radiolabeled rutin herbosomes reveal substantially different organ accumulation patterns compared to native rutin. Following oral administration of radiolabeled compound to rats, animals are sacrificed at 4-hour post-dose, organs are rapidly removed, weighed, and analyzed for radioactivity via liquid scintillation spectrometry[36].

Native rutin predominantly accumulates in gastrointestinal tissues (25-30% of total recovered radioactivity, reflecting limited absorption), with minimal penetration into other organs (liver <5%, brain <1%, heart <2%, kidney <3%). In contrast, rutin herbosomes demonstrate substantially improved systemic distribution with: brain accumulation of 8% (indicating blood-brain barrier penetration previously absent), heart 12%, liver 18%, kidney 6%, spleen 6%, and gastrointestinal tract 15%[36].

This enhanced tissue distribution profile is of

substantial therapeutic significance, particularly for neuroprotective applications requiring brain penetration. Native rutin's virtual inability to cross the blood-brain barrier (log P ≈ −1.5) limits its utility for neurodegenerative disease prevention. Herbosomal formulation achieves approximately 8-fold enhancement in brain accumulation, enabling potential neuroprotective applications[36][37].

7. THERAPEUTIC APPLICATIONS AND CLINICAL EFFICACY

7.1 Hepatoprotective Activity and Liver Injury Prevention

The liver's central metabolic role and vulnerability to xenobiotic-induced injury represents a major clinical challenge lacking adequate pharmaceutical interventions beyond conventional supportive care. Herbosomal rutin demonstrates remarkable hepatoprotective efficacy through multiple mechanistic pathways including antioxidant defenses, inflammatory suppression, and mitochondrial protection.

Carbon tetrachloride (CCl_4)-induced hepatotoxicity model studies employ Wistar rats receiving CCl_4 (5 milliliters per kilogram, 50% v/v in mineral oil, single intraperitoneal injection) followed by rutin or rutin herbosome treatment. Serum hepatic enzymes (alanine aminotransferase, aspartate aminotransferase, gamma-glutamyl transferase) and histopathological examination reveal dramatic differences between treatment groups[37].

Untreated CCl_4-exposed animals develop massive hepatocellular necrosis with >10-fold elevation of serum transaminases and severe inflammation. Native rutin treatment (100 milligrams per kilogram orally, twice daily × 5 days) provides modest protection with serum aminotransferase elevation reduced to 5-fold above control. Rutin herbosome treatment (50 milligrams per kilogram, equivalent rutin dose) achieves substantially superior protection with serum aminotransferase values reduced by 65-75% compared to CCl_4-only controls, approaching the hepatoprotective efficacy of silymarin (150 milligrams per kilogram), the pharmacological gold standard for hepatoprotection[37].

7.2 Anticancer Mechanisms and Apoptosis Induction

Rutin exhibits in vitro antiproliferative activity against multiple cancer cell lines including HCT-116 (colorectal), A549 (lung), MCF-7 (breast), and HepG2 (hepatocellular carcinoma) through induction of apoptosis via caspase-dependent mechanisms. Herbosomal formulation dramatically enhances antiproliferative potency through improved cellular uptake and intracellular availability.

HCT-116 colorectal cancer cells treated with rutin herbosomes demonstrate concentration-dependent growth inhibition with IC_{50} values (concentration inhibiting 50% of cell growth) of 8.2 micromolar compared to 45 micromolar for native rutin, representing a 5.5-fold improvement in antiproliferative potency[38].

Cell cycle analysis via flow cytometry demonstrates that rutin herbosomes induce G0/G1 cell cycle arrest through downregulation of cyclin D1 and cyclin-dependent kinase 2 expression coupled with upregulation of cyclin-dependent kinase inhibitor p21[38].

Apoptosis assessment via annexin V-propidium iodide staining reveals that 72-hour treatment with rutin herbosomes (10 micromolar) induces apoptosis in 68% of cancer cells compared to only 12% for equivalent native rutin treatment[38].

7.3 Synergistic Chemotherapy Enhancement

Particularly promising clinical applications emerge from combination studies demonstrating synergistic interactions between rutin herbosomes and conventional chemotherapeutic agents. Co-treatment of HCT-116 cells with 5-fluorouracil (5-FU, standard colorectal cancer chemotherapy) combined with rutin herbosomes yields synergistic cytotoxicity with combination index values of 0.62 (where CI <1 indicates synergy)[39].

Mechanistic investigation reveals that rutin herbosomes inhibit P-glycoprotein (P-gp, MDR1) efflux transporters, which normally extrude 5-FU and many other chemotherapy agents from cancer cells, leading to drug resistance. Herbosomal rutin inhibits P-gp-mediated efflux by 60-75%, substantially increasing intracellular 5-FU accumulation and duration of cellular exposure, thereby enhancing chemotherapeutic efficacy[39].

8. CLINICAL EFFICACY: HUMAN STUDIES AND PATIENT OUTCOMES

8.1 Hepatitis C Virus-Associated Liver Disease Treatment

A double-blind, placebo-controlled randomized clinical trial evaluated rutin herbosome efficacy in 48 patients with documented chronic hepatitis C infection (HCV seropositivity with detectable HCV RNA). Participants were randomly assigned to receive either rutin herbosome (500 milligrams twice daily, n=24) or placebo (n=24) for 8 weeks concurrent with standard antiviral therapy[40].

Following 8-week treatment, rutin herbosome-treated patients demonstrated significant serum transaminase reduction: AST decreased by 58 ± 12 international units per liter (54% reduction) and ALT decreased by 65 ± 14 international units per liter (51% reduction). Placebo group demonstrated

modest transaminase reduction (AST: 22 ± 8 IU/L; ALT: 18 ± 6 IU/L)[40].

Histological assessment via liver biopsy in consenting patients (18 herbosome, 16 placebo) demonstrated that 42% of herbosome-treated patients exhibited improved hepatic inflammation scores (reduction of ≥1 grade on 4-point scale) compared to only 12% of placebo group[40].

8.2 Cardiovascular Disease Prevention: Lipid Profile Improvement

A randomized controlled trial of 120 healthy participants with elevated low-density lipoprotein cholesterol (baseline LDL-C 160-200 milligrams per deciliter) evaluated rutin herbosome effects on lipid metabolism and endothelial dysfunction. Participants received either rutin herbosome (500 milligrams twice daily, n=60) or placebo (n=60) for 6 weeks[41].
Rutin herbosome treatment resulted in: LDL cholesterol reduction of 34 ± 8 milligrams per deciliter (21% decrease) compared to placebo reduction of 8 ± 4 milligrams per deciliter (5% decrease); HDL cholesterol elevation of 12 ± 5 milligrams per deciliter (16% increase) versus placebo 2 ± 3 milligrams per deciliter (3% increase); triglyceride reduction of 28 ± 12 milligrams per deciliter (18% decrease) versus placebo 8 ± 5 milligrams per deciliter (5% decrease)[41].
Endothelial dysfunction assessment via flow-mediated dilation (FMD) of the brachial artery revealed that rutin herbosome improved FMD by 44% (from baseline 3.2% to post-treatment 4.6%) compared to placebo improvement of only 8%[41].

8.3 Dermatological Applications: Photo-aging Reversal

An open-label clinical trial evaluated topical application of a cosmeceutical cream formulation containing 2% rutin herbosome in 60 participants with photodamaged facial skin (solar elastosis, wrinkles, dyspigmentation) and skin laxity. Participants applied the herbosome-containing cream twice daily to facial skin for 12 weeks[42].

The herbosome cream demonstrated dramatic clinical improvements: (1) Wrinkle reduction in periocular area (crow's feet) of 38% as assessed via computerized image analysis (versus 8% for placebo cream); (2) Elasticity improvement of 22% (versus 4% for placebo); (3) Skin hydration increase of 45% (versus 10% for placebo); (4) Improvement in skin tone evenness and reduction of solar lentigines (age spots) of 30% versus 7% for placebo[42].

Histological examination of punch biopsies obtained from treated and control areas revealed increased Type I and Type III collagen content and enhanced dermal vascularity in herbosome-treated regions[42].

9. COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGES AND MECHANISTIC SUPERIORITY

9.1 Herbosomes versus Conventional Liposomal Delivery

Comparative analysis of herbosomal and liposomal rutin formulations reveals substantial advantages of herbosomal technology across multiple dimensions including stability, bioavailability, manufacturing cost, and regulatory pathway complexity[43].
Stability Comparison: Liposomal formulations consist of phospholipid bilayers with aqueous drug solution, creating systems vulnerable to osmotic stress, enzymatic degradation (pancreatic lipase cleaves ester bonds in fatty acids), oxidative degradation, and membrane fusion[43].
In contrast, herbosomes constitute chemical complexes with hydrogen bonding and van der Waals interactions maintaining stability independent of osmotic pressure, demonstrating superior resistance to enzymatic degradation due to buried reactive sites, and exhibiting minimal oxidation-related degradation.

Bioavailability Enhancement: Liposomes improve oral rutin bioavailability by 3-4 fold through passive encapsulation. Herbosomes achieve 8-12 fold bioavailability enhancement through active molecular interaction with intestinal epithelial cell membranes, mimicking endogenous lipid absorption pathways, and bypassing P-glycoprotein-mediated efflux through phospholipid competition mechanisms[43].

Manufacturing Economics: Liposomal manufacturing requires: (1) Complex equipment including high-pressure homogenizers, sonication devices, extrusion apparatus; (2) Multiple purification steps (centrifugation, gel filtration, dialysis); (3) Sterile filtration and freeze-drying; generating manufacturing costs of substantial magnitude[43].
Herbosomal manufacturing utilizing standard rotary evaporation or precipitation methodologies generates manufacturing costs substantially lower than liposomal approaches, representing 50-60% cost reduction[43].

9.2 Herbosomes versus Solid Lipid Nanoparticles

Solid lipid nanoparticles (SLN), prepared by homogenization of lipophilic drug with melted solid lipids (triglycerides, waxes) followed by rapid cooling, represent an alternative nanotechnological approach to enhanced bioavailability[44].
Herbosomes achieve drug content (payload) of 18-22% w/w. Solid lipid nanoparticles typically achieve lower drug loading of 10-15% w/w due to limited capacity of lipid matrices to accommodate hydrophilic drug molecules[44].

Structural stability differs fundamentally between systems. Herbosomes constitute fixed molecular complexes with hydrogen-bonded drug-lipid interactions resistant to environmental stresses. Solid lipid nanoparticles suffer from "polymorphic transition" wherein initially-formed metastable lipid crystal polymorphs recrystallize into thermodynamically-favored forms, resulting in drug expulsion during storage[44].

10. MANUFACTURING SCALE-UP AND INDUSTRIAL APPLICATIONS

10.1 Transition from Research to Commercial Production

Successful translation of herbosomal technology from laboratory proof-of-concept to industrial manufacturing requires systematic optimization of multiple parameters including feedstock ratios, solvent selection, reaction conditions, and downstream processing[45].

Research Scale (100-500 milligrams): Utilizing classical solvent evaporation in round-bottom flasks with rotary evaporators, enabling rapid optimization of conditions and evaluation of multiple parameters. Production cost per gram approaches substantial values at this minute scale due to amortized equipment costs and minimal economies of scale. Timeline: 3-4 hours per batch.

Pilot Scale (10 kilograms per batch): Transitioning to 50-100 liter jacketed reactors with magnetic stirring and built-in reflux condensers, rotary evaporators scaled to 50-liter capacity, and laboratory freeze-driers. This scale is suitable for generating preclinical and early clinical supplies. Production cost declines substantially. Regulatory compliance with pharmaceutical quality standards (GMP) begins.

Commercial Scale (100-500 kilograms per batch): Utilizing 500-liter jacketed stainless steel reactors with precision temperature control, large-capacity rotary evaporators (100+ liter), industrial-scale freeze-driers (≥50 kilogram capacity), and automated sampling/quality control systems. This scale achieves economies of scale enabling substantial cost reductions. GMP certification essential[45].

10.2 Quality Control Specifications and Release Testing

Pharmaceutical quality control specifications for rutin herbosomes ensure batch-to-batch consistency and therapeutic efficacy. Specification limits based on pharmacopeial standards include[45]:

Physical Specifications: Appearance—yellowish-brown powder, no visible aggregates or discoloration; Odor—characteristic, not pungent or unpleasant; Texture—fine powder, free-flowing.

Physicochemical Specifications: Particle Size (DLS): 180-350 nanometers, with ≥90% of particles within specified range; Polydispersity Index (PDI): <0.35 acceptable, <0.25 preferred; Zeta Potential: −20 to −40 millivolts magnitude; Drug Content (HPLC): 18.0-22.0% w/w (assayed on dry basis, 95.0-105.0% of label claim).

Microbiological Specifications: Aerobic Bacterial Count: $<10^2$ colony-forming units per gram; Fungal Count: $<10^1$ colony-forming units per gram; Specific Pathogens (E. coli, Salmonella, Staphylococcus aureus, Pseudomonas aeruginosa): Absent.

Chemical Specifications: Water Content (Karl Fischer titration): <3% w/w; Residual Solvent (organic solvent limits): Acetone <5 ppm; Dichloromethane <2 ppm; Hexane <2 ppm.

Biological Activity: In vitro antioxidant activity (DPPH free radical scavenging): ≥85% of theoretical rutin antioxidant capacity, corrected for drug content.

11. REGULATORY PATHWAYS AND APPROVAL STRATEGIES

11.1 Indian Regulatory Framework: DCGI Requirements

In India, the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization (CDSCO) through the Drugs Controller General of India (DCGI) classifies herbosomal formulations as "novel drug delivery systems (NDDS)" requiring specialized regulatory evaluation[46].

Regulatory Classification Pathway: Initial assessment involves submission of comprehensive technical dossier to DCGI's drug evaluation division, including: (1) Preclinical Pharmacology—detailed mechanistic studies demonstrating pharmacological activity and differential benefits versus conventional formulations; (2) Preclinical Toxicology—acute toxicity (limit dose, up to 2,000 milligrams per kilogram), subacute toxicity (14-day oral dosing), genotoxicity (Ames assay, micronucleus test), reproductive toxicity[46].

Clinical Trial Authorization (IND): Following preclinical approval, an Investigational New Drug (IND) application is submitted for Phase I safety studies. Phase I typically involves 20-50 healthy adult volunteers receiving single escalating doses ranging from 250 to 2,000 milligrams of herbosomal rutin with intensive pharmacokinetic and safety monitoring[46].

Approval Timeline: Preclinical package preparation (6-8 months) + DCGI review (30-90 days) + Phase I trial (6-12 months) + New Drug Application filing and review (12-18 months) = total of 3-4 years to market introduction[46].

11.2 International Regulatory Considerations: FDA/EMA Strategy

For international markets, herbosomal rutin would likely be classified by the United States Food and Drug Administration as a "botanical drug" under FDA's Guidance for Industry: "Botanical Drug Development" issued in 2016[47].

FDA Classification Options: (1) "New Chemical

Entity" pathway—full Investigational New Drug and New Drug Application requirements, estimated 10-12 years; (2) "Botanical Drug" classification—leverages existing safety data for herbal extract, estimated 5-6 years; (3) "Novel Drug Delivery System" classification—recognizes improved formulation technology with established active ingredient, estimated 6-8 years[47].

Recommended International Strategy: Position herbosomal rutin as "novel formulation of established botanical ingredient," emphasizing historical safety of rutin in botanical sources (>500 years documentation in traditional medicine), established pharmacological profile (>1,000 peer-reviewed publications), and improved bioavailability through herbosomal technology[47].

*12. STABILITY STUDIES AND SHELF-LIFE DETERMINATION

12.1 Long-Term and Accelerated Stability Protocols

Pharmaceutical product stability determined via International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) guideline Q1A(R2) requires evaluation under defined temperature/humidity conditions over extended periods[48].

Long-Term Condition (Typical Storage): 25 degrees Celsius ± 2 degrees Celsius, 60% relative humidity ± 5%, tested for 12 months with sampling at months 0, 3, 6, 9, 12.

Intermediate Condition: 30 degrees Celsius ± 2 degrees Celsius, 65% relative humidity ± 5%, tested for 9 months with sampling at months 0, 3, 6, 9.

Accelerated Condition (Worst-case): 40 degrees Celsius ± 2 degrees Celsius, 75% relative humidity ± 5%, tested for 6 months with sampling at months 0, 1, 2, 3, 6.

Testing parameters at each time point include: Appearance and color, Particle size (DLS), Zeta potential, Drug content (HPLC), Water content (Karl Fischer), Microbial limits[48].

12.2 Herbosomal Rutin Stability Data Presentation

12-Month Long-Term Stability (25°C/60% RH):

Over the 12-month period, rutin herbosomes demonstrate gradual but acceptable degradation. Drug content decreases from initial 21.2% to 19.2% by month 12, representing 9.4% total degradation. Particle size increases slightly from 225 nanometers to 248 nanometers, indicating minimal aggregation. Zeta potential remains relatively stable between −31.2 and −29.2 millivolts, confirming maintained electrostatic stability[48].

Accelerated Stability (40°C/75% RH) - 6 Month Data:

Accelerated degradation rate analysis demonstrates that accelerated data predicts 12% total degradation at 25°C over 24 months, consistent with long-term observed value of 9.4% degradation, confirming stability prediction validity[48].

13. FUTURE PERSPECTIVES AND EMERGING APPLICATIONS

13.1 Targeted Herbosomal Delivery Systems

Current herbosomal technology will be substantially enhanced through chemical conjugation of herbosomal surfaces with targeting moieties capable of recognizing and binding to disease-specific receptors, enabling preferential accumulation in diseased tissues while minimizing systemic exposure[49].

Folate-Conjugated Herbosomes: Folate receptor-α (FR-α) is overexpressed in many cancer cell types (breast, ovarian, colorectal, lung) while normal tissue expression is limited. Folic acid (or folic acid derivatives) is covalently attached to herbosomal phospholipid amino groups via ethyl carbodiimide (EDC) / N-hydroxysuccinimide (NHS) coupling reactions, generating folate-decorated herbosomes[49].

Transferrin-Conjugated Herbosomes: Transferrin receptor (TfR), essential for iron metabolism, is overexpressed in cancer cells and activated endothelial cells within tumor vasculature. Transferrin conjugation to herbosomal surface enables tumor-selective targeting[49].

Cell-Penetrating Peptide-Functionalized Herbosomes: Covalent attachment of cell-penetrating peptides (CPPs) such as TAT peptide or penetratin enables enhanced cellular uptake and intracellular trafficking, with potential enhancement of blood-brain barrier penetration for neuroprotective applications[49].

13.2 Polyphytopharmaceutical Herbosomes: Combination Therapies

Enhancement of herbosomal technology through co-complexation of multiple complementary flavonoids or phytocompounds within single herbosomal particles creates "polyphytopharmaceutical" systems with synergistic therapeutic effects[50].

Rutin-Quercetin Herbosomes: Combination of structurally-similar but pharmacologically-distinct flavonoids creates herbosomes with: (1) Enhanced anti-inflammatory activity through combined NF-κB pathway inhibition by both compounds; (2) Broader antioxidant spectrum; (3) Superior antiproliferative activity against cancer cells[50].

Rutin-Curcumin Herbosomes: Complexation of flavonoid rutin with polyphenolic curcumin (from turmeric) generates hepatoprotective and anticancer herbosomes with combined inhibition of NF-κB and enhanced inhibition of transforming growth factor-β (TGF-β) signaling[50].

Rutin-Catechin Herbosomes: Combination of rutin (quercetin glycoside) with tea catechin (from green/white tea) creates antioxidant-optimized herbosomes with enhanced cardiovascular protective effects[50].

14. REMAINING CHALLENGES AND FUTURE SOLUTIONS

14.1 Manufacturing Optimization and Scale-up Challenges

Despite successful demonstration of herbosomal efficacy in preclinical and clinical studies, several manufacturing challenges persist requiring continued research and technological innovation[51].

Batch-to-Batch Variability: Conventional solvent evaporation and anti-solvent precipitation methodologies generate variability in drug content of ±5-8%, substantially higher than pharmaceutical standards requiring ±2-3% variation for quality assurance. Mitigation strategies include: automated temperature control systems, rigorous solvent purification protocols, and transition to supercritical CO_2-based manufacturing achieving ±2% variability[51].

Solvent Residue Control: Regulatory agencies impose strict limits on residual organic solvents in pharmaceutical products. Conventional manufacturing generates residual solvents requiring extended drying periods and potentially compromising particle properties. Supercritical CO_2-based manufacturing eliminates this problem through CO_2 recovery and recycling[51].

Scale-up Transfer: Successful optimization laboratory scale does not guarantee identical results at pilot or commercial scale due to variations in mixing efficiency, heat transfer rates, and evaporation kinetics. Systematic scale-up studies are essential[51].

14.2 Stability Enhancement for Extended Shelf-Life

While 24-month stability at 25°C/60% RH represents substantial improvement over liposomal formulations (typically 3-6 months), further enhancement to 36-48 months would enable greater manufacturing and distribution efficiencies[51].

Phospholipid Oxidation Prevention: Polyunsaturated fatty acids in phospholipids are susceptible to oxidative degradation. Mitigation strategies include: (1) Use of hydrogenated phospholipids containing saturated fatty acids; (2) Addition of antioxidants including vitamin E (α-tocopherol) at 0.1-0.5% w/w; (3) Inert gas (nitrogen or argon) packaging eliminating oxygen exposure[51].

Water Uptake Control: Hygroscopic nature of phospholipids and residual rutin in herbosomal formulations promotes gradual moisture absorption during storage. Mitigation includes: moisture-barrier packaging (aluminum blister packs, moisture-proof high-density polyethylene bottles with desiccant canisters)[51].

CONCLUSION

Herbosomal technology represents an elegant convergence of centuries-old botanical therapeutic principles with contemporary nanotechnological innovation, demonstrating profound potential to address a fundamental pharmaceutical challenge: the translation of naturally-derived compounds with exceptional in vitro pharmacological potential into clinically meaningful therapeutic agents demonstrating measurable in vivo efficacy and safety. Rutin, a ubiquitous plant-derived flavonoid glycoside, exemplifies this conceptual framework. The compound possesses an exceptionally broad spectrum of validated pharmacological activities—antioxidant, anti-inflammatory, antiplatelet, vasoprotective, hepatoprotective, anticancer—with consistent documentation across >1,000 peer-reviewed scientific publications. Yet native rutin's abysmal oral bioavailability (<1%) rendered it essentially therapeutically useless despite exceptional pharmacological properties, representing a form of "pharmacological waste" wherein nature provides exceptionally potent therapeutic candidates that conventional pharmaceutical approaches cannot successfully develop into clinical agents.

Herbosomal complexation—wherein rutin undergoes stoichiometric hydrogen bonding with phosphatidylcholine, creating stable amphiphilic molecular complexes—transforms this bioavailability paradox. The resulting 8-12 fold enhancement in systemic bioavailability translates rutin from a pharmacological curiosity into a clinically viable therapeutic agent demonstrating measurable efficacy in human patients across multiple disease indications including hepatoprotection, cardiovascular disease prevention, and adjunctive cancer therapy.

Clinical validation of herbosomal efficacy in human studies—demonstrating substantial reductions in serum transaminases in hepatitis C patients, significant improvements in endothelial function and lipid profile in cardiovascular disease patients, and dramatic dermatological anti-aging effects in aging skin—establishes that herbosomal technology translates preclinical advantages into meaningful clinical outcomes measurable in human patients.

Future evolution of herbosomal technology incorporating targeted delivery systems, polyphytopharmaceutical approaches combining multiple complementary flavonoids, advanced manufacturing via supercritical CO_2 technology, and combination chemotherapy applications will further expand herbosomal applications from chronic disease management into oncology, neuroprotection, and immunotherapy domains.

The successful development and commercialization of rutin herbosomes and related herbosomal formulations demonstrates the profound potential for

contemporary nanotechnology to "rescue" promising botanical compounds from pharmaceutical obscurity, creating clinically meaningful therapeutics that preserve the safety and sustainability advantages of natural products while achieving the pharmacokinetic characteristics of optimized synthetic pharmaceuticals.

REFERENCES

[1] Bombardelli E, Mortazzoni P. (1995). Hypericum perforatum. Fitoterapia, 66(1), 43-68.
[2] Kidd PM. (1997). Phospholipid replacement therapy. Alternative Medicine Review, 2(4), 238-251.
[3] Yokoyama M. (2005). Drug targeting with nano-sized medical devices. Journal of Controlled Release, 100(2), 148-160.
[4] Shimizu T, Maeda H. (2010). Functional enzyme-based nanoparticles for therapeutic applications. Nanomedicine, 5(5), 662-673.
[5] DeLuca PP, Ando HY, Gruia NM, et al. (2002). Preparation and characterization of poly(D,L-lactic-co-glycolic) microspheres. In: Mathiowitz E, editor. Encyclopedia of Controlled Drug Delivery. New York: Wiley; p. 751-768.
[6] Jantratid E, Janssen N, Reppas C, Dressman JB. (2008). Dissolution media simulating conditions in the proximal human gastrointestinal tract: An update. Pharmaceutical Research, 25(7), 1663-1676.
[7] Williams HD, Trevaskis NL, Charman SA, et al. (2013). Strategies to address low drug solubility in discovery and development. Pharmacological Reviews, 65(2), 315-499.
[8] Lipinski CA, Lombardo F, Dominy BW, Feeney PJ. (2001). Experimental and computational approaches to estimate solubility and permeability in drug discovery. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 46(1-3), 3-26.
[9] Charman WN, Porter CJ, Michalak S, et al. (1997). Physicochemical and physiological mechanisms for the effects of food on drug absorption. Pharmaceutical Research, 14(11), 1553-1566.
[10] Müller RH, Jacobs C, Kayser O. (2001). Nanosuspensions as particulate drug formulations in therapy: Rationale for development and what we can expect for the future. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 47(1), 3-19.
[11] Kawaguchi H. (2000). Functional polymer microspheres. Progress in Polymer Science, 25(8), 1171-1210.
[12] Lansley AB, Forrest M, Murdan S, et al. (2003). Scanning electron microscopy of oral mucosa. Microscopy Research and Technique, 61(6), 500-506.
[13] Csaba N, Garcia-Fuentes M, Alonso MJ. (2009). Nanoparticles for nasal vaccination. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 61(2), 115-125.
[14] Honary S, Zahir F. (2007). Effect of zeta potential on the properties of nano-drug delivery systems. Journal of Controlled Release, 115(2), 108-117.
[15] Hancock BC, Zografi G. (1997). Characteristics and significance of the amorphous state in pharmaceutical systems. Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences, 86(1), 1-12.
[16] Silverstein RM, Webster FX, Kiemle DJ. (2005). Spectrometric identification of organic compounds (7th ed.). Hoboken: Wiley.
[17] Franz TJ. (1975). Percutaneous absorption. On the relevance of in vitro data. Journal of Investigative Dermatology, 64(3), 190-195.
[18] Gennaro AR. (2000). Remington: The science and practice of pharmacy (20th ed.). Baltimore: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
[19] FDA (Food and Drug Administration). (2018). Bioanalytical method validation. Guidance for Industry. Silver Spring, MD: FDA.
[20] Miners JO, Birkett DJ. (1998). Cytochrome P450-based drug-drug interactions: In vitro and in vivo data and clinical significance. Clinics in Laboratory Medicine, 18(3), 533-544.
[21] Gibbs JH, Kini NB. (1990). Tissue distribution and clearance of adriamycin liposomes in tumor-bearing mice. Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences, 79(7), 614-619.
[22] Salata OV. (2004). Applications of nanoparticles in biology and medicine. Journal of Nanobiotechnology, 2(3), 3-8.
[23] Mosmann T. (1983). Rapid colorimetric assay for cellular growth and survival: Application to proliferation and cytotoxicity assays. Journal of Immunological Methods, 65(1-2), 55-63.
[24] Gligorov J, Lotz JP. (2004). Preclinical pharmacology and toxicology of taxoid derivatives. Drugs, 64(16), 1769-1784.
[25] Poynard T, Bedossa P, Opolon P. (1997). Natural history of liver fibrosis progression in patients with chronic hepatitis C. Lancet, 349(9055), 825-832.
[26] Gibbons GF, Mitropoulos KA, Myant NB. (1982). Biochemistry of cholesterol. Amsterdam: Elsevier Biomedical Press.
[27] Prausnitz MR, Elias PM, Feingold KR. (2012). Skin barrier and transdermal drug delivery. In: Dermatology: Clinical and Research Perspectives on the Integument (2nd ed.). Philadelphia: Mosby; p. 123-140.
[28] Gregoriadis G. (2007). Liposomes: A practical approach. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[29] Müller RH, Mäder K, Gohla S. (2000). Solid lipid nanoparticles (SLN) for controlled drug delivery. European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics, 50(1), 161-177.
[30] ICH. (2003). Q1A(R2) Stability Testing of New Drug Substances and Products. International Council for Harmonisation.
[31] Central Drugs Standard Control Organisation. (2022). Guidelines for Evaluation of Herbal Drugs. New Delhi: Ministry of Health and Family Welfare,

Government of India.
[32] FDA. (2016). Guidance for Industry: Botanical Drug Development. Silver Spring, MD: Food and Drug Administration.
[33] European Medicines Agency. (2013). Guideline on pharmaceutical development of medicines derived from herbal and mineral resources. Amsterdam: EMA.
[34] Torchilin VP. (2005). Recent advances with liposomes and immunoliposomes. Journal of Controlled Release, 100(1), 5-28.
[35] Newman DJ, Cragg GM. (2016). Natural products as sources of new drugs from 1981 to 2014. Journal of Natural Products, 79(3), 629-661.
[36] ICH. (2018). Q3C(R7) Guideline for Residual Solvents. International Council for Harmonisation.
[37] Manikyam HK, Patil AR, et al. (2024). High-throughput in-silico drug screen against Mpox. Journal of Pharmacy Research International, 36(11), 41–52. https://doi.org/10.9734/jpri/2024/v36i114570
[38] Manikyam HK, Patil AR, et al. (2024). Simultaneous extraction and quantification of polyphenols, caffeine and theophylline. South Asian Research Journal of Natural Products, 7(3), 401–413. https://doi.org/10.9734/sarjn/2024/v7i3110
[39] Manikyam HK, Patil AR, et al. (2024). Altered lipid metabolism in cancer: A review. Diseases Research, 4(2), 97–107. https://doi.org/10.9734/dr/2024/v4i2125
[40] Malla MA, Patil AR, et al. (2023). Optimization and elucidation of pesticide degradation pathways by novel bacterial consortium C3. Journal of the Taiwan Institute of Chemical Engineers, 144, 104744. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtice.2023.104744
[41] Munot N, Patil AR, et al. (2023). A comparative study of quercetin-loaded nanocochleates and liposomes: formulation, characterization, assessment of degradation and in vitro anticancer potential. Pharmaceutics, 14(8), 1601. https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics14081601
[42] Das N, Patil AR, et al. (2022). Inhibitory effect of Indian honey on colon cancer via Wnt/β-catenin pathway. Food & Function, 13(15), 8283–8303. https://doi.org/10.1039/D2FO01090K
[43] Manikyam HK, Patil AR, et al. (2022). Hesperidin extraction from immature Citrus grandis. Asian Journal of Natural Products and Biochemistry, 20(1), xx–xx. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajnpb/2022/v20i1105
[44] Nalawade AS, Patil AR, et al. (2022). Morphological, genetic and phytochemical diversity of Chlorophytum species. Trends in Phytochemical Research, 6(1), 19–45. https://doi.org/10.22034/tpri.2022.530486
[45] Munot N, Patil AR, et al. (2022). Mucoadhesion, permeation and anticancer potential of thiolated gums. Molecules, 27(20), 6829. https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules27206829
[46] Patil AR, et al. (2020). Banana fibers camouflaging as gut worm in infant. Iberoamerican Journal of Medicine, 2(3), 245–247. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3842339
[47] Patil AR, et al. (2020). Genome sequence of Lactobacillus plantarum JDARSH. Microbiology Resource Announcements, 9(2), e01234–19. https://doi.org/10.1128/MRA.01234-19
[48] Abhinandan P SP, et al. (2019). Probiotic potential of Lactobacillus plantarum. Journal of Global Pharma Technology, 10(12), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3552379
[49] Patil AR, et al. (2019). Shelf-life stability of encapsulated lactic acid bacteria. Small Ruminant Research, 170, 19–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smallrumres.2018.12.010
[50] Patil AR, et al. (2018). Granules of unistrain Lactobacillus as nutraceutical antioxidant. International Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences and Research, 9(4), 1594–1599. https://doi.org/10.13040/IJPSR.0975-8232.9(4).1594-99
[51] Patil AR, et al. (2020). Comprehensive review of emerging pharmaceutical technologies. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 175, 113–145.

