

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 1.1. Cardinal signs of inflammation.....	6
Fig. 1.2. The two faces of phagocytosis. The non-inflammatory clearance of apoptotic cells a) compared with the pro-inflammatory ingestion of necrotic cells and debris (b) macrophages recognize apoptotic cells through specific cell-surface receptors.....	11
Fig. 1.3. Mediators in the process of inflammation.....	13
Fig. 1.4. NF- κ B activation in response to pro-inflammatory stimuli.....	14
Fig. 1.5. Complement activation pathways.....	17
Fig. 1.6. Mechanism of action of NSAIDs.....	23
Fig. 1.7. Classification of NSAIDs based on COX specificity.....	23
Fig. 1.8. Chemical structure of diclofenac sodium.....	28
Fig. 1.9. Metabolites of diclofenac.....	29
Fig. 1.10. Schematic representation of potential nanoconstruct designs in a nutshell.....	31
Fig. 1.11. Different ways of producing crystalline and amorphous starch nanoparticles.....	35
Fig. 1.12. Structure of hydroxyethyl starch.....	37
Fig. 1.13. The three elements for translational nanomedicine.....	39
Fig. 2.1. Schematic representation of the preparation of stabilized HES Nps.....	48
Fig. 2.2. Size characterization: a) DLS and b) SEM of lecithin stabilized DS loaded HES Nps.....	49
Fig. 2.3. <i>In vitro</i> release kinetics of DS from HES matrix showing high burst at the initial time point.....	49
Fig. 2.4. Comparative Raman spectra of a) HES b) STMP c) CHES d) Lecithin and e) HES Np.....	51
Fig. 2.5. Schematic representation of the preparation of stable HES nanoparticles.....	52
Fig. 2.6. Influence of a) STMP, b) solvent : anti-solvent ratio and c) stabilizer on particle size.....	52

Fig. 2.7. Size and morphological characterization of HES Nps using a) DLS, b) AFM and SEM c) before and d) after lyophilization.....	53
Fig. 2.8. Colloidal stability analysis of HES Nps in various media such as MilliQ water, 10% serum, 0.9% saline and PBS for a period of 48 hours.....	55
Fig. 2.9. Schematic depiction of drug loading into HES nanoparticles.....	55
Fig. 2.10. Influence of a) polymer:drug, b) solvent:anti-solvent ratio and c) STMP concentration on entrapment efficiency of diclofenac sodium.....	56
Fig. 2.11. a) DLS and b) SEM of diclofenac sodium loaded HES nanoparticles..	56
Fig. 2.12. Chemical characterization of Nanodiclo by a) FTIR and b) XRD.....	57
Fig. 2.13. <i>In vitro</i> drug release of Nanodiclo.....	58
Fig. 3.1. Cell viability assay on a) macrophages (RAW 264.7) and b) lymphocytes.....	70
Fig. 3.2. Quantitative plots of <i>in vitro</i> hemocompatibility.....	73
Fig. 3.3. Quantitative estimation of a) immunoproliferation and b) immunosuppression. Optical images of c) NC, d) PC, lymphocyte proliferation of e) HES Np and f) Nanodiclo and lymphocyte suppression of g) HES Np and h) Nanodiclo at 1mg/ml concentration shows comparable results with the controls.....	74
Fig. 3.4. Quantitative estimation of the amount of nitric oxide induced by bare and nano forms of diclofenac sodium.....	75
Fig. 3.5. Anti-inflammatory activity of a) bare DS and b) Nanodiclo at 24 and 48 hours.....	75
Fig. 3.6. Quantitative estimate of a) <i>in vitro</i> and b) <i>in vivo</i> cytokine induction by HES Nps showing induction levels comparable to that of NC.....	77
Fig. 3.7. Representative images for piloerection of a) bare DS and b) Nanodiclo.....	78
Fig. 3.8. Photographs of the tails of a) untreated (control), b) bare DS and c) Nanodiclo treated animals at 50mg/kg b.w.....	79
Fig. 3.9. Biochemical assays to understand hepato-renal toxicity a) AST and b) Urea levels of Nanodiclo in comparison with bare DS.....	80

Fig. 3.10. Graph showing the WBC count of bare DS and Nanodiclo where significant reduction in the count is observed for animals treated with 25 and 50 mg/kg b.w. of bare DS.....	81
Fig. 3.11. Histopathological images of kidney for animals treated with a) bare DS and b) Nanodiclo at 40x.....	82
Fig. 3.12. Histopathological images of liver for animals treated with a) bare DS and b) Nanodiclo at 40x.....	83
Fig. 4.1. Schematic representation of the protocol for pharmacokinetics study....	87
Fig. 4.2. Schematic representation of the protocol for biodistribution study.....	88
Fig. 4.3. Schematic representation of the pharmacodynamics study protocol.....	89
Fig. 4.4. Pharmacokinetic profiles of Bare DS, Voveran and ND at 2.5 mg/kg b.w.....	90
Fig. 4.5. <i>In vivo</i> pharmacokinetic profile of nanodiclo (ND) and PEGylated nanodiclo (P ND).....	91
Fig. 4.6. Comparison of <i>in vivo</i> pharmacokinetic profiles of ND, ND ER and P ND.....	92
Fig. 4.7. <i>In vivo</i> pharmacokinetic profiles of PEGylated excipient removed nanodiclo (PND ER), non-PEGylated excipient removed nanodiclo (ND ER) and Nanodiclo (ND).....	93
Fig. 4.8. Comparison of the <i>in vivo</i> pharmacokinetic profiles of bare drug, voveran and PND ER.....	94
Fig. 4.9. <i>In vivo</i> pharmacokinetic profiles of bare drug, voveran, non-PEGylated (ND) and PEGylated nanodiclo (PND) at 15.4 mg/kg b.w.....	95
Fig. 4.10. Comparison of the <i>in vivo</i> PK profiles of PND at 2.5 and 15.4 mg/kg b.w.....	96
Fig. 4.11. <i>In vivo</i> pharmacokinetic profiles of ND ER at 2.5 and 15.4 mg/kg b.w.....	96
Fig. 4.12. <i>In vivo</i> pharmacokinetic profiles of a) PEGylated excipient removed nanodiclo (PND ER) and excipient removed nanodiclo (ND ER) at 15.4 mg/kg b.w.....	96
Fig. 4.13. Comparison of the <i>in vivo</i> PK profiles of PND ER at 2.5 and 15.4 mg/kg b.w.....	98

Fig. 4.14. Tissue distribution analyses of bare DS at 2.5 and 15.4 mg/kg b.w. doses in a) heart, b) lungs, c) liver, d) kidney and e) spleen for a period of 24 hours.....	99
Fig. 4.15. Tissue distribution analyses of nanodiclo (PNDER) at 2.5 and 15.4 mg/kg b.w. doses in a) heart, b) lungs, c) liver, d) kidney and e) spleen for a period of 120 hours.....	100
Fig. 4.16. The distribution of blood flow via systemic and pulmonary circulation.....	101
Fig. 4.17. Quantitative analysis of level of edema in millimeters at 2.5 mg/kg b.w. from 0-96 hours.....	103
Fig. 4.18. Quantitative analysis of level of edema in millimeters at 15.4 mg/kg b.w. from 0-96 hours.....	105
Fig. 4.19. A comparison between the pharmacodynamic profiles of PEGylated excipient removed samples at 2.5 and 15.4 mg/kg b.w.....	106