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#### Abstract

The present study describes a simple, accurate, precise and cost effective UV-VIS Spectrophotometric method for the estimation of albendazole (ABZ) and praziquantel (PZQ) by absorbance correction method. The simultaneous determination of albendazole (ABZ) and praziquantel (PZQ) was performed by absorbance correction method using two different wavelengths i.e. $217 \mathrm{~nm} \&$ 295.4nm. Both the drugs were dissolved in methanol for estimation. A linear response was observed in the range of 4$14 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ with a regression coefficient of 0.999 . The method was then validated for different parameters as per the ICH (International Conference for Harmonization) guidelines. The detection limits (LOD $=4 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ for both the drugs) for absorbance correction method were determined and presented the best analytical features. The recoveries of ABZ and PZQ from the synthetic samples were near to $100 \pm 5 \%$. The methods were applied in veterinary pharmaceutical formulation whose mass ratio ABZ: PZQ is $12: 1$; the results obtained were according to nominal content.
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## 1. Introduction

The antiparasitic drugs are widely used in veterinary practice and human therapy. The antihelminthics are an important type of these drugs used in cattle and pets, bringing benefit and improved quality of life to such animals. ${ }^{(1)}$ An important example of a disease treated with these drugs is helminthiases, a common parasitic disease of great economical and public health importance. Since the antihelminthic spectra of most drugs used for treatment is limited, combinations of more than one active ingredient are required to control helminthic infections effectively. In this context, albendazole, methyl 5-(propylthio)-2- benzimidazole carbamate (ABZ) (Fig. 1a), is an antihelminthic drug, it is active against most of the nematode worms and some of the cestode worms in humans and animals, and it acts by inhibiting fumarate reductase and the microtubular polymerization of the parasite. ${ }^{(2)} \quad$ Praziquantel, 2-cyclohexylcarbonyl-

1,2,3,6,7,11bhexahydro- 4h-pyrazino(2,1a) isoquinolin-4-one (PZQ) (Fig. 1b), acts on the parasite, increasing the permeability to calcium ions causing contractions and vacuolization. The mix of both drugs is efficiently used in veterinary treatment of parasitic diseases. Many publications describe the determination of ABZ and

PZQ in pharmaceutical formulations. Individual and simultaneous determination with other drugs are possible by FIA using UV-detection and HPLC method in suspensions, ${ }^{(3)}$ adsorptive stripping voltammetry (ASV) and linear sweep voltammetry (LSV), square-wave voltammetry (SWV), differential pulse voltammetry (DPV), ${ }^{(4-5)}$ Visspectrophotometry, ${ }^{(6-9)} \quad$ HPLC, ${ }^{(10,11)}$ derivative UV-spectrophotometry, ${ }^{(12-13)}$ GLC ${ }^{(14)}$ and PMR spectrometry. ${ }^{(15)}$ In biological samples for individuals, simultaneous determinations with other drugs and metabolites have been reported by: HPLC, ${ }^{(16-22)}$ LC-TMS, ${ }^{(23-24)}$ LC-ESSM, ${ }^{(25)}$ nonaqueous capillary electrophoresis, ${ }^{(26)} \quad \operatorname{IR}^{(27)} \quad$ and fluorometry. ${ }^{(28-29)}$

A newer dose regiment was developed in combination of $A B Z$ and PZQ for treatment of helminthes and the estimation was also been performed by RP-HPLC in rat plasma. ${ }^{(30)}$ Classical least squares (CLS) analysis is one of the simplest multivariate methods and is easy to perform, although its results are not very accurate in the quantification of mixtures when the analyzed spectra have significant overlapping. ${ }^{(31)}$ Second derivative spectroscopic method was developed for the estimation in Veterinary Pharmaceutical Formulation . ${ }^{(32)}$ On the
other hand, PCR and PLS regression have been used more successfully in quantification of those types of samples, although their use presents more complications than CLS and second derivative spectrophotometry (SDS). The aim of this work is to develop different mathematical approaches for the simultaneous determination of ABZ and PZQ in veterinary pharmaceutical formulation.


Fig. 1.Chemical structures of Albendazole


Fig. 2.Chemical structures of Praziquantel

## 2. Experimental

### 2.1. Materials and Solutions

Albendazole (Fig. 1) was obtained from Mercury Pharmaceutical Ltd, Vadodara, Gujarat, India. Praziquantel (Fig. 2) was obtained from Micro Labs Ltd., Goa. The solvent used was methanol which was of AR grade, purchased from SD Fine Chemicals Limited, India and double distilled water.

### 2.2. Instrumentation:

The instrument used for the present study was a UV-Vis double beam spectrophotometer (model 2080, Analytical Technological Limited) with 1 cm matched pair quartz cell.

### 2.3. Method:

### 2.3.1. Solubility Test:

Solubility test for the drug Albendazole and Praziquantel was performed by using various solvents. The solvents include water, methanol, ethanol, acetonitrile, 0.1 N hydrochloric acid $(0.1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl}), 0.1 \mathrm{~N}$ sodium hydroxide ( 0.1 N NaOH ), DMF, and chloroform.

Solvent: Methanol

### 2.3.2. Preparation of stock solution of

 Albendazole and Praziquantal $(1000 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}): 25 \mathrm{mg}$ of both the drugs were weighed and transferred to a 25 ml volumetric flask. 15 ml of diluent was added and the solution is sonicated for 15 min . Volume is made up to the mark with diluent to obtain stock solution of $1000 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$.2.3.3. Preparation of working standard solution Albendazole and Praziquantal $(100 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}): 2.5 \mathrm{ml}$ of stock solution was withdrawn and transferred to 25 ml volumetric flask, volume is made upto the mark with Solvent to get the working standard solution of $100 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$.
2.3.4. Absorbance Correction Method:

Each working standard solution was scanned between the range $200-400 \mathrm{~nm}$ in 1 cm cell against blank and the overlain spectra was recorded (Fig.3). Albendazole shows two absorbance maxima ( $\lambda \max$ ) at 295.4 nm and 215.8 nm wavelengths, whereas Praziquantel shows no absorbance maxima ( $\lambda$ max), but it shows Absorbance at 217.0 nm . (Fig.3). Overlain spectra of

Albendazole (ABZ) and Praziquantel (PRQ). The calibration curves for ABZ and PRQ were prepared with in the concentration range of $4-14 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ at selected wavelengths by diluting aliquot portions of standard stock solution of each drug. The plots of Beer's law limit are shown in (Fig.4, 5, \& 6)


Fig: 3- Selection of detection wavelength for ABZ \& PRQ at 295.4 nm and 217.0 nm respectively; $\qquad$ : Albendazole (ABZ); $\qquad$ : Praziquantel (PRQ); $\qquad$ : Mixture


Fig: 4- Overlay Spectra of linearity of Albendazole


Fig: 5-Overlay Spectra of linearity of Praziquantel


Fig: 6- Overlay Spectra of linearity of Albendazole and Praziquantel

### 2.4. UV Method Development

### 2.4.1. Preparation of Stock Solution:

Standard stock solution of Albendazole and praziquantel was prepared by dissolving individually both the drug ( 10 mg ) of in 10 ml of Methanol which gives $1000 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$. One ml of this stock Solution was taken and was diluted up to 10 ml by using methanol (solvent) to
produce a concentration of $100 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ solution.

### 2.4.2. Preparation of Working Solution:

From the above stock solution 1 ml was transferred into 10 ml volumetric flask and volume was made up to the mark with methanol to make $10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$.

### 2.4.3. Determination of $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \max$ :

Then the above working sample solution $(10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml})$ was scanned with UV-Vis Spectrophotometer in the range 400200 nm against Methanol as blank and the wavelength corresponding to absorbance was noted For Albendazole at 295.4 nm and Praziquantel at 217 nm for Absorbance Correction Method. (Fig-3)

### 2.4.4. Preparation of Calibration Curve:

 From the above stock solution $(100 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml})$ further dilution were made and the volume was make up to 10 ml using Methanol to produce $4 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}, 6 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}, 8 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}, 10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ $12 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ and $14 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ solutions respectively. Then the construction of calibration curve was showed a straight line (Fig- 7, 8, 9, $10 \& 11$ ). The correlation coefficient was found to be 0.999 for Absorbance correction method.

Fig: 7- Calibration Curve of "Praziquantel" at 217 nm


Fig: 8- Calibration Curve of "Albendazole" at 217 nm


Fig: 9- Calibration Curve of "Abendazole" at 295.4 nm


Fig: 10- Calibration Curve of "Mixture" at 217.0nm


Fig: 11- Calibration Curve of "Mixture" at 295.4nm

### 2.5. Method Validation:

Validation is a process of establishing documented evidence, which provides a high degree of assurance that a specific activity will consistently produce a desired result or product meeting its predetermined specifications and quality characteristics. The validation for UV method development was performed using parameters like Linearity, Accuracy, Precision, Robustness, Ruggedness, and Limit of detection (LOD), Limit of quantification (LOQ) ${ }^{(33)}$

### 2.5.1. Linearity

The linearity was tested for the concentration range of $4,6,8,10,12$, $14 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ for ABZ \& PRQ. The calibration curve was constructed and evaluated by its coefficient of determination $\left(\mathrm{r}^{2}\right)$. The calibration plot (concentration of PRQ
versus Absorbance of PRQ at 217 nm \& concentration of ABZ versus Absorbance of ABZ at 295.4 nm .) was generated by replicate analysis $(n=10)$ at all concentration levels and the linear relationship was evaluated using the least square method within Microsoft Excel® program. For minimum error with precise, concise and accurate data 10 different concentration were been taken which gave a wide range for linearity. The coefficient of determination ( $\mathrm{r}^{2}$ ) for ABZ \& PRQ were 0.999 \& 0.999 for ABZ \& PRQ and given in (Fig.10, 11).

### 2.5.2. Accuracy:

Accuracy of the method was determined by replicate analysis of three sets of samples spiked with three different levels of ABZ \& PRQ in level $80 \%, 100 \%$ \& $120 \%$ and comparing the difference between spiked value (theoretical value) and that actually found value.

### 2.5.3. Precision:

The precision of the method based on within-day repeatability was determined by replicate analysis of three sets of samples spiked with three different concentrations of $\mathrm{ABZ} \& \mathrm{PRQ}$ (4, 10and $14 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ ). The reproducibility (day-to-day variation) of the method was validated using the same concentration range as described above, but only a single determination of each concentration was
made on three different days. Relative standard deviation (R.S.D.) were calculated from the ratios of standard deviation (S.D.) to the mean and expressed as percentage.

### 2.5.4. Specificity:

Specificity study was performed by analyzing standard solution in the presence of an excipient to find was there any interference of excipients in \% recovery of ABZ \& PRQ. Amount of ABZ \& PRQ was spiked with $50 \%, 100 \%$, and $150 \%$ of excipient (talc) and the sample was analyzed for ABZ \& PRQ recovery UVVIS Spectrophotometer.

## 3. Result and Discussion

### 3.1. Calibration Curve:

Linearity of response for $A B Z$ and PRQ for determination of both of them in Single as well as synthetic mixture, by preparing a stock solution and suitably diluted to achieve concentration of about $4,6,8,10$, $12,14 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$. Value of Coefficient of determination ( $\mathrm{r}^{2}$ ), slope and intercept were $\mathrm{y}=0.049 \mathrm{x}-0.004, \mathrm{R}^{2}=0.999$ at 217.0 nm for PRQ in bulk, $\mathrm{y}=0.102 \mathrm{x}+$ $0.012, \mathrm{R}^{2}=0.999$ at 217.0 nm for ABZ in bulk, $\mathrm{y}=0.036 \mathrm{x}-0.003, \mathrm{R}^{2}=0.999$ at
295.4 nm for ABZ in bulk, $\mathrm{y}=0.160 \mathrm{x}+$ $0.002, \mathrm{R}^{2}=0.999$ at 217.0 nm in synthetic mixture, $\mathrm{y}=0.039 \mathrm{x}-0.005, \mathrm{R}^{2}=0.999$ at 295.4 nm in synthetic mixture. The linear regression data from the calibration curve indicate that the response is linear over the concentration range studied for both the drug. So it can be apply for determination of $A B Z$ and $P R Q$ in synthetic mixture.

### 3.2. Analytical method validation:

### 3.2.1. Linearity:

The linearity was tested for the concentration range of $4,6,8,10,12$, $14 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$. and the calibration curve was constructed and evaluated by its correlation coefficient. The linear relationship was evaluated using the least square method within Microsoft Excel® program. The coefficient of determination $\left(\mathrm{r}^{2}\right)$ for both ABZ and PRQ was 0.999 given in (Table 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, \& 6) and (Fig. 3, 4, \& 5)

Table No.: 1: Linearity data of Praziquantel at 217.0

| Conc. | Abs. | Conc. | Conc. | Absorptivity | Avg. <br> $(\mu g / m l)$ | $(n=5)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


|  | (nm) |  |  |  | $\boldsymbol{g m} / \mathbf{1 0 0 \boldsymbol { m l }}$ | 0.0496 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 0.1958 | 4.0416 | 0.00040 | 484.455 |  |  |
| 6 | 0.2874 | 5.8884 | 0.00058 | 488.075 |  | Intercept: |
| 8 | 0.3968 | 8.0940 | 0.00080 | 490.235 |  | 0.0046 |
| 10 | 0.4882 | 9.9368 | 0.00099 | 491.304 | 489.811 |  |
| 12 | 0.5959 | 12.1081 | 0.00121 | 492.146 |  | $\mathbf{r}^{2}:$ |
| 14 | 0.687 | 13.9448 | 0.00139 | 492.653 |  | 0.9994 |

Table No.: 2: Linearity data of Albendazole at 217.0 nm

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Conc. } \\ & (\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}) \end{aligned}$ | Abs. $(n=5)$ <br> (nm) | Conc. <br> found <br> ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}$ ) | Conc. gm/100ml | Absoptivity gm/100ml | Avg. absorptivity gm/100ml | Calz | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Slope: } \\ & 0.1110 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 0.447 | 3.986 | 0.00039 | 1122.793 |  | 0.0004 | Intercept |
| 6 | 0.662 | 5.923 | 0.00059 | 1118.609 |  | 0.0005 | : |
| 8 | 0.912 | 8.172 | 0.00081 | 1116.240 |  | 0.0008 | 0.0051 |
| 10 | 1.103 | 9.893 | 0.00098 | 1115.154 | 1116.777 | 0.0009 |  |
| 12 | 1.351 | 12.12 | 0.00121 | 1114.204 |  | 0.0012 | $\mathbf{r}^{2}$ : |
| 14 | 1.551 | 13.92 | 0.00139 | 1113.661 |  | 0.0013 | 0.9990 |

Table No.: 3: Linearity data of Albendazole at 295.4 nm

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Conc. } \\ (\mu g / m l) \end{gathered}$ | Abs. $(n=5)$ <br> (nm) | Conc. <br> found <br> ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}$ ) | Conc. gm/100ml | Absoptivity gm/100ml | Avg. absorptivity gm/100ml | Calz | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Slope: } \\ & 0.039 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 0.1493 | 4.0336 | 0.00040 | 370.15 |  | 0.0003 | Intercept: |
| 6 | 0.2215 | 5.8918 | 0.00058 | 375.94 |  | 0.0005 | -0.0074 |
| 8 | 0.3106 | 8.1853 | 0.00081 | 379.45 |  | 0.0008 | $\mathbf{r}^{2}$ : |
| 10 | 0.3754 | 9.8532 | 0.00098 | 380.98 | 378.68 | 0.0009 | 0.9990 |
| 12 | 0.4591 | 12.007 | 0.00120 | 382.33 |  | 0.0012 |  |
| 14 | 0.5377 | 14.030 | 0.00140 | 383.22 |  | 0.0014 |  |

Table No.: 4: Linearity data of Mixture at 217.0 nm

| Conc. <br> ( $\mu \mathrm{g}$ ) <br> ml) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Abs. } \\ (n=5) \\ (n m) \end{gathered}$ | Conc. <br> Found <br> ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}$ ) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Conc. } \\ \text { gm/100 } \\ m l \end{gathered}$ | Absorptivity | Avg. absorptivity | Alz-217 <br> (absorptivit $y^{*}$ Conc.) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Cprq= (abs-alz } \\ \text { _absorptivity }{ }^{*} \\ \text { Conc.at217) } \\ \text { /pr__absorptivi } \\ \text { ty at } 217 \mathrm{~nm} \end{gathered}$ | Slope: 0.160 Intercept: 0.002 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 0.654 | 4.06 | 0.0004 | 1611.2 |  | 0.447 | 0.00042 |  |
| 6 | 0.953 | 5.92 | 0.00059 | 1609.6 |  | 0.662 | 0.00059 | $\mathbf{r}^{2}$ : |
| 8 | 1.281 | 7.96 | 0.00079 | 1608.6 |  | 0.912 | 0.00075 | 0.999 |
| 10 | 1.601 | 9.95 | 0.00099 | 1608.1 | 1608.8 | 1.103 | 0.00101 |  |
| 12 | 1.959 | 12.1 | 0.00121 | 1607.7 |  | 1.351 | 0.00124 |  |
| 14 | 2.235 | 13.9 | 0.00139 | 1607.5 |  | 1.551 | 0.00139 |  |

Table No.: 5: Linearity data of Mixture at 295.4 nm

| Conc. <br> $(\boldsymbol{\mu g} / \boldsymbol{m l})$ | Abs.(n=5) <br> $(\boldsymbol{n m})$ | Conc. <br> found | Conc. <br> $\boldsymbol{g m} / \mathbf{1 0 0 m l}$ | Absorptivity | Avg. <br> absorptivity | Calz | Slope: <br> 0.160 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 0.1592 | 4.142 | 0.00041 | 384.30 |  | 0.00040 |  |
| 6 | 0.2296 | 5.915 | 0.00059 | 388.14 |  | 0.00058 | Interce |
| 8 | 0.3104 | 7.950 | 0.00079 | 390.43 |  | 0.00079 | pt: |
| 10 | 0.3893 | 9.937 | 0.00099 | 391.76 | 390.10 | 0.00099 | -0.005 |
| 12 | 0.4678 | 11.91 | 0.00119 | 392.65 |  | 0.00119 |  |
| 14 | 0.5565 | 14.14 | 0.00141 | 393.35 |  | 0.00142 | $\mathbf{r}^{2}:$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.9990 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table No.: 6: Spectral and statistical data for determination of Albendazole and Praziquantel by Absorbance Correction Method

| Parameters | Drug (n=5) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Albendazole | Praziquantel |


| Absorption Wavelength | 295.4 nm | 217.0 nm |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Linearity | $\mathrm{y}=0.039 \mathrm{x}-0.005$ | $\mathrm{y}=0.160 \mathrm{x}+0.002$ |
| Precision (\%RSD, NMT 2) | $0.2-0.9$ | $0.2-0.5$ |
| Repeatability | 0.9 | 0.5 |
| Intermediate precision | $0.2-0.7$ | $0.2-1.7$ |
| Accuracy (\%recovery $\pm$ SD*)n=3 | $99.79-101.95$ | $99.09-102.19$ |
| LOD $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml})$ | 1.32 | 1.31 |
| LOQ $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml})$ | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| Specificity | $100.74-101.24$ | $100.15-102.49$ |
| Assay $\left(\% \mathrm{w} / \mathrm{w} \pm \mathrm{SD}^{*}\right) \mathrm{n}=6$ | $100.176 \pm 0.03$ | $100.17 \pm 0.060$ |

### 3.2.2. Limit of detection and limit of quantification:

A limit of detection (LOD) and a limit of quantification (LOQ) were established based on the calibration curve parameters, according to the formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{LOD}=3.3 * \text { S.D/Slope and } \\
& \mathrm{LOQ}=10 * \text { S.D/Slope. (Table } 7)
\end{aligned}
$$

Table No.: 7: Determinations of LOD and LOQ.

| Conc. <br> $(\boldsymbol{\mu g} / \boldsymbol{m l})$ | Abs. $\boldsymbol{a t}$ <br> 217(nm) | Abs. at <br> 295.4(nm) | At 217nm | At 295.4nm |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 0.6499 | 0.1542 | Avg.: 0.6456 | Avg.: 0.1555 |
| 4 | 0.6307 | 0.1569 | S.D*:0.0105 | S.D*: 0.0024 |
| 4 | 0.6339 | 0.1565 | \%R.S.D:1.6344 | \%R.S.D: |
| 4 | 0.6505 | 0.1542 | LOD: 1.31 | 1.51476 |
| 4 | 0.6539 | 0.1592 | LOQ: 4.0 | LOD: 1.32 |
| 4 | 0.6549 | 0.1525 |  | LOQ: 4.0 |

### 3.2.3. Precision:

Precision was measured in terms of repeatability of measurement, performed by injecting the standard solution six times and measure the peak area. The RSD was found to be less than $2.0 \%$ for both ABZ \& PRQ. This shows that Precision of the method is satisfactory which is shown in (Table 8, 9, 10.)

Intermediate Precision: Intermediate Precision with expected results and express as percentage.

Table No.: 8: Determination of Repeatability

| Conc. $(\boldsymbol{\mu g} / \boldsymbol{m l})$ | Abs at 217.0nm | Avg.: 1.616 | Abs at 295.4nm | Avg.: 0.387 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 1.605 | S. $\boldsymbol{D}: 0.009$ | 0.3839 | S. $\boldsymbol{D}: 0.003$ |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 1.608 | \%R.S.D.: 0.5854 | 0.3889 | \%R.S.D.: 0.9012 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 1.6236 |  | 0.3833 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 1.6299 |  | 0.3892 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 1.614 |  | 0.3922 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 1.6192 |  | 0.3855 |  |

Table No.: 9: Determination of Intraday Precision

| CONC. $\boldsymbol{\mu g} / \boldsymbol{m l}$ ) | Abs at 217.Onm |  | Abs at 295.4nm |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 0.3607 | Avg:0.6383 | 0.1469 | Avg:0.1475 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 0.6339 | S.D:0.010 | 0.1465 | S.D:0.001 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 0.6505 | \%R.S.D:1.66 | 0.1492 | \%R.S.D:0.98 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 1.608 | Avg: 1.6152 | 0.3839 | Avg:0.3853 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 1.6236 | S.D:0.007 | 0.3889 | S.D:0.003 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 0.6141 | \%R.S.D:0.48 | 0.3833 | \%R.S.D:0.79 |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | 2.2356 | Avg.: 2.2271 | 0.5565 | Avg.:0.5568 |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | 2.2005 | S.D:0.023 | 0.5579 | S.D:0.0009 |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | 2.2453 | \%R.S.D:1.05 | 0.5562 | \%R.S.D:0.16 |

Table No.: 10: Determination of Interday Precision

| DAY | AT 217.0nm |  |  |  |  | AT 295.4nm |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CONC. <br> (MG/ML) | Avg. | S.D* <br> (n=3) | \%RSD | CONC. <br> (MG/ML) | Avg. | S.D* <br> $(\mathbf{n = 3 )}$ | \%RSD |  |
| 1. | 4 | 0.7759 | 0.0085 | 1.095 | 4 | 0.2030 | 0.0005 | 0.280 |  |
|  | 10 | 1.8008 | 0.0069 | 0.387 | 10 | 0.4761 | 0.001 | 0.366 |  |
|  | 14 | 2.4166 | 0.0403 | 1.670 | 14 | 0.6826 | 0.003 | 0.477 |  |
| 2. | 4 | 0.7769 | 0.0020 | 0.262 | 4 | 0.2111 | 0.001 | 0.521 |  |
|  | 10 | 1.8510 | 0.0068 | 0.368 | 10 | 0.4774 | 0.001 | 0.346 |  |
|  | 14 | 2.4672 | 0.0111 | 0.452 | 14 | 0.6728 | 0.002 | 0.311 |  |
| 3. | 4 | 0.7950 | 0.0140 | 1.763 | 4 | 0.2241 | 0.001 | 0.449 |  |
|  | 10 | 1.8760 | 0.0111 | 0.593 | 10 | 0.4961 | 0.004 | 0.941 |  |
|  | 14 | 2.5131 | 0.0100 | 0.399 | 14 | 0.6895 | 0.005 | 0.744 |  |

### 3.2.4. Accuracy:

The accuracy of the method was determined by the recovery study carried out using standard addition method at three different concentration levels $80 \%, 100 \%$ \& $120 \%$. Resulting spiked sample solutions were assayed in triplicate and the result obtained were compare with
expected result and express as percentage. The mean \% recovery of ABZ and PRQ was found to be in the range 99.79-101.95 \& 98.63-101.68 \% within the acceptance limit which is shown in (Table 11).

Table No.: 11: Accuracy (\% Recovery Study)

| Analytes | No. of Obs. | Amt. <br> Synthetic Mix. Add. ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml}$ ) | $\%$ of <br> Pure <br> Drug <br> Added |  | Total Amt. Found $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml})$ | \%Rec. | Mean \%Rec $\pm$ S.D | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { \%RS } \\ \text { D } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{ABZ} \\ (\mathbf{2 9 5 . 4 n m}) \end{gathered}$ | S1 | 10 | 80\% | 8 | 18.15 | 101.95 | 100.84 | 1.07 |
|  | S2 | 10 | 80\% | 8 | 17.98 | 99.79 | $\pm$ |  |
|  | S3 | 10 | 80\% | 8 | 18.06 | 100.79 | 1.08 |  |
|  | S1 | 10 | 100\% | 10 | 20.13 | 101.36 | 101.02 |  |
|  | S2 | 10 | 100\% | 10 | 20.07 | 100.7 | $\pm$ | 0.33 |
|  | S3 | 10 | 100\% | 10 | 20.1 | 101 | 0.33 |  |
|  | S1 | 10 | 120\% | 12 | 22.18 | 101.5 | 101.0 |  |
|  | S2 | 10 | 120\% | 12 | 22.08 | 100.69 | $\pm$ | 0.43 |
|  | S3 | 10 | 120\% | 12 | 22.09 | 100.89 | 0.43 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { PRQ } \\ (217.0 \mathrm{~nm}) \end{gathered}$ | S1 | 10 | 80\% | 8 | 17.95 | 98.63 | 100.81 | 1.36 |
|  | S2 | 10 | 80\% | 8 | 18.06 | 98.89 | $\pm$ |  |
|  | S3 | 10 | 80\% | 8 | 18.17 | 100.43 | 1.37 |  |
|  | S1 | 10 | 100\% | 10 | 20.12 | 100.18 | 100.34 |  |
|  | S2 | 10 | 100\% | 10 | 19.98 | 100.1 | $\pm$ | 0.76 |
|  | S3 | 10 | 100\% | 10 | 19.99 | 101.68 | 0.76 |  |
|  | S1 | 10 | 120\% | 12 | 21.89 | 99.76 | 100.03 |  |
|  | S2 | 10 | 120\% | 12 | 21.95 | 98.96 | $\pm$ | 1.22 |
|  | S3 | 10 | 120\% | 12 | 22.17 | 101.51 | 1.23 |  |

### 3.2.5. Specificity:

Specificity study was performed by analyzing standard solution in the presence of an excipient (talc). 10 mg each ABZ \& PRQ were spiked with $50 \%$ ( 5 mg ), $100 \%$ ( 10 mg ), and $150 \%$ ( 15 mg ) of talc and the samples were analyzed for ABZ \& PRQ recovery by UVSpectrophotometer. Acceptance criteria for \% interference $<0.5 \%$. Interference was found to be $100.74-101.24 \%$ \& $100.15-102.49 \%$ for ABZ and PRQ respectively which is within the acceptance limit. Hence the excipients do not interfere with the estimation of drug which is shown in (Table 12).

Table No.: 12: Determination of \% Specificity

| Analyte | No. of <br> Obs. | Excipient <br> amount <br> added <br> (mg) | Abs. <br> (nm) | \% <br> Recovery | Avg.\% <br> Recovery | S.D* | \% R.S.D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | S1 | 5 | 1.2681 | 99.82 |  |  |  |
|  | S2 | 5 | 1.2838 | 101.24 | 100.15 | 0.962 | 0.96 |
| Praziquantel | S3 | 5 | 1.2634 | 99.40 |  |  |  |
| (10mg) | S1 | 10 | 1.3002 | 102.72 |  |  |  |
|  | S2 | 10 | 1.3034 | 103.00 | 102.49 | 0.660 | 0.64 |
|  | S3 | 10 | 1.2894 | 101.74 |  |  |  |
|  | S1 | 15 | 1.2645 | 99.50 |  |  |  |
|  | S2 | 15 | 1.294 | 102.16 | 100.16 | 1.758 | 1.75 |
|  | S3 | 15 | 1.2571 | 98.83 |  |  |  |
|  | S1 | 5 | 0.3254 | 102.46 |  |  |  |
|  | S2 | 5 | 0.3239 | 101.96 | 101.24 | 1.702 | 1.68 |
|  | S3 | 5 | 0.3159 | 99.3 |  |  |  |
| (10mg) | S1 | 10 | 0.3259 | 102.63 |  |  |  |
|  | S2 | 10 | 0.3216 | 10.20 | 101.15 | 1.500 | 1.48 |
|  | S3 | 10 | 0.3169 | 99.63 |  |  |  |
|  | S1 | 15 | 0.3241 | 102.03 |  |  |  |
|  | S2 | 15 | 0.3193 | 100.43 | 100.74 | 1.164 | 1.15 |
|  | S3 | 15 | 0.3173 | 99.76 |  |  |  |

### 3.2.6. Sample Stock Solution for Assay

Ten tablets equivalent powdered were mixed in ratio ABZ : PRQ ( 300 mg : 25 mg ). A quantity of synthetic mixture powder equivalent to 65 mg was taken in a 100 ml volumetric flask and diluent was added up to the mark. The solution was sonicated for 5 min . This solution was further diluted to obtain a concentration $12 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ for $\mathrm{ABZ} \& 5 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ for PRQ the result is summarized in (Table 13) and UV Spectra shown in (Fig 12).


Fig: 12- Assay of synthetic mixture.
Table No.: 13: Determination of \% Assay

| Synthetic <br> Mixture | Drug | Label claim mg/tablet | Conc. estimated (mg) | Mean <br> Conc. Estimated (mg) | \%assay $(\mathbf{w} / \mathbf{w})^{ \pm}$ S.D* | \% RSD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Albendazole $+$ | Albendazole | 300mg | $\begin{aligned} & 298.79 \\ & 305.59 \\ & 301.24 \\ & 302.75 \\ & 298.03 \\ & 301.24 \end{aligned}$ | 301.27 | $\begin{aligned} & 100.42 \\ & \pm 0.03 \end{aligned}$ | 0.902 |
| Praziquantel | Praziquantel | 25mg | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 24.46 \\ & 24.58 \\ & 25.23 \\ & 25.36 \\ & 25.40 \\ & 25.21 \end{aligned}$ | 25.044 | $\begin{gathered} 100.17 \\ \pm 0.067 \end{gathered}$ | 1.639 |

## 4. Conclusion:

Linearity was determined at different concentration ABZ and PRQ shows linearity in the concentration range of 4-14 $\mu \mathrm{g} . \mathrm{mL}-1$ for ABZ and PRQ both. The percent recovery both the drugs are within the rage $95-105 \%$ which indicates the method is accurate. The $\%$ RSD values for precision are $<2.0 \%$. Method shows positive response to all validation parameter. The results of the synthetic mixture were found to be $100.42 \pm 0.03 \%$ and $100.17 \pm 0.067 \%$ for ABZ and PRQ respectively. The proposed Absorbance Correction method found to be simple,
rapid and sensitive. Therefore, validated UV spectrophotometric method will play a role for determination of ABZ and PRQ in their combined dosage formulation.
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