

Quantitative phase analysis by XRPD

Organizers and Instructors:

Arnt Kern, Burker AXS GmbH, Germany Detlef Beckers, PANalytical B.V., The Netherlands Fabia Gozzo, Excelsus Structural Solutions SPRL, Belgium Robert Dinnebier, MPI für Festkörperforschung, Germany Arnaud Grandeury, Novartis Pharma AG

This document was presented at PPXRD -Pharmaceutical Powder X-ray Diffraction Symposium

Sponsored by The International Centre for Diffraction Data

This presentation is provided by the International Centre for Diffraction Data in cooperation with the authors and presenters of the PPXRD symposia for the express purpose of educating the scientific community.

All copyrights for the presentation are retained by the original authors.

The ICDD has received permission from the authors to post this material on our website and make the material available for viewing. Usage is restricted for the purposes of education and scientific research.



PPXRD Website – <u>www.icdd.com/ppxrd</u>

ICDD Website - www.icdd.com

Workshop program



Introduction and Overview of QPA methods Detlef Beckers, 30 min	8.30
QPA with diffraction methods Fabia Gozzo, 45min	9.00
Quantification of amorphous phases - theory Robert Dinnebier, 45min	9.45
Coffee break	10.30
QPA Instrumentation, validation and sample preparation Detlef Beckers, 45min	11.00
Quantification of traces: LoD & LoQ Fabia Gozzo (SR-XRPD), Detlef Beckers (lab-instrumentation), 30min+30m	11.45 nin
Lunch	12.45
QPA as one piece of a bigger puzzle in pharmaceutical development Arnaud Grandeury, 45 min	14.30
Quantification of amorphous phases – practice part 1 Robert Dinnebier, 30 min	15.15
Coffee break	15.45
Quantification of amorphous phases – practice part 2 Robert Dinnebier, 1h	16.15



Overview of Quantitative Phase Analysis (QPA) methods

Detlef Beckers, PANalytical B.V.

Introduction and background



A diffraction pattern is a fingerprint of a (crystalline phase)



Introduction and background



Each phase in the sample produces a characteristic pattern that is superimposed on those of the other phases



Applications in the pharmaceutical industry



- Polymorphic purity: detect and quantify unwanted polymorphic forms in both drug substance and drug product
- Limit of Detection (LoD) and Quantification (LoQ)
- Assess the polymorphic composition in drug substance and product
- API / excipient concentration in formulation
- Degree of crystallinity in amorphous/crystalline mixtures (API / formulation)

• • • •

Quantification of crystalline phases



5% formulation of Olenzapine form-I (spiked with form-II)



LoD < 3% of API impurity (< 0.15% of formulation) – measured in Bragg-Brentano geometry

Quantification of amorphous phases





Quantification of amorphous phases





Overview of Quantitative Phase Analysis (QPA) methods



Single (few) peak method (small 2 Theta range): $I_{unknown} \leftrightarrow I_{known}$

- General model
- Straight line model (μ constant)
- Linear Multi-Variate Regression model (extension of straight line model with various independent reflections)
- Matrix flushing (sum of phases known and μ constant)
- Internal Standard model
- RIR method (uses ICDD data on relative intensities compared to corundum standard)
- Addition model (adding a known concentration of the compound of interest)
- Single line addition method (sample with just one crystalline and one amorphous phase)
- Dual line addition method (sample with a reference phase in high concentration preferably with non-overlapping peak)
- Thin layer with base plate correction (X-ray transparent sample, calculation of transmission factor for concentration determination)

Overview of Quantitative Phase Analysis (QPA) methods



Whole pattern methods (large 2 Theta range)

- Traditional Rietveld method
- FULLPAT / PONKCS method
- Degree of Crystallinity (1 reference) / Linear Calibration Model (multiple references)
- Internal Standard method (spiking to determine amorphous content)
- External Standard method (amorphous content determination)

Partial Least Squares regression (PLSR) – not based on diffraction properties

Which aspects to consider?



- Required LoD/LoQ
- Regions free of peak overlaps
- Possibility to create reliable standards (amount of standards)
- Sensitivity to process variations (changes in particle size etc.)
- Tendency to changing preferred orientation (particle shape)
- Are the crystal structures known (and how well?)
- Sensitivity to instrument variations (incl. tube aging)
- Reproducibility of amorphous content
- Possibility for internal standards (limitations: formulations,...)
- Aspects of method validation

The analytical problem often dictates the choice of quantitative method

Quantification by Partial Least Squares Regression - PLSR



- Whereas traditional XRD quantification methods are analyzing certain pattern features (peak intensity / background /..) and make use of correlations with physical parameters (c ~ I, crystal structure ↔ I, ...), PLSR is not using any physical property of an analytical result
- PLSR is a statistical evaluation that searches for correlations of a property parameter (c, crystallinity, T, pH, ...) with the variation of a whole pattern or parts of a pattern (x-, y- coordinates)
- Therefore applicable to virtually any analytical technique
- PLSR is commonly used in other analytical techniques (NIR, DSC,...)
- In recent years also applied to XRD data. But not (yet) very popular.

Partial Least-Squares Regression (PLSR)

PLSR as developed by Herman Wold in 1960, is able to predict any defined property **Y** directly from the variability in a data matrix **X**.

In **XRPD** the **rows** of the matrix **X** are formed by the individual scans, the **columns** are formed by all measured intensities at a certain diffraction angle 20. n scans <

XRPD data (matrix **X**) typically contains:

- Non-systematic variations (sample preparation, noise, ...)
- Non-intended variations (impurities, differences in grain sizes, ...)
- Systematic variations (different concentrations, ...) => response vector Y

Projection based methods like **PCA** or **PLS** have the goal to extract a small number of scores/factors to optimally explain the (systematic) data variation in matrix **X**. The extracted scores/factors can then be used for regression analysis.





Comparison of analytical approaches



- Lactose used as model substance
 - 1. Amorphous lactose in crystalline matrix
 - 2. Crystalline lactose in amorphous matrix

Example 1: Crystallinity - low amorphous content



Model substance: Alpha lactose monohydrate





Preparation:

 Storage at RH of 56% and 30°C to ensure complete recrystallisation



Preparation:

 Lyophilisation of saturated lactose solution

Preparation of binary mixtures: 0-10% amorphous content

Example 1: Crystallinity - low amorphous

PANalytical

get insight



Example 1: Crystallinity - low amorphous Analytical Set insight

Traditional evaluation: integral peak / background intensity (range: $2\theta = 11^{\circ} - 34^{\circ}$)



Example 1 – Comparison of methods





Example 1 – PLS





Cross validated

Data set 1

Data set 2

	PLS (as modeled – 3 factors, standardize)	PLS (cross validated 30% data removed)	PLS (on data set 1 – other step size)	PLS (on data set 2 shorter meas. time - scaled)
R ²	0.9999	0.9882	0.9970	0.9971
RMSE(SD)	0.035	0.282	0.160	0.152
Error of intercept <∆A>	0.024	0.192	0.109	0.104

Example 2: Crystallinity – low crystalline content



Model substance: Alpha lactose monohydrate





Preparation:

 Storage at RH of 56% and 30°C to ensure complete recrystallisation



Preparation:

 Lyophilisation of saturated lactose solution

Preparation of binary mixtures: 0-10% crystallinity

Example 2 – Crystallinity - low crystalline content



Example 2: Crystallinity - low crystalline content





Evaluation of net peak area (background fit, Pseudo-Voigt profile (FJC asymmetry))

Copyright : © 2015 PANalytical B.V., all rights reserved

Example 2 – Comparison of methods



PANalytical

get insight

	Net Peak Area	PLS - as modeled (3 factors, center)
R ²	0.9887	0.9992
RMSE(SD)	0.389 (46.07)	0.101
Error of intercept <∆A>	0.126 (14.89)	0.033

Example 2 – PLS

RMSE(SD)

Error of intercept

<∆A>



0.251

0.081



0.271

0.088

0.121

0.039

Copyright : © 2015 F	PANalytical B.V., all rights reserved
----------------------	---------------------------------------

0.101

0.033

Summary – PLS regression



- Requires (large) set of samples for calibration
- Calibration samples should cover all relevant sample variations (particle/crystallite sizes, operator dependencies)
- Possibility of over-fitting (limit number of factors, counting statistics)
- Factors not necessarily related to physical properties validation (ICH) to check model applicability with all process parameter variations
- + Pure phases or crystal structures not required
- + Takes full pattern variation into account
- + Less sensitive to non-ideal sample preparation / measurement set-up
- + Can be more robust than traditional XRD methods
- + User independent analysis