## List of Figures


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Figure 1.1 | Graphical representation of Spherulites assembly | 5 |
| Figure 2.1 | A complete, schematic view of the human respiratory system with their parts and functions. | 10 |
| Figure 2.2 | Schematic representation of normal cell cycle. | 14 |
| Figure 2.3 | Cellular death due to damage or alteration in normal cell cycle | 15 |
| Figure 2.4 | Cancer cell division. | 15 |
| Figure 2.5 | Types of cancer. | 17 |
| Figure 2.6 | Share of population with cancer in 2016. | 19 |
| Figure 2.7 | Share of population suffering from cancer types, World, 2016. | 19 |
| Figure 2.8 | Types of Lung cancer. | 27 |
| Figure 2.9 | Graphical representation of novel drug delivery systems; A) Polymeric nanoparticles, B) Polymeric micelles, C) Dendrimers, D) Liposomes, E) Viral-based nanoparticles, F) Carbon nanotubes. | 33 |
| Figure 2.10 | Advantages of PEGylation of a novel drug delivery system. | 39 |
| Figure 3.1 | Overlay plot of Gemcitabine Hydrochloride in distilled water at 266 nm. | 70 |
| Figure 3.2 | Calibration plot of Gemcitabine Hydrochloride in distilled water. | 70 |
| Figure 3.3 | Overlay plot of Gemcitabine Hydrochloride in PBS pH 7.4 at 269 nm. | 72 |
| Figure 3.4 | Calibration plot of Gemcitabine Hydrochloride in PBS pH 7.4. | 72 |
| Figure 3.5 | Chromatograms of Gemcitabine Hydrochloride calibration plot showing retention time of 2.89 min (A- Blank, B- 20 ng/mL, C- 100 ng/mL, D- 250 ng/mL, E- 500 ng/mL, F- 1000 ng/mL, G- 2000 ng/mL). | 76 |
| Figure 3.6 | Standard Calibration plot of Gemcitabine Hydrochloride in rat plasma by LCMS MS method. | 77 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Figure 3.7 | Standard Calibration plot of Gemcitabine Hydrochloride extracted from rat heart homogenate by LCMS-MS method. | 78 |
| Figure 3.8 | Standard Calibration plot of Gemcitabine Hydrochloride extracted from rat lungs homogenate by LCMS-MS method. | 80 |
| Figure 3.9 | Standard Calibration plot of Gemcitabine Hydrochloride extracted from rat liver homogenate by LCMS-MS method. | 81 |
| Figure 3.10 | Standard Calibration plot of Gemcitabine Hydrochloride extracted from rat kidney homogenate by LCMS-MS method. | 83 |
| Figure 3.11 | Standard Calibration plot of Gemcitabine Hydrochloride extracted from rat spleen homogenate by LCMS-MS method. | 84 |
| Figure 3.12 | Overlay plot of Vinorelbine Tartrate in distilled water at 271 nm. | 86 |
| Figure 3.13 | Calibration plot of Vinorelbine Tartrate in distilled water. | 86 |
| Figure 3.14 | Overlay plot of Vinorelbine Tartrate in PBS pH 7.4 at 273 nm. | 88 |
| Figure 3.15 | Calibration plot of Vinorelbine Tartrate in PBS pH 7.4. | 88 |
| Figure 3.16 | Chromatograms of Vinorelbine tartrate calibration plot showing retention time of 2.72 min (A- Blank, B- 5 ng/mL, C- 10 ng/mL, D- 50 ng/mL, E- 100 ng/mL, F- 200 ng/mL, G- 500 ng/mL). | 92 |
| Figure 3.17 | Standard Calibration plot of Vinorelbine tartrate in rat plasma by LCMS-MS method. | 93 |
| Figure 3.18 | Standard Calibration plot of Vinorelbine tartrate extracted from rat heart homogenate by LCMS-MS method. | 94 |
| Figure 3.19 | Standard Calibration plot of Vinorelbine tartrate extracted from rat lungs homogenate by LCMS-MS method. | 96 |
| Figure 3.20 | Standard Calibration plot of Vinorelbine tartrate extracted from rat liver homogenate by LCMS-MS method. | 97 |
| Figure 3.21 | Standard Calibration plot of Vinorelbine tartrate extracted from rat kidney homogenate by LCMS-MS method. | 99 |
| Figure 3.22 | Standard Calibration plot of Vinorelbine tartrate extracted from rat spleen homogenate by LCMS-MS method. | 100 |
| Figure 4.1 | Various types of Preformulation studies. | 103 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Figure 4.2 | FTIR Spectra of GCH. | 106 |
| Figure 4.3 | DSC thermogram of GCH. | 107 |
| Figure 4.4 | FTIR Spectra of physical mixture of GCH and excipients. | 108 |
| Figure 4.5 | DSC thermogram of physical mixture of GCH and excipients. | 109 |
| Figure 4.6 | FTIR Spectra of VLB. | 110 |
| Figure 4.7 | DSC thermogram of VLB. | 111 |
| Figure 4.8 | FTIR Spectra of physical mixture of VLB and excipients. | 111 |
| Figure 4.9 | DSC thermogram of physical mixture of VLB and excipients. | 112 |
| Figure 4.10 | Microscopic images of preliminary optimization batches of spherulites prepared by varying concentration of SPC; A) 30-46%, B) 48-62%. | 114 |
| Figure 4.11 | Homogenizer tube; A) with smooth inner surface, B) with serrated inner surface and C) Teflon probe. | 118 |
| Figure 5.1 | Ishikawa diagram showing the developmental process of GCH loaded Spherulites. | 125 |
| Figure 5.2 | Flow chart depicting the preparation of GCH loaded Spherulites. | 126 |
| Figure 5.3 | Response surface plot depicting the effect of independent variables on GCH loaded spherulites size. | 130 |
| Figure 5.4 | Bubble plot depicting the effect of independent variables on GCH loaded spherulites size. | 130 |
| Figure 5.5 | Response surface plot depicting the effect of independent variables on GCH loaded spherulites %EE. | 132 |
| Figure 5.6 | Bubble plot depicting the effect of independent variables on GCH loaded spherulites %EE. | 133 |
| Figure 5.7 | Desirability Plot for Optimization of GCH loaded spherulites. | 134 |
| Figure 5.8 | Ishikawa diagram showing the developmental process of VLB loaded Spherulites. | 136 |
| Figure 5.9 | Flow chart depicting the preparation of VLB loaded Spherulites. | 137 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Figure 5.10 | Response surface plot depicting the effect of independent variables on VLB loaded spherulites size. | 140 |
| Figure 5.11 | Bubble plot depicting the effect of independent variables on VLB loaded spherulites size. | 141 |
| Figure 5.12 | Response surface plot depicting the effect of independent variables on VLB loaded spherulites %EE. | 142 |
| Figure 5.13 | Bubble plot depicting the effect of independent variables on VLB loaded spherulites %EE. | 142 |
| Figure 5.14 | Desirability Plot for Optimization of VLB loaded spherulites. | 144 |
| Figure 6.1 | GCH loaded Non-PEGylated Spherulites size analysis. | 152 |
| Figure 6.2 | GCH loaded PEGylated Spherulites size analysis. | 152 |
| Figure 6.3 | GCH loaded Non-PEGylated Spherulites zeta potential analysis. | 153 |
| Figure 6.4 | GCH loaded PEGylated Spherulites zeta potential analysis. | 153 |
| Figure 6.5 | SEM image of GCH loaded Non-PEGylated Spherulites. | 155 |
| Figure 6.6 | SEM image of GCH loaded PEGylated Spherulites. | 155 |
| Figure 6.7 | TEM image of GCH loaded Non-PEGylated Spherulites. | 156 |
| Figure 6.8 | TEM image of GCH loaded PEGylated Spherulites. | 157 |
| Figure 6.9 | In Vitro drug release study of Standard GCH solution, GCH loaded Non-PEGylated Spherulites and GCH loaded PEGylated Spherulites. Data represents mean of three experimental values (n=3; mean±SD). | 158 |
| Figure 6.10 | Graphical representation of Electrolyte-induced flocculation study of GCH loaded Non-PEGylated Spherulites and GCH loaded PEGylated Spherulites. Data represents mean of three experimental values (n=3; mean±SD). | 160 |
| Figure 6.11 | VLB loaded Non-PEGylated Spherulites size analysis. | 161 |
| Figure 6.12 | VLB loaded PEGylated Spherulites size analysis. | 162 |
| Figure 6.13 | VLB loaded Non-PEGylated Spherulites zeta potential analysis. | 162 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Figure 6.14 | VLB loaded PEGylated Spherulites zeta potential analysis. | 163 |
| Figure 6.15 | SEM image of VLB loaded Non-PEGylated Spherulites. | 164 |
| Figure 6.16 | SEM image of VLB loaded PEGylated Spherulites. | 165 |
| Figure 6.17 | TEM image of VLB loaded Non-PEGylated Spherulites. | 166 |
| Figure 6.18 | TEM image of VLB loaded PEGylated Spherulites. | 166 |
| Figure 6.19 | In vitro drug release study of Standard VLB solution, VLB loaded Non-PEGylated Spherulites and VLB loaded PEGylated Spherulites. Data represents mean of three experimental values (n=3; mean±SD). | 168 |
| Figure 6.20 | Graphical representation of Electrolyte-induced flocculation study of VLB loaded Non-PEGylated Spherulites and VLB loaded PEGylated Spherulites. Data represents mean of three experimental values (n=3; mean±SD). | 169 |
| Figure 7.1 | Schematic representation of steps involved in cell cycle and its analysis by using DNA intercalating florescence probe in flow cytometry. | 173 |
| Figure 7.2 | Results of cell cytotoxicity by MTT assay A) at 8 hours, B) at 16 hours and C) at 24 hours (where, Standard GCH Solution Vs. GCH loaded Spherulites; *p<0.05, *** p<0.001). Experiment was performed in triplicate (n=3). Data represents mean±SD. | 176-177 |
| Figure 7.3 | IC50 values with respect to time of standard GCH drug and GCH loaded spherulites in A549 cell line. | 179 |
| Figure 7.4 | Results of cell cytotoxicity by MTT assay A) at 8 hours, B) at 16 hours and C) at 24 hours (where, Standard VLB Solution Vs. VLB loaded Spherulites; **p<0.01, *** p<0.001). Experiment was performed in triplicate (n=3). Data represents mean±SD. | 180-181 |
| Figure 7.5 | IC50 values with respect to time of standard VLB drug and VLB loaded spherulites in A549 cell line. | 183 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Figure 7.6 | Graphical representation of Cell Cycle Analysis of A549 cell line with respect to time A) After 12 hours and B) After 24 hours by PI staining using FACS technique (where, Standard GCH Solution Vs. GCH loaded Spherulites; *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001) Experiment was performed in triplicate (n=3). Data represents mean±SD. | 185 |
| Figure 7.7 | Cell cycle analysis of A549 cells; where A) Untreated cells, B) Cells treated with Std GCH, C) Cells treated with GCH loaded spherulites. | 186 |
| Figure 7.8 | Graphical representation of Cell Cycle Analysis of A549 cell line with respect to time A) After 12 hours and B) After 24 hours by PI staining using FACS technique (where, Standard VLB Solution Vs. VLB loaded Spherulites; *** p<0.001). Experiment was performed in triplicate (n=3). Data represents mean±SD. | 188 |
| Figure 7.9 | Cell cycle analysis of A549 cells; where A) Untreated cells, B) Cells treated with Standard VLB, C) Cells treated with VLB loaded spherulites. | 189 |
| Figure 8.1 | Microscopic images of RBCs for understanding the compatibility with drug solution and formulation; A) Normal saline, B) 1%v/v Triton x-100, C) Standard GCH solution, D) Standard VLB solution, E) GCH loaded Spherulites and F) VLB loaded Spherulites. | 201 |
| Figure 8.2 | Plasma concentration Vs. Time profile of Standard GCH solution, GCH loaded non-PEGylated Spherulites and GCH loaded PEGylated Spherulites administered intravenously via tail vein in Female SD rats (n=6). (Data represents mean±SD). | 203 |
| Figure 8.3 | Plasma concentration Vs. Time profile of Standard VLB solution, VLB loaded non-PEGylated Spherulites and VLB loaded PEGylated Spherulites administered intravenously via tail vein in Female SD rats (n=6). (Data represents mean±SD). | 205 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Figure 8.4 | Biodistribution of Standard GCH solution in rats in highly perfused organs as function of time. Data represents % dose injected of total dose estimated from organs. (n=3; mean±SD). | 207 |
| Figure 8.5 | Biodistribution of GCH loaded non-PEGylated Spherulites in rats in highly perfused organs as function of time. Data represents % dose injected of total dose estimated from organs. (n=3; mean±SD). | 208 |
| Figure 8.6 | Biodistribution of GCH loaded PEGylated Spherulites in rats in highly perfused organs as function of time. Data represents % dose injected of total dose estimated from organs. (n=3; mean±SD). | 209 |
| Figure 8.7 | Comparison of lung targeting potential of Standard GCH Solution, GCH loaded Non PEGylated spherulites and GCH loaded PEGylated spherulites. Data represents % dose injected of total dose estimated from Lungs. (n=3; mean±SD) (Statistically analyzed by Two way ANOVA; $p<0.0001$). | 210 |
| Figure 8.8 | Biodistribution of Standard VLB solution in rats in highly perfused organs as function of time. Data represents % dose injected of total dose estimated from organs. (n=3; mean±SD). | 212 |
| Figure 8.9 | Biodistribution of VLB loaded non-PEGylated Spherulites in rats in highly perfused organs as function of time. Data represents % dose injected of total dose estimated from organs. (n=3; mean±SD). | 213 |
| Figure 8.10 | Biodistribution of VLB loaded PEGylated Spherulites in rats in highly perfused organs as function of time. Data represents % dose injected of total dose estimated from organs. (n=3; mean±SD). | 214 |
| Figure 8.11 | Comparison of lung targeting potential of Standard VLB Solution, VLB loaded Non PEGylated spherulites and VLB loaded PEGylated spherulites. Data represents % dose | 215 |

injected of total dose estimated from Lungs. (n=3; mean±SD) (Statistically analyzed by Two way ANOVA; p<0.0001).

Figure 8.12 $^{99m}$Tc-GCH complex DTPA challenge study (n=3; mean±SD). 217

Figure 8.13 Gamma scintigraphy images at different time points viz. A1) 0.25 hr, B1) 0.5 hr, C1) 1 hr, D1) 2 hrs, E1) 3 hrs, F1) 4 hrs, of rat administered with $^{99m}$Tc labelled GCH plain drug solution showing non specific distribution of plain drug evidenced by scattered gamma quanta and A2) 0.25 hr, B2) 0.5 hr, C2) 1 hr, D2) 2 hrs, E2) 3 hrs, F2) 4 hrs, of rat administered with $^{99m}$Tc labelled GCH loaded Non-PEGylated Spherulites depicting distribution of the formulation. 219

Figure 8.14 Gamma scintigraphy images at different time points viz. A) 0.25 hr, B) 0.5 hr, C) 1 hr, D) 2 hrs, E) 3 hrs, F) 4 hrs, of rat administered with $^{99m}$Tc labelled GCH loaded PEGylated Spherulites showing targeting as well as retention of the formulation at the desired site i.e. lungs (region of interest marked by arrows). 220

Figure 8.15 Biodistribution of (A) $^{99m}$Tc labelled GCH plain drug solution (B) $^{99m}$Tc labelled GCH loaded Non-PEGylated Spherulites and (C) $^{99m}$Tc labelled GCH loaded PEGylated Spherulites in rats in different organs as function of time. 221

Figure 8.16 Comparison of lung targeting potential of GCH plain drug, GCH loaded Non-PEgylated spherulites and GCH loaded PEGylated spherulites, where: A) Left Lung, B) Right Lung. (Where, For Plain drug Solution Vs. Non-PEGylated Spherulites; *** p<0.0001, ** p<0.01 and * p< 0.05. For Plain drug Solution Vs. PEGylated Spherulites; ### p<0.0001. For Non-PEGylated Spherulites Vs. PEGylated Spherulites; $$$ p<0.0001). 222

Figure 8.17 $^{99m}$Tc-VLB complex DTPA challenge study (n=3; mean±SD). 224

Figure 8.18 In vivo biodistribution of $^{99m}$Tc labelled VLB plain drug solution injected intravenously in Sprague-Dawley rats, visualized by Gamma scintigraphy at different time points viz. A) 0.25 hr, B) 0.5 hr, C) 1 hr, D) 2 hrs, E) 3 hrs, F) 4 hrs. 226

Figure 8.19 % dose injected intravenously, of $^{99m}$Tc labelled VLB plain drug solution in Sprague-Dawley rats (n=3), where data depicts concentration found in highly perfused organs with respect to time. Data represents mean±SD. 227

Figure 8.20 In vivo biodistribution of $^{99m}$Tc labelled VLB loaded Non-PEGylated Spherulites injected intravenously in Sprague-Dawley rats, visualized by Gamma scintigraphy at different time points viz. A) 0.25 hr, B) 0.5 hr, C) 1 hr, D) 2 hrs, E) 3 hrs, F) 4 hrs. 227

Figure 8.21 % dose injected intravenously, of $^{99m}$Tc labelled VLB loaded Non-PEGylated Spherulites in Sprague-Dawley rats (n=3), where data depicts concentration found in highly perfused organs with respect to time. Data represents mean±SD. 228

Figure 8.22 In vivo biodistribution of $^{99m}$Tc labelled VLB loaded PEGylated Spherulites injected intravenously in Sprague-Dawley rats, visualized by Gamma scintigraphy at different time points viz. A) 0.25 hr, B) 0.5 hr, C) 1 hr, D) 2 hrs, E) 3 hrs, F) 4 hrs. 228

Figure 8.23 % dose injected intravenously, of $^{99m}$Tc labelled VLB loaded PEGylated Spherulites in Sprague-Dawley rats (n=3), where data depicts concentration found in highly perfused organs with respect to time. Data represents mean±SD. 229

Figure 8.24 Lung targeting potential of VLB plain drug, VLB loaded Non-PEgylated spherulites and VLB loaded PEGylated spherulites at different time points, where: A) Left Lung, B) Right Lung. (Where, For Plain drug Solution Vs. Non-PEGylated Spherulites; *** $p<0.001$. For Plain drug Solution Vs. PEGylated Spherulites; ### $p<0.001$. For Non-PEGylated Spherulites Vs. PEGylated Spherulites; $$$ $p<0.001$) 229

statiscally analyzed by repeated measure of Two way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni Post-tests.