

**DEVELOPMENT OF  
MUCOADHESIVE BIOPOLYMERS  
FOR FOOD FORMULATION**

By

**MOHD FAIZAL ALI**

A thesis submitted to  
The University of Birmingham  
for the degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

School of Chemical Engineering

University of Birmingham

2015

## ABSTRACT

Development of mucoadhesive biopolymer has received great attention in the pharmaceutical application due to its ability to retain the drug dosage at the specific targeted area. This special property could be applied in food formulation for optimum delivery of the active ingredients in the mouth. This research was carried out to study, correlate and review several *in vitro* analytical methods that can be used in development process for characterisation of mucoadhesive polymer. Four well known mucoadhesive biopolymers namely, chitosan, pectin, sodium alginate and sodium carboxymethylcellulose (CMC) were used in this study. A modified rheological characterisation was used to study the interaction between the biopolymers with mucin and the assessment was based on the viscosity synergism. The detachment force characterisation was carried out via pull-off and tensile test using texture analyser and atomic force microscopy (AFM). Kinetic interaction study was done using quartz crystal microbalance with dissipation monitoring (QCMD) and interpretation of data from the modified rheological characterisation. Meanwhile, the removal of biopolymer emulsion after water flushing in a flow cell was observed under a microscope. It was found that mucoadhesion properties of tested biopolymers were affected by the concentration of biopolymer solutions, molecular weight, contact time, ionic strength and pH. Sodium alginate was characterised as the most mucoadhesive material by all the methods while QCMD shows CMC has the highest interaction with mucin layer compared to sodium alginate and pectin.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank God the Almighty for His guidance and help in giving me the strengths to complete this thesis. I would like to acknowledge to Universiti Malaysia Pahang for the financial support throughout my study.

In particular, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my supervisor, Prof. Serafim Bakalis and co-supervisor, Prof. Ian T Norton for the encouragement, knowledge, motivation, patience and time in helping me to complete my PhD study.

I would like also to acknowledge other contributors to the work, especially Dr. James Bowen for his help in AFM. For his help with QCMD, I would like to thank Dr. Roger Parker from Institute of Food Research, Norwich. Many thanks to Dr. James Covington (University of Warwick) for his help in fabrication process of flow cell. Big thanks also go out to Dr. Benjamin Le Révérend for his guidance during my early year of study.

A lot of thanks to my wife, Diana Ghazale and handsome son, Muhammad Faris for always being at my side and for the moral support during my hard time.

My big appreciation goes to my mother-in-law, Nor Hashimah Abdullah, for her ideas that helped me in editing process of this thesis. Finally, thank you to my beloved family and friends who always pray for my happiness and successfulness.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Acknowledgement</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>xxiv</b>
<b>List of Symbols and Abbreviations</b>	<b>xxvii</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 General Introduction	2
1.2 Literature Review	7
1.2.1 Mucoadhesion	7
1.2.1.1 Theory of Mucoadhesion	8
1.2.1.2 Mechanism of Mucoadhesion	12
1.2.1.3 Factors Affecting Adhesion	14
1.2.2 Mucoadhesive Polymer	19
1.2.3 Emulsion and Gel Particles	24
1.2.4 Mucous Layer and Mucin	27
1.2.5 Mucoadhesion Analysis	29
1.2.5.1 <i>In vitro</i> Measurement	30
1.2.5.2 <i>Ex vivo</i> and <i>In vivo</i> Study	35
1.3 Objectives of Study	37
1.4 Significances of Study	37

<b>2</b>	<b>Methodology</b>	<b>38</b>
2.1	Introduction	39
2.2	Methodology	39
2.2.1	Rheometer	39
	2.2.1.1 Working Principles	39
	2.2.1.2 Instrumental Setup	46
2.2.2	Texture Analyser	50
	2.2.2.1 Working Principles	50
	2.2.2.2 Instrumental Setup	52
2.2.3	Quartz Crystal Microbalance with Dissipation Monitoring (QCMD)	55
	2.2.3.1 Working Principles	55
	2.2.3.2 Instrumental Setup	58
2.2.4	Atomic Force Microscopy (AFM)	60
	2.2.4.1 Working Principles	60
	2.2.4.2 Instrumental Setup	63
2.2.5	Flow Cell with Microscope Imaging	64
	2.2.5.1 Working Principles	64
	2.2.5.2 Instrumental Setup	66
<b>3</b>	<b>Rheological Characterisation</b>	<b>68</b>
3.1	Introduction	69
3.2	Materials and Methods	71
3.2.1	Experimental Considerations	71

3.2.2	Sample Preparation	72
3.2.3	Instrumental Setup	72
3.3	Result and Discussion	77
3.3.1	Characterisation of Chitosan and Mucin Solution	77
3.3.2	Different Concentration and Concentration of Polymers	82
3.3.3	Effect of Different Degree of Esterification of Pectin on Adhesive Capability	93
3.3.4	Effect of Holding Time Before Shearing Process	94
3.3.5	Effect of the Amount of Mucin and Sodium Alginate at Same Concentration	96
3.3.6	Effect of Ionic Strength on Sodium Alginate and the Mixture with Mucin	101
3.3.7	Viscosity Synergism, Normalised Parameter and Force of Mucoadhesion	105
3.3.8	Oscillation Analysis of the Biopolymer-Mucin Mixtures	112
3.3.9	Control Experiment	115
3.4	Conclusion	117
<b>4</b>	<b>Pull-Off and Tensile Test Using Texture Analyser</b>	<b>119</b>
4.1	Introduction	120
4.2	Materials and Methods	122
4.2.1	Pull-Off Experiment	122

4.2.1.1	Materials and Instrumental Preparation	122
4.2.2	Tensile Test	124
4.2.2.1	Materials and Instrumental Preparation	124
4.3	Result and Discussion	126
4.3.1	Pull-Off Experiment	126
4.3.1.1	Effect of Different Polymers and Concentration of Polymers	128
4.3.1.2	Effect of Different Holding Time on Mass Absorbed	136
4.3.1.3	Mass Changed During Holding Time	137
4.3.2	Tensile Test	143
4.3.2.1	Peak Force and Total of Work of Different Concentration and Biopolymers	143
4.3.2.2	Normalised Parameter	148
4.4	Conclusion	149
<b>5</b>	<b>Mucoadhesion Measurement Using Atomic Force Microscopy (AFM)</b>	<b>150</b>
5.1	Introduction	151
5.2	Materials and Methods	153
5.2.1	Continuous Solution	153
5.2.2	Preparation of 'Piranha' Solution	154
5.2.3	Preparation of Biopolymer Absorption onto Au Substrate and Mucin Coated Cantilever	154

5.2.4	Force Measurement	155
5.3	Result and Discussion	157
5.3.1	Force Measurement in Air	157
5.3.2	Force Measurement in Distilled Water	162
5.3.3	Different Ionic Strength and pH Environment	167
5.4	Conclusion	172
<b>6</b>	<b>Mucoadhesion Kinetic Studies</b>	<b>173</b>
6.1	Introduction	174
6.2	Materials and Methods	175
6.2.1	Kinetic Absorption by Quartz Crystal Microbalance with Dissipation Monitoring (QCMD)	175
6.2.2	Kinetic Interaction Analysis by Rheological Characterisation	177
6.3	Result and Discussion	177
6.3.1	QCMD	177
6.3.2	Rheological Characterisation	184
6.4	Conclusion	190
<b>7</b>	<b>Mucoadhesion Testing on Mucoadhesive Biopolymer Formulation</b>	<b>192</b>
7.1	Introduction	193
7.2	Materials and Methods	194
7.2.1	Preparation of Mucoadhesive Biopolymer Emulsion	194
7.2.2	Flow Cell Analysis	195



7.2.3	Preparation of Agar Gel Particles	198
7.3	Result and Discussion	198
7.3.1	Oil in Water Emulsion (O/W) with Mucoadhesive Biopolymer	198
7.3.2	Viscometric Experiment of Mucoadhesive Biopolymer Emulsion with Mucin Layer	202
7.3.3	Flow Cell Observation on Interaction Between Mucoadhesive Biopolymer Emulsion with Mucin Layer	205
7.3.4	Agar Gel Particles	213
7.4	Conclusion	217
<b>8</b>	<b>Conclusion and Future Work</b>	<b>219</b>
8.1	Introduction	220
8.2	Conclusions	220
8.2.1	Rheological Characterisation	220
8.2.1.1	Recommendation for Rheological Characterisation	226
8.2.2	Pull-off and Tensile Test Using Texture Analyser	227
8.2.2.1	Recommendation for Pull-off and Tensile Test Using Texture Analyser	230
8.2.3	Mucoadhesion Measurement Using Atomic Force Microscopy (AFM)	230

8.2.3.1	Recommendation for Mucoadhesion	
	Measurement Using Atomic Force	
	Microscopy (AFM)	234
8.2.4	Mucoadhesion Kinetic Studies	235
	8.2.4.1 Recommendation for Mucoadhesion	
	Kinetic Studies	237
8.2.5	Mucoadhesion Testing on Mucoadhesive	
	Biopolymer Formulation	238
	8.2.5.1 Recommendation for Mucoadhesion Testing	
	on Mucoadhesive Biopolymer Formulation	240
8.3	Correlation of Mucoadhesion from Different Analytical	
	Methods	240
8.4	Review of Analytical Methods used in This Study	242
	8.4.1 Conclusion of Review	248
8.5	Future Work	251
	<b>References</b>	<b>253</b>

## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>Figure 1.1</b>	The interpenetration or diffusion theory illustration where there are three stages involved for the interaction between a mucoadhesive polymer and mucin glycoprotein.	9
<b>Figure 1.2</b>	An illustration of the influence of the contact angle on the strength of mucoadhesion.	11
<b>Figure 1.3</b>	Illustration of fracture mechanisms.	12
<b>Figure 1.4</b>	Contact stage and consolidation stage in the mucoadhesion phenomenon.	13
<b>Figure 1.5</b>	Some scenarios where mucoadhesion can occur.	13
<b>Figure 1.6</b>	Molecular diagram of different mucoadhesives (A) Pectin, (B) Sodium alginate, (C) Sodium carboxymethyl cellulose (CMC) and (D) Chitosan.	21
<b>Figure 1.7</b>	Schematic of Mechanism leading to coalescence of an O/W emulsion.	26
<b>Figure 1.8</b>	Hypothetical model of stabilizing the O/W emulsion droplets with pectin.	26
<b>Figure 1.9</b>	Structure of human salivary monomeric mucins (MG2)- the MUC7 gene product.	28
<b>Figure 1.10</b>	Structure of human salivary monomeric mucins (MG1)- the MUC5B gene product.	29

<b>Figure 1.11</b>	Modified Wilhelmy plate method apparatus for mucoadhesion study.	33
<b>Figure 2.1</b>	Laminar shear of fluid between two plates.	40
<b>Figure 2.2</b>	Three dimensional schematic diagram of basic term in the determination of shear viscosity.	41
<b>Figure 2.3</b>	Steady state flow curve of fluid.	42
<b>Figure 2.4</b>	Schematic stress response to the strain deformation for elastic solid, viscous fluid and viscoelastic material.	44
<b>Figure 2.5</b>	Schematic of the front of AR rheometer.	45
<b>Figure 2.6</b>	Selection of rheometer geometries.	46
<b>Figure 2.7</b>	Schematic diagram of sample volume for the rheological characterisation experiments.	49
<b>Figure 2.8</b>	Typical applications of texture analyser.	51
<b>Figure 2.9</b>	Schematic diagram of a texture analyser equipment.	51
<b>Figure 2.10</b>	Typical graph of force versus time or distance for adhesion measurement.	52
<b>Figure 2.11</b>	TA. XT. Plus texture analyser instrument.	53
<b>Figure 2.12</b>	Experiment setup using texture analyser. (A) Pull-off experiment and (B) Tensile test experiment.	54
<b>Figure 2.13</b>	(a) Butterworth van Dyke (BVD) model of a quartz resonator and (b) Schematic diagram of internal circuit of the QCMD.	56
<b>Figure 2.14</b>	QCMD instrument with QAFC 302 axial flow chamber with temperature controlled loop.	59
<b>Figure 2.15</b>	Piezoelectric gold chip.	59

<b>Figure 2.16</b>	Reflection of laser beam from the cantilever to photodetector.	61
<b>Figure 2.17</b>	Atomic force causes the cantilever to bend corresponded by the sample surface tomography at nano-scale level.	61
<b>Figure 2.18</b>	A typical force curve during the measurement done by AFM.	62
<b>Figure 2.19</b>	Schematic diagram of AFM system.	64
<b>Figure 2.20</b>	Flow cell	67
<b>Figure 2.21</b>	Schematic diagram of the flow cell apparatus. (A) Reicher-Jung; (B) Flow cell; (C) Peristaltic pump; (D), Beaker containing pure distilled water; (E) Beaker containing solution removed from flow cell.	67
<b>Figure 3.1:</b>	Schematic diagram of the viscometric experiment.	75
<b>Figure 3.2:</b>	Steady state flow curve of 5% (w/v) mucin solution.	80
<b>Figure 3.3</b>	Flowcurve (steady state) of 1% (w/v) Chitosan in 1% (v/v) acetic acid solution measured with step up ( $0.2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ to $1000 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) followed by step down ( $1000 \text{ s}^{-1}$ to $0.2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ).	81
<b>Figure 3.4</b>	Viscosity profile 1% (w/v) Chitosan in 1% (v/v) acetic acid measured on different day after stored in fridge ( $T \sim 5^\circ\text{C}$ ).	81
<b>Figure 3.5</b>	Steady stead flow curve of 1% (w/v) chitosan in 1% (v/v) acetic acid, 5% (w/v) mucin and chitosan-mucin mixture which was mixed with a spoon (not magnetic stirrer).	84
<b>Figure 3.6</b>	Agglomeration of chitosan-mucin when mixed with spoon.	84
<b>Figure 3.7</b>	Stress sweep of 1% (w/v) chitosan solution in 1% (v/v) acetic acid.	87

- Figure 3.8** Frequency sweep 1% (w/v) chitosan in 1% (v/v) acetic acid and its mixture with 5% (w/v) mucin. 87
- Figure 3.9** Viscosity profile of 1.5 ml 1% (w/v) and 2% (w/v) different polymer solutions, water, polymer-mucin and water-mucin at shear rate of  $50 \text{ s}^{-1}$ . 4 ml of 10% (w/v) mucin solution was dried on the peltier stage for the shearing process. Measurement was done for 20 minutes after applying 5 minutes equilibrium time (holding time). 88
- Figure 3.10** Viscosity profile of 1.5 ml of 1% (w/v) high DE pectin mixed with 4 ml 10% (w/v) mucin at different of shear rate and 5 minutes holding time before the shearing process (—  $40 \text{ s}^{-1}$ , —  $50 \text{ s}^{-1}$ , —  $60 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ). 91
- Figure 3.11** Viscosity of the mixture of 1.5 ml 1% (w/v) high DE pectin with mucin at different shear rates. Initially, the high DE pectin-mucin mixture was mixed at  $50 \text{ s}^{-1}$  shear rate after 5 minutes holding time. 91
- Figure 3.12** (a) Frequency sweep test for the mixture of 1.5 ml 1% (w/v) high DE pectin – 4 ml 10% (w/v) mucin (mixed at different shear rate:  $\blacklozenge G' 40 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ;  $\blacksquare G'' 40 \text{ s}^{-1}$   $\blacktriangle G' 50 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ;  $\times G'' 50 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ;  $\times G' 60 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ;  $\bullet G'' 60 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) at different angular frequencies. (b)  $\tan \delta$  for the mixture of 1.5 ml 1% (w/v) high DE pectin – 4 ml 10% (w/v) mucin (mixed at different shear rate:  $\blacklozenge 40 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ;  $\blacksquare 50 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ;  $\blacktriangle 60 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) at different angular frequencies. 92

- Figure 3.13** Viscosity profile of two different types of pectin (35% and 60% degree of esterification) mixed with 4 ml of 10% (w/v) mucin (temperature is 37°C, shear rate is 50 s<sup>-1</sup> and equilibrium time is 0 s). 94
- Figure 3.14** Viscosity profile of the 1.5 ml of 1% (w/v) high DE pectin mixed with 4 ml 10% (w/v) mucin (dried condition) at different initial holding times and shear rate of 50 s<sup>-1</sup>. 95
- Figure 3.15** Initial viscosity of mixture of 1.5 ml of 1% (w/v) high DE pectin mixed with 4 ml 10% (w/v) mucin (dried condition) at different holding times and shear rate of 50 s<sup>-1</sup>. 96
- Figure 3.16** Effect of amount of mucin in the combination of 1.5 ml of 2% (w/v) sodium alginate and 10 % (w/v) mucin on the viscosity of the mixture. (Shear rate: 50 s<sup>-1</sup>; holding time: 0 s). 98
- Figure 3.17** Specific viscosity of sodium alginate-mucin with different amount of mucin in the mixture. (Shear rate: 50 s<sup>-1</sup>; holding time: 0 s). 99
- Figure 3.18** Viscosity profile of the different volume of 2% (w/v) sodium alginate mixed with 4 ml of 10% (w/v) mucin (dried condition). (Shear rate: 50 s<sup>-1</sup>; holding time: 0 s). 99

- Figure 3.19** Effect of amount of sodium alginate solution on the viscosity for mixture of 4 ml of 10% (w/v) mucin and 2% (w/v) sodium alginate solution. Viscosity of different concentration of mucin solution is measured by mixing 0.4 g of mucin (in dried film condition) with different amount of water. (Shear rate:  $50 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ; holding time: 0 s). 100
- Figure 3.20** Specific viscosity of sodium alginate-mucin at different amount of sodium alginate solution in the mixture. (Shear rate:  $50 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ; holding time: 0 s). 100
- Figure 3.21** Viscosity profile of the different volume of 2% (w/v) sodium alginate with different concentration of NaCl mixed with 4 ml 10% (w/v) mucin. (5 minutes initial holding time and shear rate of  $50 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ). 103
- Figure 3.22** Viscosity profile of the different volume of 2% (w/v) sodium alginate with different concentration of KCl mixed with 4 ml 10% (w/v) mucin. (5 minutes initial holding time and shear rate of  $50 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ). 103
- Figure 3.23** Viscosities for mixtures of the 2% (w/v) sodium alginate in different concentration of salt and its mixture with 4 ml of 10% (w/v) mucin (dried condition) after 20 minutes shearing at  $50 \text{ s}^{-1}$  and 5 minutes initial holding time. 104
- Figure 3.24** Variation of zeta potential ( $\zeta$ ) of an apple juice with salt concentration. 104



<b>Figure 3.25</b>	Force of mucoadhesion for three types of polymers. The mixture (polymer-mucin) was mixed at 37°C and 50 s <sup>-1</sup> shear rate with 5 minutes holding time.	111
<b>Figure 3.26</b>	Dynamic moduli of the high DE pectin-mucin mixture.	114
<b>Figure 3.27</b>	Tan δ of the 2% (w/v) different polymer-mucin mixtures.	114
<b>Figure 3.28</b>	Viscosity profile of control experiment. The mixing was done at 50 s <sup>-1</sup> and with 5 minutes of equilibrium (holding time).	116
<b>Figure 3.29</b>	Viscosity profile of the mixture 1.5 ml 10% (w/v) sugar, 1.5 ml 30% (w/v) sugar and 1.5 ml water with mucin. (shear rate: 50 s <sup>-1</sup> ; holding time: 5 minutes).	117
<b>Figure 4.1</b>	Modified of a tensiometer for measurement of detachment force between mucoadhesive material and mucous layer.	121
<b>Figure 4.2</b>	An advanced dual tensiometer apparatus for tensile force measurement.	122
<b>Figure 4.3</b>	Schematic diagram of the TA.XT.Plus Texture Analyser. (A) Texture Analyser with moveable arm; (B), Dell PC running the programme Texture Analysis; (C), Clean or mucin coated slide; (D), Glass beaker containing the polymer solution.	124
<b>Figure 4.4</b>	Schematic diagram of tensile test. The arrows indicated with capital letters represent relevant forces experienced in the test. Unspecific force polymer (A), unspecific force of mucin (B) and specific force between the polymer and mucin (C).	125
<b>Figure 4.5</b>	Schematic diagram of important sequences in pull-off experiment.	127

<b>Figure 4.6</b>	Force balance that experienced by slide. Total force is the measurement recorded by texture analyser.	127
<b>Figure 4.7</b>	Force of pull-off experiment recorded by texture analyser for different types of polymer with mucin coated slide. (Holding time is 300 s).	130
<b>Figure 4.8</b>	Force of pull-off experiment recorded by texture analyser for different types of polymer with clean slide. (Holding time is 300 s).	130
<b>Figure 4.9</b>	Illustration of cohesion force recorded during pulling step.	132
<b>Figure 4.10</b>	Mass changed $[(M_i - M_0)/(M_\infty - M_0)]$ during holding time (420 s) for different polymer solutions.	133
<b>Figure 4.11</b>	Force profile of pull-off experiment recorded by texture analyser with different holding time (— 30 s, — 180 s, — 300 s, — 420 s) for 2% (w/v) high DE pectin solution with mucin coated slide.	137
<b>Figure 4.12</b>	Force profile with different modes speed of 2% (w/v) sodium alginate. Holding time is 100 s.	138
<b>Figure 4.13</b>	Force profile of different type of polymers (2% w/v) with holding time of 420 s. (Fast dipping into polymer solution and pulled out at 1 mm/s).	139
<b>Figure 4.14</b>	Force recorded during holding time.	141
<b>Figure 4.15</b>	Weight change of mucin slide during holding time.	141
<b>Figure 4.16</b>	Relative weight change of mucin slide during holding time.	142

<b>Figure 4.17</b>	Force versus times for 10% (w/v) mucin and 2% (w/v) high DE pectin solution indicating the general mucoadhesion and unspecific mucoadhesion. The curves were obtained from tensile testing of mucin-pectin solution (MP) (blue line), water-pectin solution (WP) (red line) and mucin-water solution (MW) (green line).	144
<b>Figure 4.18</b>	Net force, $\Delta F_{max}$ (specific interaction) and net total work, $\Delta AUC$ (specific total work) of different polymers (high DE pectin, CMC and sodium alginate) at different concentration.	147
<b>Figure 4.19</b>	Normalised parameter of different polymer at different concentration.	148
<b>Figure 5.1</b>	Peak force between the polymer substrate and mucin.	160
<b>Figure 5.2</b>	Peak force between the sodium alginate (different ionic strength NaCl) substrate and mucin coated cantilever at different contact time.	160
<b>Figure 5.3</b>	Work between the polymer substrates and mucin coated cantilever at different contact time.	161
<b>Figure 5.4</b>	Work between the sodium alginate with different ionic strength (NaCl) and mucin cantilever at different contact time.	161
<b>Figure 5.5</b>	Peak force for polymer substrate and mucin coated cantilever at different contact time.	164
<b>Figure 5.6</b>	Work for polymer substrate and mucin coated cantilever at different contact time.	165

<b>Figure 5.7:</b>	Peak force (detachment force) for sodium alginate (different ionic strength NaCl) and mucin coated cantilever at different contact time.	165
<b>Figure 5.8</b>	Work for sodium alginate with different ionic strength (NaCl) and mucin coated cantilever at different contact time.	166
<b>Figure 5.9</b>	Peak force (detachment force) between different polymers and mucin cantilever at in different ionic strength solution (NaCl).	168
<b>Figure 5.10</b>	Work between different polymers and mucin coated cantilever at in different ionic strength solution (NaCl) environment.	168
<b>Figure 5.11</b>	Peak force (detachment force) between different polymers and mucin coated cantilever in different pH solution.	171
<b>Figure 5.12</b>	Work between different polymers and mucin coated cantilever in different pH solution.	171
<b>Figure 6.1</b>	Sequences for kinetic absorption study of mucoadhesive polymer on mucin layer.	176
<b>Figure 6.2</b>	QMCD frequency and dissipation shifts during the injection of sodium alginate solution on the absorbed mucin layer. F= Frequency and D= Dissipation. Frequencies: F1 (5 MHz); F3 (15 MHz); F5 (25 MHz); F7 (35 MHz).	179
<b>Figure 6.3</b>	QMCD frequency and dissipation shifts during the injection of CMC solution on the absorbed mucin layer. F= Frequency and D= Dissipation. Frequencies: F1 (5 MHz); F3 (15 MHz); F5 (25 MHz); F7 (35 MHz).	180

<b>Figure 6.4</b>	QMCD frequency and dissipation shifts during the injection of high DE pectin solution on the absorbed mucin layer. F= Frequency and D= Dissipation. Frequencies: F1 (5 MHz); F3 (15 MHz); F5 (25 MHz); F7 (35 MHz).	180
<b>Figure 6.5</b>	Schematic diagram of the expected frequency profile and the process happened during the formation of polymer-mucin layer.	181
<b>Figure 6.6</b>	Schematic diagram of the phenomenon happened during the experiment.	181
<b>Figure 6.7</b>	Frequency change after injection of tested polymer solution before the buffer rinse.	183
<b>Figure 6.8</b>	Relative frequency change after injection of tested polymer solution before the buffer rinse.	184
<b>Figure 6.9</b>	Focusing area for kinetic interaction analysis by rheological characterisation.	185
<b>Figure 6.10</b>	Viscosity profile during shearing of mucin layer with water, high DE pectin and low DE pectin. The shearing was done for 20 minutes (1200 s) with shear rate of $50 \text{ s}^{-1}$ and 0 s holding time.	185
<b>Figure 6.11</b>	Viscosity change during shearing of mucin layer with water, high DE pectin and low DE pectin. From $t= 0 \text{ s}$ to $t= 800 \text{ s}$ .	186
<b>Figure 6.12</b>	Relative viscosity change during shearing of mucin layer with water, high DE pectin and low DE pectin from $t= 0 \text{ s}$ to $t= 800 \text{ s}$ .	186

<b>Figure 6.13</b>	Viscosity profile during shearing process for 1% (w/v) pectin, water, 10% (w/v) sugar and 30% (w/v) sugar with mucin layer. Shear rate of $50 \text{ s}^{-1}$ and holding time 0 s and 5 minutes.	189
<b>Figure 6.14</b>	Relative viscosity change during shearing process for 1% (w/v) pectin, water, 10% (w/v) sugar and 30% (w/v) sugar with mucin layer. Shear rate of $50 \text{ s}^{-1}$ and holding time 0 s and 5 minutes.	190
<b>Figure 7.1</b>	Silverson L4RT high speed mixer.	195
<b>Figure 7.2</b>	Dimension of flow cell.	197
<b>Figure 7.3</b>	Setup for flow cell analysis with Reichert-Jung microscope using 25x magnification lense.	197
<b>Figure 7.4</b>	Images of emulsion droplets made with different mucoadhesive polymers and concentration. (a) No polymer; (b) 0.1% (w/v) high DE pectin; (c) 1% (w/v) high DE pectin; (d) 2% (w/v) high DE pectin; (e) 1% (w/v) sodium alginate; (f) 2% (w/v) sodium alginate.	201
<b>Figure 7.5</b>	Viscosity profile of the shearing process of (O/W) emulsion with dried mucin layer. Three emulsion formulation were used which are 1% (w/v) and 2% (w/v) of sodium alginate and without polymer. Shear rate at $50 \text{ s}^{-1}$ and holding time was 5 minutes prior to shearing process. The measurement done at $T=37^{\circ}\text{C}$ .	203
<b>Figure 7.6</b>	Emulsion without mucoadhesive polymer on the mucin coated slide.	208

<b>Figure 7.7</b>	Emulsion without mucoadhesive polymer on the clean slide.	209
<b>Figure 7.8</b>	1% (w/v) Sodium Alginate O/W emulsion on clean slide.	210
<b>Figure 7.9</b>	1% (w/v) Sodium Alginate O/W emulsion on mucin coated slide.	211
<b>Figure 7.10</b>	2% (w/v) Sodium Alginate O/W emulsion on mucin coated slide.	212
<b>Figure 7.11</b>	Temperature ramp of 3% (w/v) agar with different shear rate: (a) $40 \text{ s}^{-1}$ and (b) $100 \text{ s}^{-1}$ . Cooling rate is $1.5^\circ\text{C}/\text{min}$ .	214
<b>Figure 7.12</b>	Images of fluid agar gel formed with different shear rate. (a) $40 \text{ s}^{-1}$ and (b) $750 \text{ s}^{-1}$ .	215
<b>Figure 7.13</b>	Frequency sweep of 3% (w/v) Agar gel particle at 0.5% strain. Shear rate: (a) $40 \text{ s}^{-1}$ and (b) $100 \text{ s}^{-1}$ .	216
<b>Figure 7.14</b>	Flowcurve of 3% (w/v) agar gel particle produced by applying different shear rate: (a) $40 \text{ s}^{-1}$ and (b) $100 \text{ s}^{-1}$ .	216

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 1.1</b>	Reason of the encapsulation technology.	3
<b>Table 1.2</b>	Microencapsulation processes.	5
<b>Table 1.3</b>	Microencapsulation process for different suspending media.	5
<b>Table 1.4</b>	The polymer factors that affecting the mucoadhesion strength.	15
<b>Table 1.5</b>	The environmental factors that affecting the mucoadhesion processes.	17
<b>Table 1.6</b>	Physiological effect on the mucoadhesion strength.	18
<b>Table 1.7</b>	Example of mucoadhesive polymers. More (+) symbols indicate stronger adhesion.	23
<b>Table 2.1</b>	Viscoelastic parameters.	43
<b>Table 2.2</b>	Experiment procedures were used in rheological characterisation experiment and production of agar gel particles.	48
<b>Table 2.3</b>	Texture analyser setting for the pull-off and tensile test experiments.	54
<b>Table 3.1</b>	Summary of the experiment parameters used in rheological characterisation. All the tests were performed at temperature of 37°C.	75
<b>Table 3.2</b>	Apparent viscosity and observed viscosity of the different polymers and their mixture with 10% (w/v) mucin (1.5 ml of polymer solution was used for the mixing process) at 50 s <sup>-1</sup> and 5 minutes holding time.	107



**Chapter 1:**  
**Introduction and**  
**Literature Review**

## 1.1 General Introduction

Throughout the pharmaceutical industry and more recently, with the introduction of ‘functional foods’ in the food industry there is a need to deliver active components to consumers especially people with ailments. This is possible by encapsulation technology. This is an advanced technology which is growing in the pharmaceutical, cosmetic, food and printing industry (Heinzen, 2002). Encapsulation can be defined as a technique to coat an active ingredient or a mixture of active materials in a system (Madene et al., 2006). The system or coating material is called shell, wall, material, carrier or encapsulant while the active ingredient that is coated is known as the active material or core material. In food industry, the materials that are normally used as the core material are flavours, colourants, aroma compounds, fats and oils, vitamins and minerals (Shahidi and Han 1993). Enhancement of the quality of food through encapsulation technology has gained increasing importance in the manufacture of health food or functional food. The use of encapsulation technology to achieve a target of flavour release and some other functions encourages researchers to study the mechanisms of flavour release and make enhancement on the existing encapsulation technology. Similar emphasis is given in the pharmaceutical industry where encapsulation of drugs has been explored extensively in order to improve the therapeutic performance of drugs. The reasons for applying encapsulation technology in the industries mentioned are summarised in Table 1.1.

**Table 1.1:** Reason of the encapsulation technology. (Adapted from Finch and Bodmeier, 2005).

<b>Reason</b>	<b>Description</b>
Controlled release	Controlling the release of the active material in a carrier material to have various release profiles.  This reason is mainly applied to the food and pharmaceutical industry.
Protection of core material against the atmospheric condition	Some of active ingredients are sensitive to the atmospheric condition such as moisture, atmospheric oxygen and temperature.  Encapsulation can prevent any active materials from direct contact to the atmospheric condition and thus increase its functionality.
Protection of hygroscopic core contents	Flowability and direct compressible nature of hygroscopic core materials such as hygroscopic B group vitamins can be improved with iron phosphate by microencapsulating this core material before compressing it into tablets.
Masking of taste and odour	Compounds with unpleasant taste and odour can be masked by microencapsulation in hard gelatine capsules or by incorporating the unpleasant compound in sugar or film-coated tablets.
Flavour and aroma release	Encapsulation can control the release profile of

**Chapter 3:**  
**Rheological**  
**Characterisation**

### 3.1 Introduction

Rheological technique that studies the flow and deformation of material due to applied stress and strain is useful in predicting the mucoadhesive properties of polymers or formulations. These techniques have been widely used by previous researchers to study the mucoadhesion properties and mechanisms of interaction of some biopolymers such as pectin, sodium alginate, chitosan and others (Hassan and Gallo, 1990; Mortazavi, 1995; Rossi et al., 2000; Thirawong et al., 2008; Sriamornsak and Wattanakorn, 2008). The interaction between the mucoadhesive polymers with mucin (or mucous) through chain interpenetration, structure conformation and chemical reaction will be reflected by the viscosity and rheology properties (Thirawong et al., 2008). Hence, the reflection of intermolecular friction as characterised by viscosity could be used to describe the mucoadhesion properties. The rheological characterisation for assessing the mucoadhesiveness of polymers *in vitro* was first discovered by Hassan and Gallo (1990). They have tested the interaction of several polymers (e.g. polyethylene glycol, dextran, chitosan, polyacrylic acid and others) with porcine gastric mucin. They introduced the term viscosity synergism and bioadhesion force in order to rank the adhesive strength of the polymers. The viscosity synergism is the increase in viscosity due to bioadhesion between polymers and mucin components in the mixture. The assessment has been considered successful when the results obtained by Hassan and Gallo (1990) were consistent with the results obtained by others.

Several different strategies can be used to study mucoadhesion when using rheology. One of them is the direct method of measuring the viscosity increment or

synergism at different shear rate using shear rheology. Besides the viscosity, the viscoelastic properties of the polymer-mucin mixture can be determined by oscillatory rheology. Rheological enhancement (synergism) is the term used to describe the magnitude of changes in viscoelastic properties of the sample due to mucoadhesion (Sriamornsak and Wattanakorn, 2008). In this technique, the sample is subjected to an oscillatory stress which is enough to excite the sample without breaking its molecular structure. Riley et al. (2001) have successfully investigated and characterised the polyacrylic acid (PAA) as mucoadhesive polymer and its interaction with homogenised pig gastric mucous using the rheological techniques. In their study, concentration and pH of the polymer and mucous were identified as some of the factors affecting the interaction. Another technique is the advanced frequency sweep analysis proposed by Mortazavi (2003). He used lower range frequency (0.0001 - 10 Hz) as compared to ordinary limited frequency sweep study (0.1 - 10 Hz) and reported that the technique could provide a more detailed and accurate data on change in intermolecular structure during the interaction of polymer with mucous layer.

Likewise, the purpose of this investigation is to study the mucoadhesion properties of five well known mucoadhesive biopolymers (chitosan, high DE pectin, low DE pectin, sodium alginate and sodium carboxymethylcellulose) and the factors that affect their interaction with mucin using similar rheological characterisation. However, there was a small modification in the technique used in this research. Instead of using mixtures of biopolymers and mucin as in previous studies, a thin