International Journal of Enhanced Research in Medicines & Dental Care (IJERMDC),
ISSN: 2349-1590, Vol. 12 Issue 4, April 2025

$Trpv_1$ Modulation in Vitro to Investigate How $Trpv_1$ Activation Affects Mucoregulatory Genes and Goblet Cell Markers

Rohit Maywad[1], Dr Sushila Kaure[2]

[1]Research Scholar, Dept of Pharmacy, Jayoti Vidyapeeth Women's University
[2]Associate Professor, Dept of Pharmacy, Jayoti Vidyapeeth Women's University

ABSTRACT

Both efficacy and toxicity may result from the gut microbiota's direct and indirect impacts on the metabolism of drugs and xenobiotics. In fact, the activation of some prodrugs, such as azo drugs like prontosil and neoprontosil, which release sulfanilamide, depends on microbiome-driven drug metabolism. Apart from serving as a significant source of reductive metabolizing capacity, the gut microbiota also facilitate a variety of other reactions, such as acetylation/deacylation, decarboxylation, dehydroxylation, demethylation, dehalogenation, and—most importantly—conjugate hydrolysis reactions in the context of specific drug-related toxicity types. Apart from direct impacts, the gut microbiota can also have indirect effects on drug metabolism and toxicity through the competition of bacterial-derived metabolites for xenobiotic metabolism pathways and the modification of host drug metabolism and disposition. Naturally, the therapeutic medications themselves may have unintended as well as intentional side effects that affect the gut microbiota's makeup and health, with potentially disastrous results.

Keyword: Decarboxylation, Dehydroxylation, Demethylation, Dehalogenation

1. INTRODUCTION

A habitat and its microbial inhabitants, including their collective genomes and their local environmental settings—that is, the biotic and abiotic elements—but taken into consideration at the microbial scale, can be referred to as a microbiome. The microbiome is a group of microorganisms that are present in a particular study environment, including bacteria, viruses, phages, microbial eukaryotes, and Archaea [1]. Thanks to advances in high throughput sequencing methods, the study of these complex communities has grown significantly in recent years [2]. This has raised interest in how bacteria affect their hosts' health. Since their function as obligatory and facultative symbionts of their hosts has been recognised, microbes are no longer only viewed as pathogens [3]. The "human gut microbiome," or the microbiota community of the human gastrointestinal tract (GIT), has been thoroughly studied in relation to human health. This is because one of the host's largest interfaces with external exposures is the GIT, which has a surface area of about 32 m2, or half the size of a badminton court [4, 5]. With a microbial gene set that is roughly 150 times larger than the human gene complement, bacterial cells are expected to outnumber human cells in an average body [6, 7]. The projected number of species that can reside in the GIT is increasing due to the development of culture-independent and reference-free methods; the most recent metagenomics-based study found 1,953 uncultured candidate microbial species [7]. According to co-phylogeny analysis of microbes with the hosts and host-specific clades, this unusual ecosystem is home to a variety of hitherto unseen specialised species that show human co-evolution with their microbial counterparts [8, 9].

The microbiota that inhabits the many habitats along the small and large intestines (colon) is referred to as the "gut microbiome," even though the GI tract stretches from the mouth to the anus [8]. Lactobacillus, Proteobacteria, and Enterococcus predominate in the small intestine (SI), whereas Bacteroidaceae, Prevotellaceae, Rikenellaceae, Lachnospiraceae, Ruminococcaceae, Streptococcus, Clostridium, Enterococcus, Prevotella, and Fusobacteria predominate in the large intestine (LI) [10]. The gut microbiome is an intricate biological system made up of microbial communities that cooperate with one another as well as with their host [11]. The structure of the microbial community is largely stable in terms of species composition without long-term changes, despite observable overnight changes in the microbiota [12], and a fundamental function of the microbiota is probably still conserved in humans [13].

1.2. Development of the microbiota

Early in life, the GIT is colonised by microorganisms. Although it has been suggested that colonisation starts in the womb through the placenta and amniotic fluid, the methods used to gather these data have been questioned because of their shortcomings and the potential for contamination in the sequencing and sampling instruments [14, 15]. Birth is a crucial stage in the seeding of the ecosystem, as evidenced by the disparities between infants born via caesarean section and vaginal birth [16]. Early in life, the mother's influence on the microbial community persists because of breast milk feeding. The fermentation of human milk oligosaccharides (HMOs), important components of breast milk, is aided by the predominance of Bifidobacterium in the newborn gut [17]. A more stable microbial community structure develops after weaning and the introduction of solid foods, reflecting the adult microbiota composition that is dominated by Firmicutes and Bacteroidetes [18, 19]. Lifelong interactions with the gut microbiota are believed to be mostly determined by early environmental exposures (such as food, illnesses, and antibiotics) [17], and significant inter-individual differences are evident in maturity [20]. The ensuing "climax-community" is a complicated web of cross-talk and mutualistic relationships that reveals more significant inter-individual differences [11].

1.3 Statement Of The Problem

A rapidly developing field of study with significant ramifications for personalized medicine is the dynamic interplay between gut microorganisms and pharmacological drugs. However, this emerging field faces a number of obstacles: The most significant obstacle concerns standardization. In order to guarantee consistent study results, it is crucial to establish rigorously regulated techniques for examining interactions between the gut microbiota and medications. This calls for the strict implementation of consistent protocols for data analysis and interpretation, as well as the standardization of approaches covering sample collection, storage, and processing. The ethical aspect is a second crucial concern. A complicated web of ethical issues arises when the gut microbiota is purposefully altered for medicinal objectives. These worries include privacy, informed permission, and the possibility of personal health information being misused. In order to guarantee the security and effectiveness of interventions based on the microbiome, the field of regulatory concerns also deserves attention. Furthermore, a broad research agenda and stringent validation protocols are necessary for the clinical implementation of microbiome-based therapies. This effort includes the crucial duties of proving the effectiveness of such treatments in extensive clinical studies, deciphering their complex mechanisms of action, and examining any possible adverse effects.

Although there are many difficulties in researching how medications and gut microbes interact, there are also a number of exciting directions for further investigation in this area. It is crucial that future research focus on understanding the complex mechanisms underlying drug-gut bacterial interactions, developing new methods for modifying the gut microbiota, and investigating potential therapeutic uses resulting from these interactions. Addressing these challenges could improve our understanding of MDI and make it easier to incorporate targeted/microbiome-based therapies into clinical practice.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Rai, Vishal & Shobhit, Prakash & Gupta, Yash & Trivedi, Adarsh & Khan, Soban & Yadav, Reena & Bano, Nisha. (2023). This thorough analysis explores the emerging knowledge on how the gut microbiota affects medication metabolism and treatment effectiveness, clarifying the possible ramifications for customized medicine. It is becoming more and more clear as our knowledge of the gut microbiome develops that individual differences in gut microbial communities are crucial in determining how drugs work. Drug metabolism is changed by microbial enzymes, which also affect pharmacokinetics and bioavailability. Additionally, treatment outcomes, including therapeutic efficacy and toxicity, can be greatly impacted by the complex interactions between the gut microbiota and drug-metabolizing pathways. Making use of this information creates opportunities for personalized medicine, wherein gut microbiota profiling is used to create customized medication regimens. Through microbiome manipulation, probiotics, prebiotics, and fecal microbiota transplantation offer promising therapeutic approaches for maximizing medication efficacy. In order to promote a better understanding of the gut microbiome's significance in medication metabolism, this review compiles the most recent scientific findings, talks about clinical case studies, and tackles regulatory issues. This review opens the door to fully utilizing customized medicine through microbiome-driven innovations by investigating the possible integration of microbiome analysis in medication development.

Shuaib, Faiza & Ali, Anwar & Khan, Imran & Ahmad, Ayaz & Khan, Zarghuna & Amanullah,. (2023). The gut microbiota, a naturally occurring collection of microorganisms that live in the digestive tract, is thought to number in the billions. It is becoming more widely recognized for its role in drug metabolism and the impact it has on the toxicity and effectiveness of medications. Individual disparities in drug response and treatment processes are caused by variations in the gut microbiota's composition.The goals are to assess how the gut microbiota affects drug metabolism and results, examine how the microbiome affects therapeutic outcomes, and find microbial markers that predict different therapeutic outcomes.A cross-sectional study was used as the study design.The study was conducted from January 2022 to January 2023 in the Department of Biochemistry, Saidu Medical College, Swat KP, Pakistan.Methodology: A sample of 150 patients was gathered for this investigation. 16S rRNA analysis was used to examine the bacterial structure in the gut, and blood plasma samples collected at the appropriate intervals were used to

assess medication metabolism. Standard deviations and p-values, respectively, were used to properly examine the significance of the results after patients were categorized based on their drug efficacy performance and statistical comparisons were performed to assess the correlations.Findings: In terms of SD (.35, $p < 0.05$), a greater number of bacterial strains among the 150 patients was likewise linked to better medication results. There was a group difference when the drug metabolism rates in the two groups were compared (SD = 0.28, p = 0.01). They discovered that patients with longer and more intricate bacterial signatures fared better throughout treatment than individuals with less varied gut bacterial counts.The study's conclusion is that there is a direct correlation between the gut bacteria makeup and the efficacy and efficiency of drug metabolism. Additionally, it might aid in the discovery of microbial biomarkers that could enhance therapy results, increase adherence to personalized treatment regimens, and lessen adverse effects.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Given this context, the research presented primarily focuses on investigating the connection between TRPV1 and the regulation of gut mucus, the ensuing impact on host-gut microbiota interactions, and the potential of dietary mucus modulation in preventing diet-induced metabolic disorders. In light of the aforementioned, the following goals guided the experimental investigations:

1. TRPV1 modulation in vitro to investigate how TRPV1 activation affects mucoregulatory genes and goblet cell markers.

4. METHODOLOGY AND WORK PLAN

Preparation of GRDDS of Losartan potassium and Alfuzosin Hydrochloride
In the current work, wet granulation strategy has been utilized to get ready GRDDS of Losartan potassium and Alfuzosin Hydrchloride with hydroxy propyl methyl cellulose (HPMC) of various thickness grades, (viscosities 4,000cps, 15,000cps) and different polymers like arbopol 934P and sodium alginate, each with various medication to polymer proportions according to the arrangement. Lactose and microcrystalline cellulose were utilized as diluents alongside sodium bicarbonate and citrus extract as gas producing specialists and PVP (3%w/v arrangement) as fastener, magnesium stearate was utilized as ointment and powder as a glidant.

Procedure for preparation of GRDDS of Losartan potassium and Alfuzosin Hydrochloride
Every one of the fixings were precisely gauged, went through sifter no. 60 and moved to a perfect porcelain mortar with the exception of magnesium stearate and powder. PVP (3% w/v) restricting arrangement is added to the blend in the mortar in little amounts, exhaustive blending of the combination is done arbo a reasonable mass is framed. Then, at that point, it is gone through sifter no.12 and the wet granules were spread on a paper and dried in hot air broiler at 300C-400C for 30 minutes.

Tablets were packed on a revolving punching machine (Clit pilot press) utilizing level surfaced, round molded punches of 8mm and 9mm measurement.

5. RESULTS AND DATA INTERPRETATION

Preparation of GR HBS capsules of HCTZ
Following the procedure employed by “Ali et al.” for the production of single unit HBS capsules of Metformin 300,303, a variety of single unit GR HBS capsules of HCTZ were made with the aid of various low density polymers. Every component was meticulously weighed using an AXIS-LCGC electronic balance. After being thoroughly mixed, the materials were put into hard gelatin capsules. The weight of the substances used and the overall weight of the capsules are attached in “table 17.”

Table 5.1: Composition of GR HBS capsules of HCTZ

Formulation code	Carbopol 974P	Sodium CMC	HPMC K15M	HPMC K4M	Ethyl cellulose	Methyl cellulose	Eudragit S 100	Eudragit L 100	Drug (HCTZ)	Total weight (mg)
F IH	150.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	50.00	200

F IIH	75.00	---	---	---	75.00	---	---	---	50.00	200
F IIIH	75.00	---	---	---	---	75.00	---	---	50.00	200
F IVH	75.00	75.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	50.00	200
F VH	75.00	---	75.00	---	---	---	---	---	50.00	200
F VIH	50.00	50.00	---	---	50.00	---	---	---	50.00	200
F VIIH	50.00	---	---	50.00	50.00	---	---	---	50.00	200
F VIIIH	50.00	---	50.00	---	---	50.00	---	---	50.00	200
F IXH	50.00	50.00	---	---	---	50.00	---	---	50.00	200
F XH	---	150.00	---	---	---	---	---	---	50.00	200
F XIH	---	75.00	75.00	---	---	---	---	---	50.00	200
F XIIH	---	75.00	---	---	---	75.00	---	---	50.00	200
F XIIIH	---	50.00	50.00	---	---	50.00	---	---	50.00	200
F XIVH	---	75	---	75	---	---	---	---	50.00	200
F XVH	---	---	75.00	---	75.00	---	---	---	50.00	200
F XVIH	---	---	100.00	---	50.00	---	---	---	50.00	200
F XVIIH	---	---	125.00	---	25.00	---	---	---	50.00	200
F XVIIIH	---	---	137.50	---	12.50	---	---	---	50.00	200
F XIXH	---	---	12.50	---	137.50	---	---	---	50.00	200
F XXH	---	---	75.00	---	---	75.00	---	---	50.00	200
F XXIH	---	---	50.00	---	---	50.00	50.00	---	50.00	200
F XXIIH	---	---	75.00	---	---	---	75.00	---	50.00	200
F XXIIIH	---	---	100.00	---	---	---	50.00	---	50.00	200
F XXIVH	---	---	112.50	---	---	---	37.50	---	50.00	200
F XXVH	---	---	75.00	---	---	---	---	75.00	50.00	200

F XXVIH	---	---	50	---	---	50	---	50	50	200
F XXVIIH	---	---	---	75	---	75	---	---	50	200
F XXVIIIH	---	---	---	50	---	50		50	50	200
F XXIXH	---	---	200.00	---	---	---	---	---	50.00	250
F XXXH	---	---	100.00	---	---	---	100.00	---	50.00	250
F XXXIH	---	---	133.33	---	---	---	66.67	---	50.00	250
F XXXIIH	---	---	150.00	---	---	---	50.00	---	50.00	250
F XXXIIIH	---	---	66.67	---	---	---	133.33	---	50.00	250
F XXXIVH	---	---	50.00	---	---	---	150.00	---	50.00	250
F XXXVH	---	---	250.00	---	---	---	---		50.00	300

Pre-formulation studies for the selection/ screening of polymers and weight adjustment of the GR HBS capsules of HCTZ

HCTZ and a number of low-density polymers, including 11arbopol 974P, sodium carboxymethylcellulose (NaCMC), HPMC K4M, HPMC K15M, methylcellulose, ethylcellulose, eudragit S100, and eudragit L100, were tested for buoyancy and matrix integrity in vitro as part of the pre-formulation studies. In order to determine the ideal weight for the formulation development of GR HBS capsules, the capsule fill weight was also adjusted during the trial from 200 to 300 mg.

CONCLUSION

Creating gastroretentive hydrodynamically adjusted frameworks (GR HBS) of propranolol HCl (unreservedly dissolvable; BCS Class I medication) and hydrochlorothiazide (HCTZ) (sparingly solvent, BCS class IV medication) as single unit drifting containers was the point of the ongoing examination. The previously mentioned framework was made utilizing various low thickness polymers. The review utilized plans made with HPMC and eudragit on the grounds that they created empowering results.

The medicine and polymers were actually mixed in various proportions to make HBS containers. Involving SGF without pepsin and SGF as disintegration media in mimicked quick state gastric liquid and citrate phosphate cushion pH 3 as a disintegration medium in took care of state gastric liquid, the plans were enhanced in light of in vitro lightness, network uprightness, and in vitro discharge. Moreover, on account of HCTZ GR HBS containers, drug delivery, lightness, and lattice honesty were surveyed in citrate phosphate support pH 3 with 0.5% SLS. The wetting/solubilizing activity of regular surface dynamic substances, including phospholipids, in the gastrointestinal plot was thought about by utilizing surfactant.

Both HCTZ GR HBS containers and propranolol HCl GR HBS cases were tried for maximal (100 percent) drug conveyance more than a 12-hour time span involving in-vitro discharge tests and the effect of a delivery modifier (lactose).

Utilizing a 32 factorial plan, the impacts of detailing factors on drug discharge, drifting time, and grid trustworthiness were researched. On account of HCTZ (poor fluid dissolvable) GR HBS containers, drug discharge (in SGF without pepsin and SGF) at first expanded with the expansion in HPMC level, but the outcomes demonstrated that the medication discharge rate diminished as the HPMC K15M level expanded. Despite the fact that adding eudragit S100 to GR HBS case definitions of the two meds further developed their network uprightness and lightness to a healthy degree, eudragit focuses and levels over a specific limit were found to make unfriendly impacts (i.e., diminished lattice respectability, lightness/drifting time, and expanded drug discharge rate). The ongoing review reached the determination that, up until a basic focus is reached, a slow expansion in eudragit level outcomes in a customary

expansion in network honesty and lightness and a reduction in drug discharge rate. From that point forward, any extra eudragit level increment causes a reduction in network honesty and lightness as well as an expansion in drug discharge rate.

REFERENCES

1. Jr., L. V. A., Popovich, N. G. & Ansel, H. C. *Ansel's pharmaceutical dosage forms and drug delivery systems*. (Philadelphia-Baltimore, Lippincott Williams and Wilkins, 2011).
2. Bruschi, M. L. *Strategies to modify the drug release from pharmaceutical systems*. (Woodhead Publishing Limited, 2011).
3. Allen, T. M. & Cullis, P. R. in *Science* **303,** 1818–1823 (2004).
4. Raza, S. & Khan, N. Gastric retention – an innovative approach to increase bioavailability. *Int. J. Biol. Pharm. Allied Sci.* **3,** 113–133 (2014).
5. Awasthi, R. & Kulkarni, G. T. Decades of research in drug targeting to the upper gastrointestinal tract using gastroretention technologies : where do we stand ? *Drug Deliv.* **23,** 378–394 (2014).
6. Chawla, G., Gupta, P., Koradia, V. & Bansal, A. K. Gastroretention a means to address regional variability in intestinal drug absorption. *Pharm. Technol.* 50–68 (2003).
7. Sharma, N., Agarwal, D., Gupta, M. K. & Khinchi, M. P. A comprehensive review on floating drug delivery system. *Int. J. Res. Pharm. Biomed. Sci.* **2,** 428–441 (2011).
8. Arora, S., Ali, J., Ahuja, A., Khar, R. K. & Baboota, S. Floating drug delivery systems: a review. *AAPS PharmSciTech* **6,** E372-90 (2005).
9. Mandal, U. K., Chatterjee, B. & Senjoti, F. G. Gastro-retentive drug delivery systems and their in vivo success: A recent update. *Asian J. Pharm. Sci.* **11,** 575–584 (2016).
10. Kotreka, U. K. & Adeyeye, M. C. Gastroretentive floating drug-delivery systems: A critical review. *Crit. Rev. Ther. Drug Carr. Syst.* **28,** 47–99 (2011).
11. Fell, J. T. Targeting of drugs and delivery systems to specific sites in the gastrointestinal tract. *J. Anat.* **189 (Pt 3,** 517–519 (1996).
12. Culen, M., Rezacova, A., Jampilek, J. & Dohnal, J. Designing a dynamic dissolution method : A review of instrumental options and corresponding physiology of stomach and small intestine. *J. Pharm. Sci.* 1–23 (2013). doi:10.1002/jps
13. Banker, G. S. & Rhodes, C. T. *Modern Pharmaceutics*. (Marcel Dekker, 2002).
14. Deshpande, A. A., Rhodes, C. T., Shah, N. H. & Malick, A. W. Controlled-Release Drug Delivery Systems for Prolonged Gastric Residence : An Overview. *Drug Dev. Ind. Pharm.* **22,** 531–539 (1996).
15. Narang, N. An updated review on: Floating drug delivery system (FDDS). *Int. J. Appl. Pharm.* **3,** 1–7 (2011).
16. Labu, Z. K. *et al.* Glimpse of comprehensive review on floating drug delivery system. *Int. J. Chemitry Pharm. Sci.* **2,** 581–596 (2014).
17. McGuigan, J. E., Isaza, J. & Landor, J. H. Relationships of gastrin dose, serum gastrin, and acid secretion. *Gastroenterology* **61,** 659–66 (1971).
18. Walsh, J. H. Role of Gastrin as a Trophic Hormone. *Digestion* **47,** 11–16 (1990).
19. Sathish, D., Himabindu, S., Kumar, Y. S., Shayeda & Rao, Y. M. Floating drug delivery systems for prolonging gastric residence time: a review. *Curr. Drug Deliv.* **8,** 494–510 (2011).
20. Karna, S., Chaturvedi, S., Agrawal, V. & Alim, M. Formulation approaches for sustained release dosage forms: a review. *Asian J Pharm Clin Res* **8,** 46–53 (2015).