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#### Abstract

Falsified or substandard medicines can present a health hazard to us. We have been attempting to clarify how often we might encounter such medicines and also to identify the specific features of defects to find clues for improvement. Despite of our results, much remains to be studied. Therefore, we reviewed the quality of medicines for lifestyle diseases in Cambodia for three years, and the quality of antimicrobial medicines in Cambodia for four years. In addition, we surveyed counterfeit or substandard medicines in Yangon, Myanmar survey in 2014 for collecting more data.

We conducted a four-year and three-year study to evaluate the quality of selected antimicrobials and lifesaving medicines and to examine the prevalence of falsified or substandard antimicrobial and lifesaving medicines in Cambodia, aiming to promote efforts to improve the quality of medicines. We collected samples of clarithromycin, sulfamethoxazole/trimethoprim, ceftriaxone, cefuroxime, levofloxacin, gentamicin, ciprofloxacin, fluconazole, nalidixic acid, ofloxacin, phenoxymethyl penicillin and roxithromycin medicines as well as cimetidine, amlodipine, esomeprazole, rabeprazole, glibenclamide and metformin from pharmacies, Depot-A, Depot-B, wholesalers and non-licenced drug outlets in five provinces (rural areas) and Phnom Penh (an urban area), during 2011 to 2014 (antimicrobial) and 2011 to 2013 (lifesaving). The authenticity of the collected medicines was investigated, and the medicines were


analyzed to determine whether they met the appropriate pharmacopoeial standards. We collected 647 samples, produced by 179 manufacturers, from 353 outlets. Only 51 (15\%) of the outlets were air-conditioned. We found different-coloured packaging of the same brand (different lots) of products from some manufacturers. The insert information of one sample was different from the package information. Twelve (1.9\%) samples were not officially registered with DDF. In authenticity investigation, 43 of 179 manufacturers replied and confirmed the authenticity of 154 samples (out of 647); also, 18 out of 54 MRAs replied to enquiries about whether products were licensed or not (one was not). Among the samples, 84 (16.5\%), 58 (12.5\%) and 47 (8.1\%) failed in dissolution, content uniformity and quality tests, respectively. Samples of cefuroxime and roxithromycin that failed were significantly cheaper than those that passed. Poorquality antimicrobial medicines were found in Cambodian markets, though no falsified medicines were detected. Manufacturers should be encouraged to improve GMP implementation. Storage conditions in the distribution chain may also need to be improved. Continuous efforts by MRAs are needed to ensure that medicines are properly licensed.

In the case of three-year survey, we found 342 samples ( 223 from Phnom Penh) were collected from 263 outlets; among them, 32 (9.4\%) had no inserts, and 14 (4.1\%) were not registered with DDF. 38 (11.1\%) were domestically produced. The containers
of one amlodipine and three cimetidine samples were different from those of authentic samples. Nonstandard inserts were found in two samples (amlodipine and metformin). Only 21/81 manufacturers and 16/35 MRAs replied during authenticity investigation. In quality evaluation, $38(11.1 \%), 52(15.2 \%)$ and $48(14 \%)$ samples failed dissolution, content uniformity and quantity tests, respectively. The failure rate in quality tests was significantly associated with the results of visual analysis of samples. Poor-quality medicines were prevalent in Cambodia in 2011-2013. Further surveys should be conducted to monitor the situation. Measures are desirable to improve the quality of domestically manufactured products.

We also investigate the current situation of substandard or counterfeit medicines in Myanmar. Samples of oral medicines, cefuroxime axetil (CXM), donepezil hydrochloride (DN) and omeprazole (OM), and injections, ceftriaxone sodium (CTRX) and gentamicin sulfate (GM), were collected from pharmacies, hospitals and wholesalers in Yangon, Myanmar in 2014. Authenticity and registration were verified. Quality tests of samples were performed according to the pharmacopeia indicated on the label. There were 221 ( $94 \%$ ) foreign medicines among 235 samples collected from 75 locations. Five samples of GM and 1DN sample were not registered with Myanmar Food and Drug Administration (MFDA). In quality analysis, 36 samples out of 177 (20.3\%) did not pass quantity tests, 27 samples out of 176 (15.3\%) did not pass content
uniformity tests, and 23 out of 128 samples (18.0\%) did not pass dissolution tests. Three of the unregistered GM samples failed in both identification and microbial assay tests. Counterfeit GM is being sold in Yangon. Also, the quality of OM is a matter of concern, and requires follow-up. Poor-quality medicines were frequently found among the products of a few manufacturers. Regular surveys to monitor counterfeit and substandard medicines in Myanmar are recommended.

We found that poor-quality medicines are the urgent problems in Cambodia and Myanmar, even though the medicines were not counterfeit. Serious dissolution failure is the dominant problem in these countries. It is necessary to collect more information of such medicines, and to analyze the characteristics of the data for preventing health hazards caused by falsified or substandard medicines.
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## General Introduction:

Medicine is one of the most essential elements especially for human being to survive in the in the world. People used different types of plants for their treatments before 5000 years [1] however, now in modern world patients are using biotech medicines like as insulin, interferon, interleukin and so on [2]. Sir Alexander Fleming discovered the benzylpenicillin (Penicillin G) from the mould Penicillium_notatum in 1928 [3], since then patients in the world wants to use particular elements (active ingredient) for their treatments. From the historical reason and requirement in the world manufacturers are producing lot of medicines and supplying to the markets. Some manufacturers are taking a chance and preparing counterfeit or falsified or poor quality medicines and supply to the markets. These types of medicines are accessed in both developed and developing countries [4-6]. One investigation was occurred and found around $1 \%$ and $10 \%$ in developed and developing countries, respectively [7]. People are suffering and even died due to effect of counterfeit / falsified / substandard / poor quality medicines which evidences were already established in the world [8-10]. Perception from the above of story the governments of Myanmar and Cambodian were started more than one collaborative projects with Kanazawa University investigated to observe their own situations and evaluate the quality of selected medicines through different surveys.

Chapter One:
An investigation into the quality of medicines in Yangon, Myanmar survey in 2014

### 1.1 Introduction

Medicines are the most essential elements especially for human beings for surviving their lives in this world. It is almost impossible to imagine the remedy of human body from various diseases without taking good quality of medicines. Deliberately, many pharmaceuticals have been producing counterfeit medicines and supply to the patients as well as they are taking a chance to earn more money by producing such detrimental counterfeit medicines and even extending their imposture day by day. This is also happening in both developed and developing countries [4-6]. In this vast sector it is very difficult to optimize the counterfeit medicines. Depending on geographic region the range of counterfeit drugs supply to the developed countries as well as the rising countries are about $1 \%$ and $10 \%$, respectively [7]. Another investigation from the World Health Organization (WHO) about 20\%-90\% falsified medicines were found in several Africa countries [11, 12]. The incidence due to counterfeit medicines were estimated in Cambodia with the range of 4\%-90\% from 2001 to 2010 [13-16]. Furthermore, owing to fake medicines around 200 children were died in Bangladesh in 1990-1993 ingesting counterfeit paracetamol that contained diethylene glycol [17].

In Myanmar, a massive investigation occurred by World Health Organization (WHO) in 1999 and caught counterfeit medicines [18]. It is very difficult to identify such
counterfeit medicines however it is also possible to buy good quality medicines. The problem is that the sellers demand extra money for good quality medicines which is illegal and unethical. For this reason, an emergency cases, people suffer or may die for the prevalence of counterfeit drugs [17, 19]. In most cases the patients from developing counties do not want or cannot fulfill antibiotic courses due to their economic crisis. Thus the misuses or inadequate doses of antibiotics may guide them to the advance of resistance [20] while support the extra food demands of the rising population of the world antibiotics are using in husbandry sectors specially in poultry industry as a growth promoter and transmitted to the human that is occurred resistance by several types of microorganisms particularly in bacteria [21, 22].

Counterfeiting or poor quality antibiotic is Worldwide spreading that is one of the biggest and vital factors and is making sub-inhibitory concentrations naturally and enhance the selection of resistant strains from various types of microorganisms [23, 24].

### 1.2 Aim of This Work

People in low income countries are suffering in counterfeit or poor quality medicines in their daily life. People in this type of country are almost depending on foreign country medicines. In 1999, a massive investigation occurred by WHO to evaluate the quality of medicines and found counterfeit medicines in Myanmar. Since then there
were no systematic survey conducted on medicines in Myanmar. We want to investigate the quality of medicines which associate outlet condition, outlet types, price of medicine, type of medicines (domestically produced or not) and medicines entered in to Myanmar that is needed to fulfil Myanmar government policies. Finally, we suggested to the government of Myanmar how to remove counterfeit or poor quality medicines from Myanmar markets.

### 1.3 Sample Collection

From the suggestions of Myanmar FDA (MFDA), we selected a populated region as well as from the MFDA essential drugs list, we selected five types of medicines. Samples of oral medicines, cefuroxime axetil (CXM) [25], donepezil hydrochloride (DN) and omeprazole (OM) [26] and injections, ceftriaxone sodium (CTRX) and gentamicin sulfate (GM) [27] were purchased during 27 September- 4 October 2014 by two teams from Yangon, Myanmar (Annex 1.1). Each team consisted of one supervisor from MFDA, one local assistant and one or two Japanese researcher (s). All team members received training before starting the sampling work. During the sampling period, we maintain a sampling form for each number of samples (Annex 1.2). We collected samples from the governmental hospital and private hospital as well as community pharmacies, clinical
pharmacies and wholesalers. Obtained samples were stored at $20-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ before analyzed in Kanazawa University, Japan.

### 1.3.1 Observation Analysis

During the sampling we observed room conditions like as temperature, humidity and also observed in both internal and external environmental conditions around the surrounding of the retail shops. After sampling, the obtained samples were checked physical shape, size of sample volume or shape, uniform colour, insert, spelling, registration number from MFDA, manufacturing date, expire date, lot no., name of active ingredient, doses form etc. that were utilized in the form of the "Tool for Visual Inspection of Medicines" (Annex 1.3) [28]. For establishing the evidences, photographs were taken for each samples with scanned insert and the sample box.

### 1.3.2 Sample Authenticity Investigation

The authenticity investigation and registration verification was performed according to the modification method of World Health Organization (WHO) [16]. We asked some questions to the responsible manufacturers by using a form (annex 1.4) with sent scan copy of the samples box, samples photographs and insert of the sample by Email (annex 1.5). At the same time, we asked to the Medicine Regulatory Authority
(MRA) of each country regarding the medicines were registered or not (annex 1.6). While, we asked to the MFDA about obtaining medicines were registered or not.

### 1.3.3 Samples for Chemical Analysis

Samples were evaluated according to the pharmacopeia that mentioned on the package of the samples. In the following method we used and evaluated our collected samples. Our collected cefuroxime samples 250 mg tablets were performed dissolution, content uniformity and quantity test. To determine the amount of cefuroxime ( $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{8} \mathrm{~S}$ ) dissolved by employing UV absorption at the wavelength of maximum absorbance at 278 nm on filtered portions of the solution under test, suitably diluted with dissolution medium 0.07 N Hydrochloric Acid; 900 ml , if necessary, in comparison with a standard solution having a known concentration of UPS cefuroxime axetil RS, equivalent to about 0.01 to 0.02 mg of cefuroxime $\left(\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{8} \mathrm{~S}\right)$ per ml , in the same medium. 55 rpm (for test 1 ) and 100 rpm (for test 2 ) were used during the dissolution test, while samples considered at 15 and 45 minutes not less than $60 \%, 75 \%$ for $1^{\text {st }}$ stage and $50 \%, 70 \%$ for $2^{\text {nd }}$ stage gradually. 0.2 M monobasic ammonium phosphate (purchased from Nakalai Tesque Kyoto, Japan) dissolve 23.0 gm of monobasic ammonium phosphate in water to preparer 1000 ml of solution. 620 ml solution were taken from 1000 ml and added 380 ml methanol (Wako, Japan) to make 1000 ml mobile phase. 5.4 mg
acetanilide dissolved in per ml methanol to preparer internal standard solution. For Resolution Solution, mix 10.0 ml of a solution of USP cefuroxime axetil RS in methanol containing 1.2 mg per ml then transfer in a 50 ml volumetric flask and including of 5.0 ml of internal standard solution with 3.8 ml of a solution of cefuroxime axetil Delta-3 Isomers RS in a methanol containing 0.16 mg per ml . Finally, to fill with dilute with 0.2 M monobasic ammonium phosphate to make the target the volume, and well mix. For standard preparation, transfer 30 mg of USP cefuroxime axetil RS to a 25 ml volumetric flask dissolve dilute to make the volume. Promptly transferred 10.0 ml of this solution to another 50 ml volumetric flask then added 5.0 ml of internal standard solution and 3.8 ml of methanol, finally added dilute to make the volume. In assay preparation, fine powder not fewer than 10 tablets were accurately counted. Transfer the powder, with the aid of methanol, to a volumetric flask of such capacity that when filled to volume, the solution will contain the equivalent of about 2 mg of cefuroxime $\left(\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{8} \mathrm{~S}\right)$ per ml. Added methanol to fill the volumetric flask to about half of its capacity, and shake by mechanical means for about 10 min . Dilute with methanol to volume, and mix. Filter a portion of this stock mixture, and transfer 5.0 ml of the filtrate to a 50 ml volumetric flask. Add 5.0 ml of internal standard solution and 8.8 ml of methanol dilute with 0.2 M monobasic ammonium phosphate to the volume, and mix. The HPLC system from JASCO (Tokyo,

Japan) were maintained 278 nm UV detector, $4.6 \mathrm{~mm} \times 25 \mathrm{~cm} ; 5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ packing L13 column, $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ column oven temperature, flow rate $1.2 \mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{min}$ and injection volume $10 \mu \mathrm{l}$. In quantity analysis $90.0 \leqq$ mean $\leqq 110.0$ and content uniformity $\mathrm{AV} \leqq 15.0$ were followed [29], cefuroxime peak observed (Figure 1.1). The linearity of the standard cefuroxime/diluent solution was maintained and analyzed between 0.025 and $0.5 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml}$ and the 0.6 to 0.5 (Figure 1.2).

Figure 1.1 Chromatogram of cefuroxime (standard) (

## Figure 1.2 Linearity of cefuroxime solution, using acetanilide as an internal standard.



For content uniformity test of ceftriaxone for injection (1 gm vial) at first we prepared $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{H}} 7.0$ buffer, dissolve 17.415 gm of dibasic potassium phosphate in 500 ml of water and dissolve 13.605 gm of monobasic potassium phosphate in 1000 ml of water. Control the $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}}$ of dibasic potassium phosphate solution to $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}} 7.0$ by using monobasic potassium phosphate solution. $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}} 5.0$ buffer, dissolved 12.9 gm of sodium citrate in 250 ml of water and dissolved 9.6 gm of citric acid in 500 ml of water. Control the $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}}$ of sodium citrate solution to $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}} 5.0$ by using citric acid solution. Dissolved 3.2 gm of tetraheptyl ammonium bromide were taken in 400 ml of acetonitrile, added 44 ml of $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}}$ 7.0 buffer and 4 ml of $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}} 5.0$ buffer, and added water to make 1000 ml to make the mobile phase. $0.5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ membrane filter was used then allow to degas. 450 ml Acetonitrile were taken into the 1000 ml volumetric flask then added water up to the volume for diluents as
well as IS preparation 5 mg of diethyl terephthalate were taken to dissolve in diluents and make up to the volume 50 ml . Regarding the standard solution preparation, 5 mg of ceftriaxone sodium RS were transferred to 50 ml volumetric flask, and dilute with diluents to the volume $(0.1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml})$ then 2 ml of these solutions were transferred into 10 ml volumetric flask ( $20 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ ) to make $200 \%$. Mixed 3 ml of $20 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ solution and 1 ml of diluents ( $15 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ ) to make $150 \%$. Mixed 2 ml of $20 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ solution with solution 2 ml diluents ( $10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ ) for $100 \%$. Again mixed 2 ml of $10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ solution with 2 ml of diluents ( $5 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ ) to make $50 \%$ of the solution. While, mixed 2 ml of $5 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ solution and 2 ml of diluents then prepared $(2.5 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}) 25 \%$ of the samples. Mixed 1 ml of each $(200 \%, 150 \%, 100 \%, 50 \% \& 25 \%)$ of this solution with 1 ml of IS solution for linier carve. During the assay preparation, 1 gm ceftriaxone sodium were transferred to a 100 ml volumetric flask then added diluents to the volume. Transferred 1 ml of this solution to 50 ml volumetric flask and added with diluents to the volume. Mix 0.5 ml of this solution and 2.5 ml of diluents. Mix 1 ml of this solution and 1 ml of IS solution. In chromatographic system 270 nm detector, $4.0 \times 10 \mathrm{~cm}$ column, $2.0 \mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{min}$ flow rate, injection volume and $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ oven temperature were maintained. In quantity analysis $90.0 \leqq$ mean $\leqq 115.0$ and content uniformity $\mathrm{AV} \leqq 15.0$ were followed [30].

Donepezil samples were investigated according to the Japanese Pharmacopoeia 16th edition (JP 16). 2.5 gm of sodium-1 decane sulfonate were dissolved in 650 ml of water, and added 350 ml of acetonitrile, 1 ml of per chloric acid to make mobile phase, then to prepare standard solution and weighed accurately about 50 mg of JP donepezil hydrochloride RS, and dissolved in diluent-1 (Methanol and $0.1 \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{L}$ hydrochloride 3:1) to make exactly 25 ml . Transfer 5 ml of this solution to a suitable test tube, added diluent1 to make exactly 50 ml . For assay preparation, one tablet of donepezil hydrochloride with added diluent- 1 so that it contained the concentration about 0.2 mg per ml then sonicate and properly mix until a tablet is disintegrated for 10 min . After sonicate then centrifuge for 4000 rpm for 15 min with continued $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and supernatant solution were taken. For dissolution test was performed at 50 revolutions per minute according to the puddling method as directed under the dissolution test in JP16, using 900 ml of the dissolution medium. After the dissolution, performed the test with $50 \mu 1$ each of the sample solution and standard solution as directed under Liquid Chromatography in JP16 followed and calculate the ratios of AT and AS, of the peak area of donepezil hydrochloride. 3.4 gm Potassium dihydrogen phosphate and 3.55 gm of sodium dihydrogen phosphate were taken in 1000 ml water to make the phosphate buffer. Phosphate buffer ( pH 6.8 ) and water (1:1) were used as a dissolution medium. Mightysil

RP 18GP $150 \times 4.6 \mathrm{~mm}(5 \mu \mathrm{~m})$ column, wavelength $271 \mathrm{~nm}, 35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in column temperature, $1.0 \mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{min}$ flow rate, $50 \mu \mathrm{l}$ injection volume, mobile phase: water, acetonitrile and per chloric acid (650:350:1) were used in this test. To make the standard solution we weighed accurately about 20 mg of JP donepezil hydrochloride RS with dissolve in diluent-1 to make exactly 20 ml .1 ml of this solution were transferred to a suitable test tube then added with the dissolution medium to make exactly 100 ml . In addition, transferred 5 ml of this solution to a suitable test tube and added the dissolution medium to make exactly 10 ml solution. The sample solution was withdrawal not less than 20 ml of the medium at 15 min , after starting the test and filtered with a membrane filter which contained the pore size of $0.45 \mu \mathrm{~m}$. Discard the first 10 ml filtrate of the sample then transfer the subsequent filtrate to a suitable test tube. Not less than $80 \%$ of the labeled amount of donepezil hydrochloride $(\mathrm{C} 24 \mathrm{H} 29 \mathrm{NO} 3 \cdot \mathrm{HCl})$ is dissolved in 15 min were considered [31].

Identification was performed on the gentamicin samples. 1 gm of ophthalaldehyde in 5 ml of methanol and added 95 ml of 0.4 M boric acid that previously adjusted with 8 N potassium hydroxide to a $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}}$ of 10.4 and 2 ml of thioglycolic acid. Adjust, obtained of the solution with 8 N potassium hydroxide to a pH of 10.4. To prepare the mobile phase and maintained the ratio of methanol, water and glacial acetic acid
(68:27:5) as well as 5 gm of sodium 1-heptanesulfonate were added per liter to this solution. Then standard solution was prepared to use of USP gentamicin sulfate RS in water to make the concentration of 0.65 mg per ml .10 ml of this solution were transferred to a suitable test tube and added of 5 ml of isopropyl alcohol with 4 ml of o-phthalaldehyde solution then properly mix and finally isopropyl alcohol were added to obtain 25 ml of solution. At $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ tempereture were maintained in a water bath for 15 minutes then cool. In the case of sample solution preparation, 1 ml of the sample were taken and mix with 60.5 ml of water. Taken 10 ml from the mixture transfer to a suitable test tube with added 5 ml of isopropyl alcohol as well as 4 ml of o-phthalaldehyde solution then properly mix and finally added isopropyl alcohol to obtain 25 ml of solution. At $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ tempereture were maintained in a water bath for 15 minutes then cool. Phenomenex Luna C18 L1 150×4.6 (mm) column, $1.0 \mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{min}$ flow rate, 330 nm UV detector and $20 \mu \mathrm{l}$ injection volume were used in the chromatographic system. In analysis part, we compared the peak of the sample with that of the RS to quantitate GM, and determine whether any impurity peaks appear in the chromatogram [32].

Content uniformity test in omeprazole at first to make for the solution A (1L) 10.454 gm tri-sodium phosphate 12 -water and 15.616 gm disodium hydrogen phosphate were taken in a 1000 ml volumetric flask. Suitable amount of distill water were added
and sonicate to dissolve it. Adjust the volume with distill water then adjust the $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}}$ to 11.0 $\pm 0.05$ with 10 M sodium hydroxide or orthophosphoric acid were used. For solution B $(500 \mathrm{ml}) 5 \mathrm{ml}$ of 10 M NaOH were taken in 500 ml volumetric flask. To make the volume of 500 ml with 0.05 M phosphate buffer solution $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}} 4.5$ and well mix. In 1 L phosphate 6.8 gm potassium dihydrogen were taken in a 1000 ml volumetric flask and added suitable amount of distill water to dissolve and used a sonicate, adjust the volume and then filter by a vacuum filter and degas it. 210 ml of 0.05 M phosphate buffer solution ( $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}} 4.5$ ) with 60 ml of solution B were mixed, from it 200 ml solution were taken in a 1000 ml volumetric flask and make volume with solution A. Finally, this solution used for diluent. Regarding the mobile phase, 1.17 gm of sodium dihydrogen phosphate dihydrate $\left(\mathrm{NaH}_{2} \mathrm{PO}_{4} \cdot 2 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)$ were taken in a 500 ml volumetric flask, allow to the sonicator for dissolved and added with dilute to the volume. In another 500 ml volumetric flask was taken and transferred 1.06 gm of disodium hydrogen phosphate $\left(\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4}\right)$ dissolve in diluent and make sure the volume. Transferred the $\mathrm{NaH}_{2} \mathrm{PO}_{4} \cdot 2 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ solution to a 1000 ml beaker and adjust the $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}}$ to $7.6 \pm 0.05$ with $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4}$ solution in a $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}}$ meter. For 1 Liter of mobile phase 600 ml of this solution were taken in a 1000 ml volumetric flask and added 400 ml of acetonitrile (60:40 ratio). Filtered the solution in a suction filter and then degas the mixture in a sonicator for 30 minute. For standard solution preparation 10 mg
of omeprazole RS were weighted and dissolve to a 50 ml volumetric flask with medium in a sonicator than sure to make the final volume and properly mix which was $200 \%$ (solution concentration $0.2 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml}$ ). From this concentration of the solution with medium to make $150 \%, 100 \%, 50 \%$ and $25 \%$ of solution. while weighted accurately about 10 mg of lansoprazole were dissolved to a 100 ml volumetric flask with medium in a sonicator, make final volume and mix for IS preparation ( $0.1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml}$ ). Transferred 1 ml of $200 \%$ ~ $25 \%$ to each test tube with 1 ml IS added to each mix then allow to filter and put it in 1 ml vial. For assay preparation in content uniformity, 10 capsules granules were transferred in 50 ml volumetric flask. Dissolved the capsules with diluent in a sonicator and continue sonication until it dissolves. Transferred 1 ml from each to 10 test tube and added 3 ml of diluent and mix then filtered of the sample by $0.45 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ filter paper, 1 ml of this solution was taken and added 1 ml of IS solution with well mix and transferred to 1 ml vial. $4.6 \mathrm{~mm} \times 150 \mathrm{~mm}$ column ( C 18 ) column, 302 nm wavelength, $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ column oven temperature, $0.5 \mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{min}$ flow rate and $10 \mu \mathrm{l}$ injection volume were maintained in chromatographic system. In quantity analysis $95.0 \leqq$ mean $\leqq 105.0$ for BP as well as $90.0 \leqq$ mean $\leqq 110.0$ for USP and content uniformity were followed in $\mathrm{AV} \leqq 15.0$ [33-35]. In dissolution test for omeprazole samples were performed according to BP and USP that were mentioned on the package label. Regarding the dissolution test in BP, solution A
and solution B were used as well as to prepare solution C with 1.170 gm Sodium dihydrogen phosphate dihydrate and 1.061 gm disodium hydrogen phosphate were taken in a separate 500 ml volumetric flask. Suitable amount of distil water were used then allow for sonicate to dissolve and then adjust volume. Added 400 ml of disodium hydrogen phosphate to 500 ml of sodium dihydrogen phosphate dihydrate and adjust $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}}$ to $7.6 \pm 0.05$. We prepared the mobile phase and 400 ml acetonitrile with 600 ml of solution C were properly mixed ( $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}} 7.6 \pm 0.05$ ) then filter it in a vacuum filter and degas it for 30 minute in a sonicator. At that time, we prepared this solvent, 13.6 gm potassium dihydrogen phosphate were taken in a 2000 ml volumetric flask with added distil water to dissolve in a sonicator (about 10 min ), adjust the volume and allow for filter by a vacuum filter then degas it. For the first stage, 0.05 M phosphate buffer solution $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}} 4.5$ and solution $\mathrm{A}(1: 4, \mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v})$ as well as in the final stage, 0.05 M phosphate buffer solution $p^{H} 7.6$ and solution $A(1: 4, v / v)$ were mixed to make the diluent. In the dissolution tester water were transferred before test, to keep warmed to $37 \pm 0.5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Measure the degassed solvent 700 ml in a graduated cylinder and put it in the vessel. Filled all the six vessels following the first one. Mount the paddle up, then lower it to the original position when temperature reaches to the desired level, set rotational speed to 100 rpm . Put the weighed samples, in each vessel in 1 min interval. In acid stage ( $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}} 4.5$ ), after 45-minute elution,

5 ml medium were withdrawal and filter the aliquot of dilute to 25 ml with solution A in a 25 ml volumetric flask then transferred 1 ml of this test solution to a test tube with added 1 ml IS solution to it and properly mixed. Proceed immediately to the final stage. Preparation of standard we used, 1) 40 ml of 0.05 M phosphate buffer solution ( $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}} 4.5$ ) were taken in a 200 ml volumetric flask and fill it up to the mark with solution A (Solution D). 2) Accurately weigh 5 mg of lansoprazole IS were put in 50 ml a volumetric flask, added a suitable amount of Solution D, sonicate for 10 minutes to dissolve and then make it up to 50 ml with solution $\mathrm{D}(0.1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml})$. Taken 1 ml of this solution to place it in a volumetric flask of 10 ml and filled up with Solution D (IS solution with $10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ ). 3) Accurately weigh 5 mg of Omeprazole RS and put in a volumetric flask of 50 ml , add an appropriate amount of Solution D, sonicate for 10 minutes to dissolve, and make volume $(0.1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml}) .2 \mathrm{ml}$ of this solution were transferred to 10 ml volumetric flask and dilute it up to the mark with solution D $200 \%$ solution (concentration of $20 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ ). From this concentration of this solution with diluent to make $150 \%, 100 \%, 50 \%$ and $25 \%$ of the solution. Transferred 1 ml from solution $200 \% \sim 25 \%$ to each test tube and added 1 mL IS to each with mix then filter and put it in 1 ml vial. For the buffer stage ( pH 6.8 ), within 5 minutes of the 200 ml of solution B at $37 \pm 0.5^{0} \mathrm{C}$ were added to each vessel. The rotation speed at 100 revolutions per minute was controlled and continue to operate the apparatus
for 45 minutes as well as again 5 ml of the dissolution medium were withdrawn 45 minutes, after starting the test and transferred to a 25 ml volumetric flask, make sure to the volume with dilute then 1 ml of above test solution were transferred to a test tube and added 1 ml of IS solution with well mix. Regarding the buffer stage again we prepared for standard, 1) 21 ml of 0.05 M phosphate buffer solution ( $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}} 4.5$ ) were mixed with 6 ml of Solution B, from this solution 20 ml were transferred in a 100 ml volumetric flask and make volume with solution A (Solution E). 2) 5 mg Lansoprazole were transferred in a 50 ml volumetric flask with added the suitable amount of solution E and sonicate for 10 minutes to dissolve then actual make the volume $(0.1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml})$. Taken 1 ml from it to a 10 ml volumetric flask then make volume with solution E that was IS solution. 3) 5 mg omeprazole RS were put in a 50 ml volumetric flask, added a suitable amount of solution E and sonicate for 10 minutes to dissolve then make volume $(0.1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml})$. From this volume 2 ml were placed in a 10 ml volumetric flask and filled it up with Solution E $(20 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml})$ and obtained $200 \%$ solution. From $200 \%$ solution with diluent used to make $150 \%, 100 \%, 50 \%$ and $25 \%$ of the solution. Transferred 1 ml from solution 200\% ~ 25\% to each test tube and added 1 ml of IS to each with mix then allow to filter and put it in 1 ml vial. In chromatographic system 302 nm detector, Gemini-NX column, $0.5 \mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{min}$ flow rate, $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ temperature and $10 \mu \mathrm{l}$ injection were used. In acid stage, no individual
unit exceeds $10 \%$ dissolved and buffer stage no unit is less than $\mathrm{Q}+5 \%(\mathrm{Q}=65 \%)$ were considered. According to the USP dissolution method, for the mobile phase we used 340 ml of Acetonitrile to a 1000 ml volumetric flask, dilute with $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}} 7.6$ phosphate buffer to the volume then allow for filtration through membrane filter then degas for 30 minutes. 1) For Acid Resistance Stage, 40 ml of 5 N HCl were measured exactly and placed it in a 2000 ml volumetric flask dilute were used to make the volume ( 0.1 NHCl ). 2) pH 10.4 , 0.235M disodium hydrogen phosphate (For 1L) 2.4 L for Buffer Stage 33.36 g of disodium hydrogen phosphate were dissolved in 1000 ml of water and adjust with 2 N sodium hydroxide for $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}}$ of $10.4 \pm 0.1$. 3) pH 6.8 phosphate buffer $(900 \mathrm{~mL}), 500 \mathrm{ml}$ of 0.1 N hydrochloric acid were added with 400 ml of disodium hydrogen phosphate $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}} 10.4$. 0.235 M dibasic sodium phosphate $\left(\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4} .7 \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)$ were used to adjust with 2 N hydrochloric acid or 2 N sodium hydroxide, if necessary to the contain of $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}}$ of $6.8 \pm 0.05$. 4) $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}} 7.6$ phosphate buffer (1L) for the mobile phase, 0.178 gm sodium dihydrogen phosphate and 1.12 gm disodium hydrogen phosphate were transferred in a 250 ml volumetric flask and dissolve it with distilled water. If necessary, adjust to $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}} 7.6 \pm 0.1$ with utilized 2 N sodium hydroxide or 2 N hydrochloric acid. Total solution was transferred to 1000 ml volumetric flask and make the volume with dilute. 5) For 0.01M sodium borate solution (1L), 3.8137 gm of Sodium tetra-borate decahydrate (Borax) were
taken in a 1000 ml volumetric flask and make the volume with distilled water. Regarding the dissolution of the Sample, water was pre-fill to the dissolution tester and to keep warm to $37.0 \pm 0.5^{\circ} \mathrm{C} .500 \mathrm{ml}$ of media $(0.1 \mathrm{~N} \mathrm{HCl})$ were placed in each of the six dissolution vessels. The apparatus was assembled and warm the media to $37^{\circ} \pm 0.5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Weigh and place pellets equivalent to 20 mg omeprazole were maintaining one-minute interval in each vessel and immerse paddle in media to a distance of $2.5 \pm 0.2 \mathrm{~cm}$ between the paddle and bottom of the vessel. Analyze the sample by the following HPLC method. For the acid resistance stage in standard solution, 40 ml methanol were transferred in 200 ml volumetric flask than added with 160 ml of 0.01 M sodium borate solution for diluent preparation. To prepare the IS solution, 5 mg Lansoprazole RS were used and put it in a 50 ml volumetric flask as well as added a suitable amount of diluent allow to sonicate for 10 minutes for dissolving and then make it up to 50 ml with diluent $(0.1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml})$. From this solution 1 ml were taken and placed in a10 ml volumetric flask with filled up with solution D. To make the WS solution, put 5 mg of accurately weighed omeprazole RS into 50 ml volumetric flask with added an appropriate amount of diluent to allow sonicate for 10 minutes then filled the volume with diluent. 4 ml solution were put in a10 ml volumetric flask of and make up to volume with diluent for 200\%) Solution. From 200\% solution with diluent to make $150 \%, 100 \%, 50 \%$ and $25 \%$ of the solution. Transferred 1
ml from solution $200 \% \sim 25 \%$ to each test tube and added 1 ml IS to each as well as mix to allow filter and put it in 1 ml vial. In the case of test solution, after 2 hours filtered the dissolution medium which were containing the pellets through a sieve with an aperture not more than 0.2 mm . Collected the pellets on the sieve and rinse them with water and were using approximately 60 ml of 0.01 M sodium borate solutions with carefully transfer the pellets quantitatively to a 100 ml volumetric flask then sonicate for about 20 minute until the pellets are broken up. Added 20 ml of methanol to the flask with dilute of 0.01 M sodium borate solution to volume and properly mix. Dilute an appropriate amount of this solution with 0.01 M sodium borate solutions were obtained a solution which having a concentration of about 0.02 mg per ml. Filter the solution through Whatman No. 42 or equivalent omeprazole filter paper were used. Then filter the filtrate again done through syringe filter of 0.20 micron. During the buffer stage, proceed as directed for Acid resistance stage with accurately weighed fresh pellets from the same batch. After 2 hours 400 ml of 0.235 M dibasic sodium phosphate were added to the 500 ml of 0.1 N hydrochloric acid medium in the vessel as well as of adjust, if necessary, with 2 N hydrochloric acid or 2 N sodium hydroxide to a $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}}$ of $6.8 \pm 0.05$ were used. At the end of 30 minutes, determine the amount of omeprazole dissolved in $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}} 6.8$-phosphate buffer. Regarding the test solution (for 20 mg display of capsule), after dissolution for 30
minutes, immediately transferred 5 ml of the solution under test to a test tube which containing 1 ml of 0.25 M sodium hydroxide, well mix well and filter the solution through Whatman No. 42 or equivalent filter paper. Then filter the filtrate again through syringe filter of 0.20 micron. To prepare the standard solution, $200 \mathrm{ml} \mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}} 6.8$ phosphate buffer with 40 ml 0.25 M sodium hydroxide were used for diluent as well as in the IS solution, accurately 5 mg Lansoprazole RS were weighed and put it in a volumetric flask of 50 ml with added a suitable amount of the diluent then sonicate for 10 minutes to dissolve with the making for 50 ml which containing of the diluent, from this solution taken for 1 ml and placed it in a volumetric flask of 10 ml fill up with solution D . Then we were making the WS solution and put 5 mg of accurately weighed omeprazole RS into 50 mL volumetric flask with added an appropriate amount of diluent then allow for sonicate for 10 minutes finally to prepare the volume with diluent. Transferred 4 ml solution in a volumetric flask of 10 ml and filled the volume with diluent which was $200 \%$ solution. From this solution (200\%) with diluent to make $150 \%, 100 \%, 50 \%$ and $25 \%$ of the solution. Transferred 1 ml from the solution of $200 \% \sim 25 \%$ to each test tube and were added 1 ml of the IS solution to each and well mix allow to filter and put it in 1 ml vial. In chromatographic system 280 nm detector, $4.0 \mathrm{~mm} \times 12.5 \mathrm{~cm}$ including packing L 7 of $5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ of column, $1.0 \mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{min}$ flow rate and $10 \mu \mathrm{l}$ injection volume were used. In acid
resistance stage tolerance, level L1 individual data will not exceed $15 \%$ of the omeprazole dissolved, for the level L2 of 12 average units within $20 \%$ dissolved omeprazole in individual data will not exceed 35\% omeprazole dissolved. Regarding the level L3of 24 within $20 \%$ of the average dissolution omeprazole units, greater than $35 \%$ of the maximum in also dissolved within 2 units is omeprazole, individual units is not greater than $45 \%$ of omeprazole dissolved. While in the case of buffer stage, level B1 Each unit is not less than $\mathrm{Q}+5 \%(\mathrm{Q}=75 \%)$ and the level B 2 average of 12 units was equal to or greater than Q and no individual unit were less than $\mathrm{Q}-15 \%$, finally the level B3 average of 24 units is equal to or greater than Q and not more than 2 units were less than $\mathrm{Q}-15 \%$ and no unit was then Q-25\%.

In our investigation, we caught counterfeit gentamicin samples. For this reason, we further investigation in this way to use fluorescence spectrophotometer and observed and compare in pass and counterfeit samples. In fluorescence spectrometry both an excitation spectrum (the light that is absorbed by the sample) and/or an emission spectrum (the light emitted by the sample) can be measured. The concentration of the analyte is directly proportional with the intensity of the emission with excitation of wavelength.

### 1.3.4 Samples for Biological Analysis

Our collected gentamicin samples (injection) which were performed in microbial assay according to the analysis of USP. Regarding this test, Staphylococcus epidermidis ATCC 12228 strain were performed during this test. We used Base layer media which consists of peptone, pancreatic digest of casein, yeast extract, beef extract, dextrose, agar and water (12:8:6:3:2:32:2000) and controlled the $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{H}} 6.6 \pm 0.1$. culture organisms were transferred in this media. $16.73 \mathrm{gm} / \mathrm{l}$ of diabasic potassium phosphate and $0.523 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$ of monobasic potassium phosphate were mixed to make 0.1 M buffer with adjust the pH to $8.0 \pm 0.1$ with 18 N phosphoric acid or 10 N potassium hydroxide. Microorganisms were suspend in 10 ml saline and adjust the solution to give a transmittance of around $1.0 \%$ at 580 nm as a solution. For the standard solution, we weighted 10 mg of gentamicin RS and dissolve in 10 ml of the buffer solution. From the serial dilution we prepared the standard solution $5(4.0 \mathrm{gm} / \mathrm{ml})$, solution $4(3.0 \mathrm{gm} / \mathrm{ml})$, solution $3(2.286 \mathrm{gm} / \mathrm{ml})$, solution $2(1.0 \mathrm{gm} / \mathrm{ml})$ and solution $1(0.5 \mathrm{gm} / \mathrm{ml})$. Also, prepared a control solution which were containing $2.0 \mathrm{gm} / \mathrm{ml}$ ( $=590 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{mg}$ as potency) of gentamicin RS. To make the sample solution, 1 ml of the solution from the ampoule (sample) were taken and added to a flask with adjust to 17576 fold dilution of buffer $(=2.2758 \mathrm{gm} / \mathrm{ml})$ then transferred the
solution to a clean bench, allow for filter and place it a 2 ml tube. In this method we maintain the following procedure, at first we injected 100 ml of microrganism solution on the base layer, and spread with a turn table and spreader. At least five test plates are needed to make the standard curve. Second, place four cylinder-cups on each plate. Third, injected 250 ml of one of the standard solutions 1 to 5 and control solution on each plate. Put control solution in one cylinder on each plate and fill the remaining cylinders as follows. 1) Plate 1 has one control and three cylinders of solution1. 2) Plate 2 has one control and three cylinders of solution 2. 3) Plate 3 has one control and three cylinders of solution 3. 4) Plate 4 has one control and three cylinders of solution 4. 5) Plate 5 has one control and three cylinders of solution 5. 6) Plate 6 has one control and three cylinders of sample (1). 7) Plate 7 has one control and three cylinders of sample (2). Fourth, place all the test plates were in an incubator at $35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and cultivate for twenty hours [36].

According to the USP (our collected samples) the endotoxin and sterility tests were applicable in both cefteriaxone (for injection) and gentamicin (injection) samples. For endotoxin test were performed in two ways one for gel-clot thecnique and another was chromogenic technique. In gel-clot technique, at first 5 ml pure water were injected into the Limulus Ambocyte Lysate (LAL) vial. For another 10 ml pure water were injected into the standard endotoxin which concentration $1000 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}$ and then vortex.

From this concentration to prepare $100,10,1,0.1,0.6(2 \lambda), 0.03(\lambda), 0.015(0.5 \lambda)$ and $0.0075(0.25 \lambda)$ (Table 1.1). Each step was done for vortex in one minute and solutions were keep into an ice box. 10 ml pure water were used with sample and vortex for 1 minute, to make the sample solution. 0.6 ml were taken from the stoke solution with 5.4 ml pure water then vortex for 1 minute to make for dilute stoke solution. For the positive control, 1 ml from stoke solution with 1 ml from $100 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}$ solution and then added 8 ml pure water to allow for vortex to make $10 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}$ solution 1.1 ml from the solution 1 with 9 ml pure water were used for $1 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}$ solution 2.0 .3 ml solution 2 were taken and added 4.7 ml pure water for $2 \lambda$ solution 3.1 ml from solution 3 with 7 ml of pure water were used to make $0.25 \lambda$ solution 4 . A total 44 bottles were taken and transferred 0.1 ml of LAL reagent. Three bottles were used in each of the sample solution, positive control $10 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}$, standard endotoxin concentration $10 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}$ and pure water as well as 1 battle was used for normal water. For an another case four bottle were used in each of the sample solution, positive control $10 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}, 1 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}, 2 \lambda$ and $0.25 \lambda$. While two battles were used in each of the standard concentration $10 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}, 1 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}, 2 \lambda, 0.25 \lambda$ and pure water. After one an hour incubation and we observed about the positive control of $10 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}$ and $1 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}$, standard concentration $10 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}$ and $1 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}$ solution with normal water
containing were solid in the bottles and rest of the bottles were liquid (Fig 1.3a \& 1.3b) [37].

Table 1.1 Preparation of the different concentration of endotoxin solution

| Concentration taken from the amount | Pure water | Concentration |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From 1000 to 2 ml | 18 ml | 100 |
| From 100 to 1 ml | 9 ml | 10 |
| From 10 to 1 ml | 9 ml | 1 |
| From 1 to 1 ml | 9 ml | 0.1 |
| From 0.1 to 9 ml | 6 ml | $0.06(2 \lambda)$ |
| From $2 \lambda$ to 4 ml | 4 ml | $0.03(\lambda)$ |
| From $\lambda$ to 4 ml | 4 ml | $0.015(0.5 \lambda)$ |
| From $0.5 \lambda$ to 5 ml | 5 ml | $0.0075(0.25 \lambda)$ |




In colorimetric methods, 5 ml were taken from $1000 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}$ and 5 ml PW were added to make the concentration $500 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}$ then to prepare $100 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}, 50 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}, 10$ $\mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}, 5 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}, 1 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}, 0.5 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}, 0.1 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}, 0.05 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}, 0.025 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}$ and 0.00625 $\mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}$ of the solution for calibration curve. 10 ml PW were injected into the sample for the sample stock solution (SS). For the making of sample solution, 0.1 ml were taken from the sample stock solution and added 9.9 ml PW were added as well as for the positive control of the solution, 0.1 ml taken from the stock solution and 0.5 ml were from standard concentration $0.1 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}$ solution then 9.4 ml PW were added in a test tube. While PW were used as a negative control. 7 LAL bottles were taken and keep into the ice box with aluminum cap then marking for sample, positive control, negative control, standard concentration $0.1 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}, 0.05 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}, 0.025 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}$ and $0.0065 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml} .0 .2 \mathrm{ml}$ of buffer solution were added into each LAL battle (pipetting with no bubble). Each of 0.2 ml of the solutions sample, positive control, negative control, standard concentration $0.1 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}$, $0.05 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}, 0.025 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}$ and $0.0065 \mathrm{EU} / \mathrm{ml}$ were transferred into the representative LAL bottles and keep into the water bath for 30 minutes. During the bath preparation we were taken Pyrocolour MP which were containing 1, 1A, 2, 3, 3A kits. Just, solutions of the kit 1A were transferred into the kit 1 (sodium nitrite) as well as solutions of the kit $3 \mathrm{~A}(\mathrm{~N}-$ Methyl- 2- pyrrolidone) were transferred into the kit 3 ( N - (1-Napthyl) ethylenediamine
dihydrochloride). 4 ml Water were added into the kit 2 which containing Ammonium sulfamate. 7 LAL bottle were picked up from the water bath and put into the ice box. Each 0.5 ml solutions were taken from the prepared solutions 1, 2 and 3 and added of the seven bottles then allow for measuring spectrophotometer with 545 nm wavelength. After the measurement calculates the average concentration of endotoxin based on the calibration curve. Expected the absolute value of the correlation coefficient of the calibration curve is 0.98 or more (Figure $1.4 \mathrm{a} \& 1.4 \mathrm{~b}$ ). Whether the measurement results of the water for injection (negative control) does not exceed the limit of the blank test, which is set in the lysate reagent, bellow the detection limit of endotoxin. For positive control and is based on the difference between the endotoxin concentration of the sample solution that, the recovery rate is calculated and it is in the range of 50\% to 200\% (Figure 1.4b). Based on the average endotoxin concentration of the sample solution to determine the endotoxin concentration of the sample, when meeting the endotoxin standards that value is defined, and pass the endotoxin test [38].



Regarding the sterility test were performed in both ceftriaxone and gentamicin samples. In this types of samples (injectable) must be contained in sterile condition. According to the pharmacopeia we were investigated on these types of samples. At first 10 ml pure water were injected into the samples. Steritest EZ Devices were clamped on the stand and tubes were properly griped in the Fluid Transfer Pump (FTP). Dehydration tubes were attached with the bottom side of the both kits. Fluid A were transferred into the both kits. Red caps were attached at the top side of the kites then the fluids were dehydrated by the using of dehydration tubes then red caps were leaved from the kites. Prepared samples were transferred in both kits and dehydration with red caps. Again fluid A were transferred into the both kits for washing and dehydration with red caps. The dehydration tubes and red caps were removed and yellow caps were attached with the bottom side of the kits. The tubes of the kits which were griped in the FTP, among one tube was blocked by the clip and other was open and tryptic soy broth medium transferred into the one kit. Similarly, other tube which was used to blocked and one tube opened, then fluid Thioglycollate medium were transferred to the kit. Both kits were picked from the stand. Tryptic soy broth medium containing kit was transferred an incubator which maintained at $21-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ as well as fluid Thioglycollate medium containing kit was transferred another incubator which was maintaining at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (Figure 1.5). Finally, we
observed both kits under 14 days for visible any particles, if the samples were contaminated by microorganisms [39].

## Figure 1.5 outline of sterility test



Dehydration tubes were rem-oved and attached yellow caps


### 1.4 Results:

### 1.4.1 Sample collection:

Outline of the samples collected in this study was summarized in Table 1.2. In our survey we collected 235 samples from 63 manufacturers with 71 different brand products. 14 (6\%) samples were produced domestically. 49 (20.9\%) Samples were ceftriaxone (1 $\mathrm{gm} / \mathrm{vial}$ ), $60(25.5 \%)$ samples were cefuroxime ( 250 mg ) [25], 58 ( $42.7 \%$ ) samples were gentamicin ( $80 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml}$ ) [27], 65 (27.7\%) samples were omeprazole ( 20 mg ) [26] and 3 ( $1.3 \%$ ) samples were donepezil hydrochloride ( 5 mg ) collected from Yangon, Myanmar.

### 1.4.2 Drug outlets and registration status in Myanmar FDA

We sampled 103 samples from community Pharmacy, 47 samples were governmental hospital, 42 samples were private hospital, 28 samples were clinic and 15 samples obtained from five different wholesalers as well as 6 (2.6\%) samples were not registered in Myanmar FDA (Table 1.2).

Table 1.2 Outline of samples collection

| Items | Government <br> hospitals | Private <br> hospitals | Community <br> pharmacies | clinical <br> pharmacies | wholesalers | No. of samples <br> registered in <br> Myanmar FDA | No. of samples <br> unregistered in <br> Myanmar FDA |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ceftriaxone(49) | 9 | 11 | 18 | 7 | 4 | 0 |  |
| Cefuroxime(60) | 14 | 12 | 22 | 9 | 3 | 69 | 0 |
| Donepezil | - | - | - | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |
| Hydrochloride(3) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gentamicin(58) | 11 | 7 | 31 | 6 | 3 | 53 |  |
| Omeprazole(65) | 13 | 12 | 30 | 6 | 4 | 65 | 0 |
| Total $(235)$ | $47(20 \%)$ | $42(17.9 \%)$ | $103(43.8 \%)$ | $28(11.9 \%)$ | $15(6.4 \%)$ | $229(97.4 \%)$ | $6(2.6 \%)$ |

### 1.4.3 Observations

In our observation 71 manufacturers were participated in this survey. While 8 manufacturers were repeated in more than one item of the medicines. We observed 41 manufacturers which were Indian originated (Figure 1.6). A total 235 samples were collected from Myanmar. Among of 149 samples out of 235 were found from Indian manufacturers (Figure 1.7). Mentioned on the label of each sample should be stored at $\leq$ $25-30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with dry place. Only twenty-nine out of 74 retail shops ( $39.2 \%$ ) are airconditioning. 36 ( $15.5 \%$ ) Out of 235 samples did not contain package inserts. We had collected two samples which did not found box (loos samples). While one sample of address was showing different in the label and insert. One cefuroxime sample of blister was torn in a hole and another manufacturer from Indian origin and their one sample was existed two different types of colour of the tablet in a strip. All ceftriaxone, cefuroxime and omeprazole samples were registered but one donepezil hydrochloride sample out of $3(33 \%)$ which was Indian origin and 5 gentamicin samples out of 58 ( $8.6 \%$ ) from two Chinese companies were not registered in Myanmar FDA (Table 1.3). 11 CXM and 2 GM samples were found which showing error spelling (Figure $1.8 \mathrm{a} \& 1.8 \mathrm{~b}$ ). One GM sample was showing unequal volume with yellow colour (Figure 1.9).

Figure 1.6 Number of Manufacturers found in the program


Figure 1.7 Number of samples collected from that origins


Figure 1.8a Spelling error in CXM samples A-030, 057, 068, 079, 085, 099, B-023, 047, 067, 093, 111


Figure 1.8b Spelling error in GM A-020 \& A-077


### 1.4.4 Authenticity

Authenticity investigation with the response from the manufacturers side were quite low. We received, 6 Manufacturers replied out of 19 that were represented of 8 samples out of 235 with agree as a genuine product (Table 1.3a \& 1.3b), while 3 MRAs out of 12 MRAs in manufacturing countries informed about manufacturers licenses (Table 1.4). We obtained information from Myanmar, Switzerland and Bangladesh MRAs, but Bangladesh did not reply the questionnaire.

Table 1．3a Reply from manufacturers with their number of samples

| Country | Manufacturer＇s name | Replied | Number of samples | Number of Brands | Reply on samples$(\mathrm{N}=235)$ |  | Authentic |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Bangladesh | Aristo Pharma Ltd． | $\checkmark$ | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Jayson Pharmaceutical Ltd． |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Renata Limited |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Square Pharmaceutical Ltd． |  | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Subtotal |  | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| China | Shenzhen Zhijun Pharmaceutical Co．Ltd |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Beverly Henan Pharmaceutical Co．Ltd |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Henan Dekang Pharma Actual Co；Ltd |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Kunming Pharmaceutical Corp |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Shanghai Modern Hasan Pharmaceutical Co． Ltd |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Tianjin Pharmaceutical Group Xinzheng Co． Ltd |  | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Zhanfeng Pharma．Factory，Long Chuan， Yunnan |  | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | 河南龙源药业股份有限公司 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Subtotal |  | 17 | 8 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Japan | Eisai Co．Ltd | $\checkmark$ | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Subtotal |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Korea | Korea Pharma Co．Ltd |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Shin Poong Pharm．Co．Ltd |  | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Subtotal |  | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Myanmar | Myanmar Pharmaceutical Factory |  | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | No．（1）Pharmaceutical Factory |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | No．（2）Pharmaceutical Factory |  | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Subtotal |  | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Pakistan | CCL Pharmaceuticals（Pvt）Ltd． |  | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Subtotal |  | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Singapore | Golden Kabaw Pte．Ltd |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Subtotal |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Switzerland | F．Hoffmann－LaRoche Ltd． |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Subtotal |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Taiwan | Siu Guan Chem，Ind．Co．Ltd |  | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Subtotal |  | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Thailand | The United Drug Co．，Ltd． |  | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Subtotal |  | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| UK | Glaxo Smith Kline |  | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Subtotal |  | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| Vietnam | Domesco Medical Import Export Joint Stock Corp |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Fresenlus Kabi Bidiphar Jolnt－Stock Company | $\checkmark$ | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 |  |
|  | Pharbaco Central Pharmaceuticals J．S．C No1 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Subtotal |  | 5 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 |  |

Table 1.3b Reply from manufacturers with their number of samples

| Country | Manufacturer's name | Replied | Number of samples | Number of Brands | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Reply on } \\ \text { samples ( } \mathrm{N}=\text { ) } \end{array}$ |  | Authentic |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| India | Alkem Laboratories Ltd |  | 20 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | AMN Life Science Pvt. Ltd |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Asmoh Laboratories Ltd. |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Belco Pharma |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Blue Cross Laboratories Ltd |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Brawn Laboratories Ltd |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Cadila Health Limited |  | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Cipla Ltd. |  | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Dr. Reddy`s Laboratories Ltd |  | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Eisai Pharmatechnology and Manufacturing Pvt | $\checkmark$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |
|  | Emcure Pharmaceuticals |  | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Fourrts Laboratories Pvt. Ltd |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Galpha Laboratories Ltd |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Global Pharma Healthcare Pvt. Ltd |  | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Great Himalayan Pte. Ltd |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Intas Pharmaceuticals Ltd | $\checkmark$ | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  |
|  | Lupin Ltd |  | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Lyka Labs Limited |  | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | MDC Pharmaceuticals (P) Ltd |  | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Mercury Laboratories Ltd |  | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | M. J. Biopharm Private Limited |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Nectar Lifescience Ltd |  | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Orchid Healthcare |  | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Rainbow Life Sciences Pvt. Ltd |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Ranbaxy Laboratories Limited |  | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Regain Laboratories | $\checkmark$ | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Rhydburg Pharmaceuticals Ltd |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Saviour Pharmaceuticals |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Stallina Laboratories Pvt. Ltd |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | SRS Pharmaceutical Pvt. Ltd |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Toqure Pharmaceutical |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Umedica Laboratories Ltd |  | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Universal Pharmaceuticals Limited |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Virchow Healthcare Private Limited |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Wockhard Limited |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | XL Laboratories Pvt. Ltd. |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Subtotal |  | 149 | 40 | 3 | 0 | 3 |  |

Table 1.4 Reply from MRAs

| Country | Organization | Reply | Manufacturer |  | Sample |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Legitimate | Nonapproval suspected | Legitimate | Nonapproval suspected |
| Bangladesh ( $\mathrm{n}=4$, 10 samples) | The Directorate General of Drug Administration Ministry of Health \& Family Welfare | YES | uk | uk | uk | uk |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { China ( } n=8, \quad 17 \\ & \text { sample) } \end{aligned}$ | Department of Drug Registration State Food and Drug Administration, P.R. China the department of Drug \& Cosmetics Registration | NO | - | - | - | - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { India ( } \mathrm{n}=36,149 \\ & \text { sample) } \end{aligned}$ | Drugs Controller General of India $r$ Central Drugs Standard Control Organization, Directorate General of Health Services, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare New Delhi, India | NO | - | - | - | - |
| Korea ( $\mathrm{n}=2$, <br> 6 sample) | Ministry of Food and Drug SAFETY | NO | - | - | - | - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Myanmar } \quad(\mathrm{n}=3 \text {, } \\ & 14) \end{aligned}$ | Food Drug Administration of Myanmar | YES | 3 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Pakistan ( } \mathrm{n}=1, \\ & 2 \text { samples) } \end{aligned}$ | Director General Health\| Drug Control Organization| Ministry of Health| Government of Pakistan | NO | - | - | - | - |
| Singapore ( $\mathrm{n}=1$, <br> 1 samples) | Ministry of Health | NO | - | - | - | - |
| Switzerland ( $\mathrm{n}=1$, 1 samples) | Swiss medic (Swiss Agency for Therapeutic Products) | YES | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Taiwan }(\mathrm{n}=1, \\ & 13 \text { sample) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Food and Drug Administration (FDA) | NO | - | - | - | - |
| $\text { Thailand ( } \mathrm{n}=1 \text {, }$ $3 \text { sample) }$ | Food and Drug Administration | NO | - | - | - | - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { United Kingdom } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=2, \\ & 11 \text { sample }) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | MHRA | NO | - | - | - | - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Vietnam (n=3, } \\ & 5 \text { samples) } \end{aligned}$ | Cổngthông tin điệntửBộ Y tế ( MOH ) | NO | - | - | - | - |

*We found two samples from a Japanese manufacturer. We confirmed about the license of the Japanese manufacture's from online.

### 1.4.5 Quality evaluate of samples

The results of the samples are showing in Annex 1.7 and Annex 1.8 as well as the summary of the results of quantity test is shown in Table 1.5. In the quality test 36 samples were unacceptable out of 177 samples. Among 176 samples were analyzed that finally confirmed, 27 samples were unacceptable in content uniformity tests as well as in the case for dissolution tests 23 samples were unacceptable out of 128 samples. In the case of omeprazole 23 ( $35.4 \%$ ), 9 ( $13.8 \%$ ) and 17 (26.2\%) samples were unacceptable in quantity, content uniformity and dissolution test respectively [26]. In our investigation, we found 149 samples out of 235 from Indian origin. Among of the Indian 49 samples
were failed in any test out of 149 samples (Figure 1.10). Particularly, any fail of the all cefuroxime and omeprazole (except one from Bangladesh) samples came from India [2526], while three counterfeit gentamicin samples were found from China (Figure 1.11, $1.12,1.13,1.14 \& 1.15)$. We had collected 12 cefuroxime samples which manufacturer was Global Pharma Healthcare Pvt. Ltd, India. Among of them 10 samples were failed out of 12 [25]. Both endotoxin and sterility tests in ceftriaxone and gentamicin were satisfactory but in this case of unregistered three gentamicin samples out of 58 were failed in identification and during the analysis there were no peak appeared against standard solution at that moment (Fig. 1.16 \& 1.17). While in the case of microbial assay test these three counterfeit gentamicin samples were not showing the zone of inhibition (Fig. 1.18). Myanmar Government announced three gentamicin samples from two Chinese manufacturers were counterfeited [27].

Table 1.5 Summary of quality test of samples

| Items (n) | Assay test |  | Content uniformity test |  | Dissolution test |  | Endotoxin test |  | Sterility test |  | Identification |  | Microbial Assay |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| Ceftriaxone (49) | 47 | 2 | 46 | 3 | - | - | 49 | 0 | 49 | 0 | 49 | 0 | - | - |
| Cefuroxime (60*) | 49 | 11 | 44 | 15 | 54 | 6 | - | - | - | - | 60 | 0 | - | - |
| Donepezil <br> Hydrochloride (3) | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | - | - | - | - | 3 | 0 | - | - |
| Gentamicin (58) | - | - | - | - | - | - | 58 | 0 | 58 | 0 | 55 | 3 | 55 | 3 |
| Omeprazole (65) | 42 | 23 | 56 | 9 | 48 | 17 | - | - | - | - | 65 | 0 | - | - |
| Total (235) | 141 | 36 | 149 | 27 | 105 | 23 | 107 | 0 | 107 | 0 | 232 | 3 | 55 | 3 |

*Result pending due to insufficient of samples

Figure 1.10 Comparison between pass and fail samples of origin


Figure 1.11 Comparison between CXM pass and fail samples of origin


Figure 1.12 Comparison between OM pass and fail samples of origin


Figure 1.13 Comparison between GM pass and fail samples of origin


Figure 1.14 Comparison between CTRX pass and fail samples of origin


Figure 1.15 Comparison between DN pass and fail samples of origin


Figure 1.16 Chromatogram of GM standard


Figure 1.17 Chromatogram of counterfeit GM samples


Figure 1.18 Counterfeit gentamicin samples


Figure 1.19 Zone of inhibition (microbial assay) are showing between standard concentration and counterfeit GM samples


### 1.4.6 Factors influencing the outcome of the price

There was significant difference in the average price of passed and failed samples of cefuroxime (Student's $t$-test, $p<0.05$ ). In the samples of gentamicin, failed sample (identification, microbial assay) were significantly cheaper than passed samples (Student's $t$-test, $p<0.05$ ) and falsified ones were cheaper than other samples (Table 1.6).

### 1.4.7 Effect of air-conditioning

In the table 1.7, we also observed in significance that associated between air conditioning and temperature ( $t$-test, $p<0.01$ ).

Table 1.6 Association between price and medical quality (CXM, GM, OM and CTRX)

|  |  | n | Mean(Kyat****) ${ }^{\text {S }}$ S . | $p$ (t-test) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CXM | all pass fail* | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 44 \\ & 15 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 654.9 \pm 206.7 \\ & 374.8 \pm 122.6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $] \mathrm{P}<0.05$ |
| GM | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Pass } \\ \text { Fail }^{* *} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 55 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 145.1 \pm 73.0 \\ & 38.3 \pm 10.4 \end{aligned}$ | $\square \mathrm{P}<0.05$ |
| OM | all pass fail* | $\begin{gathered} 32 \\ 32 * * * \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49.0 \pm 31.5 \\ & 49.2 \pm 30.6 \end{aligned}$ | $] \text { n.s. }$ |
| CTRX | all pass fail | $\begin{gathered} 46 \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1634.1 \pm 1039.2 \\ 1650 \pm 650 \end{gathered}$ | $\square$ n.s. |

*Fail includes first, second and permanent fails.
** Counterfeit
**Excluded B-008 (free gift)
*** 1 Kyat $\Leftrightarrow 0.00076 \$$
Table 1.7 Association between air conditioning and temperature /humidity

| Air-conditioning | n | Average temperature $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right) \pm$ SD. | p (t-test) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| yes | 29 | $28.6 \pm 2.6$ | $\mathrm{P}<0.01$ |
| no | 44 | $30.8 \pm 2.2$ |  |
|  |  | Average Humidity $(\%) \pm$ SD. |  |
| yes | 29 | $67.9 \pm 12.4$ |  |
| no | 44 | $69.3 \pm 8.7$ |  |

### 1.4.8 To observe again of the unacceptable samples by using new judge which is wider than original (pharmacopeial criteria)

In Myanmar some samples were unacceptable, according to pharmacopeial test. We want to see, if the restricted value considers than original value how many samples are pass or fail. In dissolution test, we considered and calculated $80 \%$ of Q value of cefuroxime $75 \%$, donepezil hydrochloride $80 \%$, omeprazole $10 \%$ acid stage and $65 \%$ for buffer stage. For example, if Q value $75 \%$ so that, consider new value is $75 * 0.8=60$. In this case, the samples are containing $\leq 60$ consider as a pass samples. In the case of content uniformity test the acceptance value (AV) is 15 . In this case we consider $120 \%$. Our new value is $15^{*} 1.2=18$. The samples which are containing AV bellow 18 consider as a pass samples in regarding this test. While quantity tests we multiply 0.8 with lower limit and upper value with $1.2(80 \%-120 \%)$. The following tables 1.6 and 1.7 are showing the summary of comparisons between original and new value on pass and fail samples. While annex 1.8 are showing broadly of the results.

Table 1.8 Showing the comparisons of the pharmacopeial quality test between original and newly considered value.

| Name of sample | DS originaltest |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{DS} \\ \text { consider } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { QTY } \\ \text { original } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { QTY } \\ \text { consider } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{CU} \\ \text { original } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{CU} \\ \text { consider } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| Cefuroxime(60*) | 54 | 6 | 60 | 0 | 49 | 11 | 51 | 9 | 44 | 15 | 48 | 11 |
| Omeprazole(65) | 48 | 17 | 51 | 14 | 42 | 23 | 64 | 1 | 56 | 9 | 59 | 6 |
| Ceftriaxone(49) | - | - | - | - | 47 | 2 | 49 | 0 | 46 | 3 | 46 | 3 |

Table 1.9 are showing the comparisons between original all and new all tests.

| Name of sample | Original all |  | New all |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| Cefuroxime(60) | 44 | 16 | 49 | 11 |
| Omeprazole(65) | 33 | 32 | 45 | 20 |
| Ceftriaxone(49) | 46 | 3 | 46 | 3 |

Cefuroxime samples were analyzed in dissolution and 4 samples were finally failed. But when it was done $1^{\text {st }}$ stage 12 sample were fail. To consider and apply new judge in cefuroxime samples $(75 * 0.8=60 \%)$ all sample pass in this test in first stage and need not to go for $2^{\text {nd }}$ stage. Insert new judge for quantity test $80 \%-132 \%$ were considered. To apply new judge on 11 fail samples which were in $1^{\text {st }}$ stage and all samples are pass in this stage and need not to go for $2^{\text {nd }}$ stage in quantity test. In content uniformity to use new $\mathrm{AV}=18$, 4 samples pass in this stage and need not to go for $2^{\text {nd }}$ stage. Though all cefuroxime samples are not pass in content uniformity but we can say the results of dissolution and quantity test are satisfactory by using new judge.

In omeprazole samples in dissolution acid first stage to use new judge (12\%) 2 fail samples and buffer stage $(\mathrm{Q}=57 \%) 18$ samples pass in this stage and need not to go for $2^{\text {nd }}$ stage. In the case of USP consider $\mathrm{Q}=65 \%$ pass 2 sample. In the same way when we judge in $2^{\text {nd }}$ stage finally 14 samples are fail which were smaller than the original number. In quantity test all sample is pass except one when we use the new judge in $1^{\text {st }}$ stage. In content uniformity 7 samples are fail when we use new judge that is lower than the actual number. In this case we can say quantity test of this samples are all most satisfactory but not in dissolution and content uniformity.

In ceftriaxone injection samples all samples are pass in quantity in $1^{\text {st }}$ stage when use wider interval 72-138 and need not to go for $2^{\text {nd }}$ stage. But in content uniformity test 3 fail samples are not changed if we apply new judge $A V=18$. Though all samples are not pass in CU but the result of quantity test are satisfactory. Summary of the results are showing in table 1.10 and broadly in annex 1.9 .

Table 1.10 Compare the results between pharmacopeial guideline and considered new judge

| Name of sample | Original all |  | New all |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| Cefuroxime (60) | 44 | 16 | 49 | 11 |
| Omeprazole (65) | 33 | 32 | 45 | 20 |
| Ceftriaxone (49) | 46 | 3 | 46 | 3 |

* Gentamicin three samples were failed in both identification and microbial assay which were not applicable for considered new judge, while all of Donepezil Hydrochloride were pass and need not to new judge.


### 1.4.9 Results of fluorescence spectrophotometer

We analyzed the excipient of gentamicin samples. We did not get any peak for samples of gentamicin and low peak observed of the samples which were showing in yellow colour of the samples as well as the samples which were pass found peak in the following figures.

Figure 1.20 counterfeit samples A-020 (China)
Figure 1.21 counterfeit sample A-069 (China)


Figure 1.22 counterfeit sample A-077 (China)


Figure 1.23 Pass sample B-09 (Bangladesh)


Figure 1.24 pass sample of B-072 but colour change white to yellow before the expiration (India)


Figure 1.25 pass sample A-024 (Myanmar)


Figure 1.26 pass sample A-040 (Taiwan)


Figure 1.27 pass sample A-090 (Vietnam)


### 1.5 Discussion

We selected Yangon the commercial city of Myanmar, considered of population density and number of drug outlets. In this city, our survey and 235 samples were collected from pharmacy, governmental hospital, private hospital, clinic and also 15 (6.4\%) samples were taken from wholesalers. Medicines must be stored at optimum temperature that mentioned on the label. Temperature is the most critical factors for degrading medicines not only in shop but also it can affect medicines during the distribution time [40-42]. Our all sampled medicines that mentioned on the label and should be keeping in $\leq 25-30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with dry place, but air conditioner was set in fewer than half the number of retail shops visited. Under such situation in Myanmar good pharmacy practice, distribution practice and storage practice are not having satisfactory. Temperature and humidity parameters can be affected and decline the quality of product during the storage or distribution time. To obtain the better quality medicines it will be needed to develop the storage condition at the drug outlets. Most of the omeprazole samples were failed in quantity test as well as dissolution test. These products might be quality and eventually lead to adverse effect of health. This is similar to the high unacceptable ratio in dissolution of omeprazole samples collected in the Cambodian pharmaceutical markets [43].

Antibiotics have been prescribing against infectious diseases that are occurring by microorganisms. The roles of antibiotics in the world are able to kill or inhibit the growth of different types of infectious microorganisms and finally overcome from diseases by its proper uses. Unfortunately, misusing of antibiotic or counterfeiting from manufacturers end side that are increasing to resistance by microorganisms. Resistance to third generation cephalosporin series and aminoglycoside series have been established worldwide. Especially, resistance to third generation cephalosporin by Klebsiella pneumoniae and Neisseria gonorrhoeae were documented at $60 \%$ and $18 \%$ respectively in Myanmar [44, 45]. Sixty percent of Acinetobacter species, $60 \%$ of E. coli, $55 \%$ of Klebsiella species, $60 \%$ of Pseudomonas and $36 \%$ of Staphlococcal species were resistance to gentamicin at North Okkalapa General Hospital in Myanmar [46]. Better qualities of antimicrobials drugs are key issue to prevent microbial resistance. We analyzed and observed in gentamicin samples but three samples out of 58 did not get the zone or low potency from the samples which were counterfeiting (Fig.1.19) as well as did not have peaks during the identification investigation (Fig. 1.17). In fluorescence spectrophotometer we farther investigate about the excipient of GM samples, we did not get any peak for the excipient during the investigation (Fig. 1.20-1.22). We found GM samples (injection) in vial which were low volume and some were yellow colour. During this investigation we observed the low peak for excipient which were yellow colour than
the white colour of the samples (Fig. 1.24). In our survey, we observed a strategy that was associated for spreading counterfeit samples. They made a plan and counterfeit samples were placed only to the community pharmacy. Though, we collected samples from community pharmacy, private hospital, government hospital and clinical pharmacy but the counterfeit samples of gentamicin that were collected from only community pharmacy and these counterfeit medicines produced by Chinese manufacturers who were not registered in Myanmar FDA. In the case of two nonregistered Chinese manufacturers were produced gentamicin, Myanmar government announced their products were counterfeited. Obviously it is compulsory to include antibiotic after any surgical operation to tackle infection from microorganisms.

In our studied, though analytical tests were satisfactory except five gentamicin samples while in the case of cefuroxime and ceftriaxone some samples were not satisfactory in pharmacopeias test. Even we observed one cefuroxime sample was showing torn in a hole of blister and another cefuroxime sample from Indian origin showing different colour in a same strip which were unexpected. Though ceftriaxone and gentamicin all samples were acceptable both sterility and endotoxin tests. Unacceptable cefuroxime tended to cost almost a half price of the pass products. Gentamicin belongs to the class of aminoglycoside antibiotics medicines which is killed or inhibits the growth of bacteria. The price of counterfeit gentamicin is one fourth cheaper than that of good-
quality products, even though no clear relation between unacceptable and price were observed in omeprazole and ceftriaxone products; we should be carefully to buy very cheap products compared to normal price of the domestic markets. Though the counterfeit medicines were very cheaper than the pass samples but other fail samples which were also cheaper as a poor quality not counterfeit. Thus, if cheaper medicines will import in future it must confirm the quality from manufacturers. Deliberately, the manufacturers were not only producing counterfeit medicines but also in manufacturing purpose they were using inexperienced manpower for more money saving. In this case we found spelling errors, different volume in the ampoule were not uniform of the solution (Fig. $1.8 \mathrm{a}, 1.8 \mathrm{~b} \& 1.9)$. Probably, this is the first report of counterfeit gentamicin in Myanmar. During the critical period the patients have been suffering these types of mistake and cannot separate from the authentic drugs. More overdue to lack of awareness general customers were confused these types of messages usually in the crucial time and entered to the danger zone. Spreading the drugs which are unregistered and distributed by unknown wholesaler or company is increasing the percentage of counterfeit to the markets. In this survey we found counterfeit gentamicin samples were unregistered in Myanmar FDA that above mentioned.

Investigation of this survey may not indicate the overall situation of Myanmar because we had several limitations like as region of sample collection, inadequate sample
size, random sampling and budgetary limitations. In authenticity investigation, we tried to communicate to the manufacturers and medicine regulatory authority of each country over telephone or by email which were involved in this program but, the response from the manufacturers side were quite low and there were no manufacturers to reply who were produced counterfeit drugs.

In Myanmar counterfeit medicines have been existing because survey was not conducted for long time. In our survey, we found counterfeit gentamicin which is a matter of serious concern, while chipper samples were more problematic than high price of the samples. For this reason, it is needed to evaluate the quality of medicines regularly in future. Any kind of medicine must be registered in country FDA with maintain actual protocol for storages and distribution time.

### 1.6 Conclusion

Counterfeit GM is being sold in Yangon. The quality of OM is a matter of concern, and requires follow-up. We found that a few specific manufacturers tend to produce poorquality medicines. Regular surveys to monitor counterfeit and substandard medicines in Myanmar are recommended.

Chapter two Four-year survey of the quality of antimicrobials in Cambodia

### 2.1 Introduction

Poor quality or falsified medicines are a serious problem which introduce the global issue especially in low-income countries from a public health point of view [4, 5, 47]. In particular, poor-quality antibiotics and antiparasitic agents may lead not only to treatment failure, but also to development of drug resistance [12,18,48,49,50]. For example, low concentrations of antibiotics accelerated the acquisition of resistance by Salmonella typhimurium LT2 strain, and the effect lasted for over 700 generations in vitro [51]. This problem is exacerbated by the use of antibiotics in the livestock sector as a growth promoter, with resistant strains being passed to humans [22]. The quality problem is not confined to antibiotics, however; in a study of 104 samples of anti-malarials in Southeast Asia in 2001, $38 \%$ were found to be substandard or falsified [52]. In Cambodia in 1999, substandard or falsified artesunate containing sulfadoxine-pyrimethamine caused the death of at least 30 people [53]. Falsified paracetamol that contained diethylene glycol killed more than 200 children in Bangladesh in 1990-1993 [17].

In Cambodia, the prevalence of falsified and substandard antibiotics has been reported to range from $4 \%$ to $90 \%$, according to the Ministry of Health and our earlier surveys [13-16, 43]. In this paper, we describe a 4-year consecutive investigation of medicines distributed in Cambodia, designed to investigate the quality of antimicrobial medicines in Cambodia, as well as to promote efforts to improve the quality of medicines on sale there in the future.

### 2.2 Objective

In Cambodia, the prevalence of falsified and substandard medicines has been reported to range from $4 \%$ to $90 \%$, according to the Ministry of Health and our earlier surveys. As a part of Cambodia's continuing efforts to eliminate falsified medicines, the

Ministry of Health of Cambodia in collaboration with Kanazawa University carried out a further survey designed to evaluate the quality of selected key medicines in the country as well as to promote efforts to improve the quality of both antimicrobial and lifesaving medicines on sale there in the future.

### 2.3 Materials and Methods

### 2.3.1 Selection of sampling areas

In consultation with the Department of Drugs and Food (DDF), Cambodia, we selected six sampling areas in the provinces of Battambang, Kandal, Kampong Speu and Takeo (rural areas) and in Phnom Penh, the capital of Cambodia (urban area) (Annex 2.1).

### 2.3.2 Sample collection

Samples of clarithromycin [54] and sulfamethoxazole/trimethoprim (June 2011) [55]; ceftriaxone (June 2012) [56]; cefuroxime [25], levofloxacin, gentamicin (August 2013) [57]; ciprofloxacin [58], fluconazole, nalidixic acid, ofloxacin, phenoxymethyl penicillin and roxithromycin (August2014) [59] were collected by two teams, each containing one or two Japanese researcher(s), one local assistant and one supervisor from DDF. Samples were collected from pharmacies, Depot-A, Depot-B, non-licenced drug outlets and wholesalers. Depot-A was defined as a site having a pharmacist with at least three years' pharmacy training, while Depot-B was defined as a site having a doctor or retired nurse in attendance.

### 2.3.3 Observation

The obtained samples were checked with reference to "Tool for Visual Inspection of Medicines" [28]. Packages, tablets and blisters of collected samples were observed
carefully for package data, packaging condition, Cambodian registration number on the label, and insert of each sample. Photographs were taken of each sample. During sampling, we also observed the environment of the drug outlets.

### 2.3.4 Authenticity

Authenticity investigation and registration verification were adopted from the World Health Organization procedures [16, 18, 48, 60, 61]. E-mail, contact address and telephone numbers were collected from each manufacturer with Medicine Regulatory Authority (MRA) from their web site. We sent photographs of samples with short questionnaires to the manufacturers to check authenticity and asked MRAs whether manufacturers were licensed or not. We also asked the DDF about sample registration in Cambodia.

### 2.3.5 Sample chemical analysis

The quality of samples was evaluated according to the pharmacopeia indicated on the sample package. For the quantity test, an HPLC method was adopted. A Shim-pack CLC-ODS (M) 15 cm column (Shimadzu, Kyoto, Japan) was used for clarithromycin, ceftriaxone, ciprofloxacin, fluconazole, nalidixic acid, ofloxacin, roxithromycin and gentamicin samples. A Shim-pack CLC-ODS (M) 25 cm column (Shimadzu, Kyoto, Japan) column was used for cefuroxime and levofloxacin samples, while a 30 cm column was used for sulfamethoxazole/trimethoprim samples. An NTR-VS6P dissolution tester (Toyama, Osaka, Japan) was used in dissolution test for all samples except in the cases of ceftriaxone for injection and gentamicin injection. All tests followed on pharmacopeial (according to the package information).

Table 2.1 HPLC conditions for pharmacopoeial tests

| Items | Brand name of HPLC system | Column size | Wavelength | Oven temperature | AV§ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Quantity } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $Q$ value for 30 min . in dissolution |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clarithromycin | Hitachi, Japan | $4.6 \mathrm{mmX1} 15 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 210 nm | $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 15 | 90-110 | $\geq 80 \%$ |
| Sulfamethoxazole/ <br> Trimethoprim | Shimadzu, Japan | 4.6 mmX30 cm | 254 nm | $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 15 | 90-110 | $\geq 70 \%$ |
| Levofloxacin | Shimadzu, Japan | 4.6 mmX 25 cm | 260 nm | $45^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 15 | 90-110 | $\geq 75 \%$ |
| Ciprofloxacin | Waters, USA | $4.6 \mathrm{mmX1} 15 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 278 nm | $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 15 | 90-110 | $\geq 75 \%$ |
| Fluconazole | Shimadzu, Japan | $3.9 \mathrm{mmX15} \mathrm{~cm}$ | 261 nm | $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 15 | 90-110 | $\geq 75 \%$ |
| Nalidixic Acid | Shimadzu, Japan | $4.6 \mathrm{mmX1} 15 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 254 nm | $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 15 | 90-110 | $\geq 80 \%$ |
| Ofloxacin | Waters, USA | $4.6 \mathrm{mmX1} 15 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 294 nm | $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 15 | 90-110 | $\geq 80 \%$ |
| Phenoxymethylpenicillin | Shimadzu, Japan | $4.6 \mathrm{mmX2} 25 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 254 nm | $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | - | 90-120 | $\begin{aligned} & \geq 75 \% \\ & \text { (45min.) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Roxithromycin | Shimadzu, <br> Japan | $4.6 \mathrm{mmX1} 15 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 205 nm | $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 15 | 90-110 | $\geq 75 \%$ |

*Ceftriaxone and gentamicin samples were analyzed previous way.

### 2.3.6 Statistical analysis

Data analysis was performed using SPSS 19.0.0 (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL, USA). Student's t-test was used to determine the significance of differences in scale data. Statistical significance was assessed at 5\% level.

### 2.4 Results

Collected samples are summarized in table 2.2. During the four-year survey, we collected 647 samples, produced by 179 manufacturers, involving 247 different brand products: 50 clarithromycin ( $\mathrm{n}=24500 \mathrm{mg}, \mathrm{n}=26250 \mathrm{mg}$ tablet) (7.7\%) [54], 72 sulfamethoxazole/trimethoprim ( $\mathrm{n}=24800 / 160 \mathrm{mg}, \mathrm{n}=48400 / 80 \mathrm{mg}$ tablet ) ( $11.1 \%$ ) [55], 61 ceftriaxone ( 1 gm vial) ( $9.4 \%$ ) [56], 53 cefuroxime ( 250 mg tablet) ( $8.2 \%$ ) [25], 60 levofloxacin ( $\mathrm{n}=53500 \mathrm{mg}, \mathrm{n}=7250 \mathrm{mg}$ tablet) ( $9.3 \%$ ), 59 gentamicin ( $\mathrm{n}=5180 \mathrm{mg} / 2 \mathrm{ml}$ ampoule, $\mathrm{n}=880 \mathrm{mg} / 2 \mathrm{ml}$ vial) ( $9.1 \%$ ) [57], 56 ciprofloxacin ( 500 mg tablets) ( $8.7 \%$ ) [58], 57 fluconazole ( $\mathrm{n}=5150 \mathrm{mg}, \mathrm{n}=52150 \mathrm{mg}$ capsule) ( $8.8 \%$ ), 9 nalidixic acid ( $\mathrm{n}=3$ $1000 \mathrm{mg}, \mathrm{n}=6500 \mathrm{mg}$ tablet) ( $1.4 \%$ ), 57 ofloxacin ( 200 mg tablet) ( $8.8 \%$ ), 56 phenoxymethyl penicillin ( $\mathrm{n}=13250 \mathrm{mg}$, $\mathrm{n}=181000000 \mathrm{IU}$, $\mathrm{n}=6400000 \mathrm{IU}, \mathrm{n}=19$ 500000 IU tablet) ( $8.7 \%$ ) and 57 roxithromycin ( 150 mg tablet) ( $8.8 \%$ ) samples [59], from Battambang, Kandal, Kampong Speu, Takeo and Phnom Penh. In these surveys we collected $390(60.3 \%)$ samples from urban areas and the rest ( $257,39.7 \%$ ) from rural areas. We found that $138(21.3 \%)$ of 647 samples were domestically produced by 28 ( $15.6 \%$ ) manufacturers among the total of 179 manufacturers (Table 2.3).

### 2.4.1 Drug outlets

We collected 371 ( $57.3 \%$ ) samples from pharmacies, 86 (13.3\%) from Depot-A, 142 ( $21.9 \%$ ) from Depot-B, 45 ( $7 \%$ ) from wholesalers and 3 ( $0.5 \%$ ) from non-licensed drug outlets (Table 2.1). There was no significance association among of these outlets in the quality test of pass and fail samples (Table 2.4).

Table 2.2 Outline of samples collection in Cambodia

| Year | Antibiotic | No. of samples | Types of area |  | Type of drug outlet |  |  |  |  | Price/unit (\$) mean $\pm$ SD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Urban area no. of sample\% | Rural area no. of sample\% | Pharmacy no. of sample\% | Depot-A no. of sample\% | Depot-B no. of sample\% | Wholesaler no. of sample\% | non-licensed no. of sample\% |  |
| 2011 | Clarithromycin | 50 | 28 (56\%) | 22(44\%) | 26 (52\%) | 5 (10\%) | 17 (34\%) | 2 (4\%) | - | $0.321 \pm 0.198$ |
|  | Sulfamethoxazol e/ Trimethoprim | 72 | 42 (58\%) | 30 (32\%) | 23 (32\%) | 15 (21\%) | 29 (40\%) | 4 (5\%) | 1 (2\%) | $0.039 \pm 0.029$ |
| 2012 | Ceftriaxone | 61 | 32 (52\%) | 29 (48\%) | 26 (43\%) | 10 (16\%) | 19 (31\%) | 4 (7\%) | 2 (3\%) | $1.086 \pm 1.386$ |
| 2013 | Cefuroxime | 53 | 37 (70\%) | 16 (30\%) | 34 (64\%) | 3 (6\%) | 10 (19\%) | 6 (11\%) | - | $0.468 \pm 0.198$ |
|  | Levofloxacin | 60 | 35 (58\%) | 25 (32\%) | 30 (50\%) | 6 (10\%) | 18 (30\%) | 6 (10\%) | - | $0.384 \pm 0.294$ |
|  | Gentamicin | 59 | 35 (59\%) | 24 (31\%) | 26 (44\%) | 11 (19\%) | 17 (29\%) | 5 (8\%) | - | $0.069 \pm 0.032$ |
| 2014 | Ciprofloxacin | 56 | 36 (64\%) | 20 (36\%) | 40 (71\%) | 7 (13\%) | 5 (9\%) | 4 (7\%) | - | $0.075 \pm 0.120$ |
|  | Fluconazole | 57 | 35 (61\%) | 22 (29\%) | 36 (63\%) | 4 (7\%) | 9 (16\%) | 8 (14\%) | - | $0.427 \pm 0.312$ |
|  | Nalidixic Acid | 9 | 6 (66\%) | 3 (34\%) | 6 (66\%) | 2 (22\%) | 1 (2\%) | - | - | $0.102 \pm 0.072$ |
|  | Ofloxacin | 57 | 33 (58\%) | 24 (32\%) | 41 (72\%) | 6 (10\%) | 9 (16\%) | 1 (2\%) | - | $0.078 \pm 0.039$ |
|  | Phenoxymethyl penicillin | 56 | 33 (59\%) | 23 (31\%) | 42 (75\%) | 8 (15\%) | 3 (5\%) | 3 (5\%) | - | $0.063 \pm 0.112$ |
|  | Roxithromycin | 57 | 38 (66\%) | 19 (34\%) | 41 (72\%) | 9 (16\%) | 5 (9\%) | 2 (3\%) | - | $0.091 \pm 0.092$ |
|  | Total | 647 (100\%) | 390 (60\%) | 257 (40\%) | 371 (57\%) | 86 (13\%) | 142 (22\%) | 45 (7\%) | 3 (1\%) |  |

Urban area: The capital of Cambodia (Phnom Penh)
Rural area: Other provinces (Battambang, Kandal, Kampong Speu and Takeo) which are located outsides of capital city
Depot-A: Depot-A outlet by an assistant pharmacist (who received 3 years' pharmacy training)
Depot-B: Depot-B outlet by a doctor or retired nurse

Table 2.3 Number of samples collected which were produced domestically (Cambodia) foreign samples

| Name of sample | Number of <br> Cambodian <br> samples | Number of <br> Cambodian <br> manufacturers | Number <br> of foreign <br> samples | Number of <br> foreign <br> manufacturers |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clarithromycin | 14 | 2 | 36 | 8 |
| Sulfamethoxazole/ Trimethoprim | 42 | 6 | 30 | 9 |
| Ceftriaxone | 0 | 0 | 61 | 17 |
| Cefuroxime | 0 | 0 | 53 | 15 |
| Levofloxacin | 0 | 0 | 60 | 19 |
| Gentamicin | 0 | 0 | 59 | 12 |
| Ciprofloxacin | 18 | 5 | 38 | 15 |
| Fluconazole | 10 | 1 | 47 | 16 |
| Nalidixic Acid | 6 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Ofloxacin | 14 | 6 | 43 | 15 |
| Phenoxymethyl penicillin | 24 | 3 | 32 | 3 |
| Roxithromycin | 10 | 4 | 47 | 19 |
| Total | 138 | 28 | 509 | 151 |

Table 2.4 Significance association among the drug outlets in quality test

| Outlet | Number of | Quality test |  | p (Fisher's |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | samples | Pass | Fail |  |
| Pharmacy | 371 | 269 | 102 |  |
| Depot-A | 86 | 64 | 22 |  |
| Depot-B | 142 | 94 | 48 |  |
| Wholesaler | 45 | 36 | 9 |  |
| Non-licensed | 3 | 2 | 1 | $*$ |

*Due to few samples not calculated in statistically

### 2.4.2 Observations

During the collection of samples, we observed that 51 shops out of 353 were airconditioned. 85 (13.1\%) samples lacked an insert, while insert information of one sample which was found in the package and package information about the medicine was not match during the observation. Five samples showed variations of package colour. Two lots of tablets and one ampoule showed different colours from others of the same brands. The blister which was picked from the package and it’s information did not match the package (which carry blister) information for one sample (Table 2.5). We collected 12 (1.9\%) samples that were not registered with the DDF (Table 2.6). We found one cefuroxime sample that was a physician sample (this was mentioned on the box) [25], and one sulfamethoxazole/trimethoprim sample that had passed its expiration date [55].

Table 2.5 Number of abnormal samples were found during observation analysis.

| Name of samples | Number <br> of <br> samples | Number of <br> insert <br> missing of <br> the samples | Insert <br> information <br> not match to <br> the package | Blister <br> information <br> did not match <br> with container | Different <br> package <br> colour in <br> same lot | Different <br> colour of <br> tablet/ <br> ampoule |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clarithromycin | 50 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| Sulfamethoxazole/ | 72 | 24 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Trimethoprim |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ceftriaxone | 61 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cefuroxime | 53 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Levofloxacin | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gentamicin | 59 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Ciprofloxacin | 56 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fluconazole | 57 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nalidixic Acid | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ofloxacin | 57 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Phenoxymethyl | 56 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| penicillin |  |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Roxithromycin | 57 | 647 | $85(13.1 \%)$ | $1(0.15 \%)$ | $1(0.15 \%)$ | $5(0.8 \%)$ |

Table 2.6 Number of unregistered samples in DDF

| Name of medicine | Number of <br> samples | Samples were <br> unregistered in DDF |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Clarithromycin | 50 | 0 |
| Sulfamethoxazole/ | 72 | 2 |
| Trimethoprim |  |  |
| Ceftriaxone | 61 | 2 |
| Cefuroxime | 53 | 2 |
| Levofloxacin | 60 | 0 |
| Gentamicin | 59 | 2 |
| Ciprofloxacin | 56 | 1 |
| Fluconazole | 57 | 0 |
| Nalidixic Acid | 9 | 3 |
| Ofloxacin | 57 | 0 |
| Phenoxymethyl | 56 | 0 |
| penicillin |  |  |
| Roxithromycin | 57 | 0 |
| Total | 647 | $12(1.9 \%)$ |

### 2.4.3 Authenticity

In 2011, 11 manufacturers replied about 60 samples; in 2012, 4 manufacturers replied about 17 samples; in 2013, 15 manufacturers replied about 51 samples, and in 2014, 13 manufacturers replied about 26 samples, confirming that those samples were authentic. On the other hand, 18 MRAs out of 40 replied about manufacturer licenses and branded products (Table 2.7). The MRA in Germany replied that one manufacturer was not licensed.

### 2.4.4 Quality investigation of samples

The results of quality evaluation of collected samples are summarized in Table 2.8. In the quantity test, $533(90.6 \%)$ out of 588 samples passed. Among 472 samples analyzed for content uniformity, 406 (86\%) passed. In the dissolution test, 424 (80.4\%) out of 527 samples passed. Identification, microbial assay, sterility and endotoxin tests were satisfactory. In the content uniformity test, the average price of failed samples of cefuroxime was significantly cheaper than that of passed samples (Student's t-test, $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ). In the dissolution test, failed samples of roxithromycin were significantly cheaper than passed samples (Table 2.9) (Student's t -test, $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ). In the dissolution test, there was a significant difference between the pass and fail rates of Cambodian-produced samples and foreign-produced samples (Table 2.10) (Fisher's exact test, $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ).

Table 2.7 MRAs and manufacturers replied during the authenticity investigation

| Country | Participated year | MRAs replied year | Number of manufacturers participated | Number of samples | Number of manufacturers replied | Manufacturers confirmed all samples were genuine |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Austria | 2013 \& 2014 | 20013\& 2014 | 2 | 17 | Not replied | - |
| Bangladesh | $\begin{aligned} & 2011,2012,2013 \& \\ & 2014 \end{aligned}$ | - | 14 | 30 | 2 Replied in 2013 | 5 |
| Cambodia | 2011, 2014 | 2011 \& 2014 | 16 | 128 | 16 in 2011 | 128 |
| China | 2013 | 2013 | 8 | 43 | Not replied | - |
| Cyprus | 2011, 2013 \& 2014 | 2011 | 3 | 7 | Not replied | - |
| France | 2011 \& 2014 | 2011 | 3 | 10 | 1 replied 2011 | 1 |
| Germany | 2013 \& 2014 | 2011 \& 2014 | 2 | 10 | 1 in 2013 \& 1 I 2014 | 1 |
| India | $\begin{aligned} & 2011,2012,2013 \& \\ & 2014 \end{aligned}$ | 2011 \& 2012 | 83 | 257 | 9 in 2013 | - |
| Indonesia | 2013 \& 2014 | - | 4 | 5 | 1 in 2013 | - |
| Korea | 2011, 2014 | 2011 | 13 | 36 | 1 in 2011 \& 1 in 2014 | 7 |
| Malaysia | 2011, 2013 \& 2014 | 2011 | 3 | 10 | 1 in 2014 | - |
| Pakistan | $\begin{aligned} & 2011,2012,2013 \& \\ & 2014 \end{aligned}$ | 2011 \& 2012 | 11 | 38 | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { in } 2011,4 \text { in } 2012 \& 1 \\ & \text { in } 2013 \end{aligned}$ | 8 |
| Singapore | 2014 | - | 1 | 1 | Not replied | - |
| Sweden | 2012 | 2012 | 1 | 3 | Replied | 3 |
| Thailand | 2011, 2013 \& 2014 | 2011 | 7 | 33 | 2 in 2011 | 1 |
| United Kingdom | 2013 | 2013 | 1 | 10 | Not replied |  |
| Vietnam | 2011, 2013 \& 2014 | - | 7 | 9 | Not replied | - |

Table 2.8 Summary of quality test of samples

| Antibiotic | Total no. of samples | Dissolution |  | Content uniformity |  | Quantity |  | Identification |  | Sterility |  | Endotoxin |  | Microbial assay |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| Clarithromycin | 50 | 36 | 14 | 43 | 7 | 49 | 1 | 50 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sulfamethoxazole/ <br> Trimethoprim | 72 | 62 | 10 | 70 | 2 | 53 | 19 | 72 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ceftriaxone | 61 | - | - | 46 | 15 | 48 | 13 | 61 | 0 | 61 | 0 | 61 | 0 | - | - |
| Cefuroxime | 53 | 53 | 0 | 43 | 10 | 51 | 2 | 53 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Levofloxacin | 60 | 42 | 18 | - | - | 57 | 3 | 60 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Gentamicin | 59 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 59 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 59 | 0 | 59 | 0 |
| Ciprofloxacin | 56 | 54 | 2 | 56 | 0 | 54 | 2 | 56 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Fluconazole | 57 | 29 | 28 | 40 | 17 | 54 | 3 | 57 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Nalidixic Acid | 9 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ofloxacin | 57 | 49 | 8 | 44 | 13 | 46 | 11 | 57 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Phenoxymethylpenicillin | 56 | 56 | 0 | - | - | 55 | 1 | 56 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Roxithromycin | 57 | 40 | 17 | 55 | 2 | 57 | 0 | 57 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 647 | 424 | 103 | 406 | 66 | 533 | 55 | 647 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 120 | 0 | 59 | 0 |

Table 2.9 Comparison between price and result of the quality test in samples

| Name of sample | Test | Result | Number of samples | Price/unit (\$) mean $\pm$ SD | t-test |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clarithromycin | Dissolution | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Pass } \\ \text { Fail } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 14 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.355 \pm 0.199 \\ & 0.235 \pm 0.174 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | n.s |
|  | Content uniformity | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{gathered} 43 \\ 7 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.340 \pm 0.207 \\ & 0.209 \pm 0.159 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | n.s |
|  | Quantity | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{gathered} 49 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.324 \pm 0.20 \\ & 0.20 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | - |
| Sulfamethoxazole/ <br> Trimethoprim | Dissolution | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{aligned} & 62 \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.041 \pm 0.031 \\ & 0.028 \pm 0.011 \end{aligned}$ | n.s |
|  | Content uniformity | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{gathered} 70 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.040 \pm 0.029 \\ & 0.42 \pm 0.14 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | n.s |
|  | Quantity | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{aligned} & 53 \\ & 19 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.04 \pm 0.024 \\ & 0.038 \pm 0.407 \end{aligned}$ | n.s |
| Ceftriaxone | Content uniformity | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{aligned} & 46 \\ & 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.970 \pm 0.524 \\ & 0.661 \pm 0.339 \end{aligned}$ | n.s |
|  | Quantity | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{aligned} & 48 \\ & 13 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.970 \pm 0.533 \\ & 0.69 \pm 0.360 \end{aligned}$ | n.s |
| Cefuroxime | Dissolution | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{gathered} 53 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $0.468 \pm 0.198$ | - |
|  | Content uniformity | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{aligned} & 43 \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.360 \pm 0.210 \\ & 0.510 \pm 0.180 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ |
|  | Quantity | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{gathered} 51 \\ 2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.462 \pm 0.198 \\ & 0.615 \pm 0.190 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | n.s |
| Levofloxacin | Dissolution | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{aligned} & 42 \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.421 \pm 0.339 \\ & 0.303 \pm 0.228 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | n.s |
|  | Quantity | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{gathered} 59 \\ 3 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.391 \pm 0.300 \\ & 0.247 \pm 0.024 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | n.s |
| Gentamicin | All test | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{gathered} 59 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $0.069 \pm 0.032$ | - |
| Ciprofloxacin | Dissolution | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Pass } \\ \text { Fail } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 54 \\ 2 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.076 \pm 0.123 \\ & 0.049 \pm 0.016 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | n.s |
|  | Content uniformity | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{gathered} 56 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $0.075 \pm 0.016$ | - |
|  | Quantity | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{gathered} 54 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.0758 \pm 0.123 \\ & 0.668 \pm 0.0102 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | n.s |
| Fluconazole | Dissolution | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{aligned} & 29 \\ & 28 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.448 \pm 0.348 \\ & 0.406 \pm 0.274 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | n.s |
|  | Content uniformity | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.419 \pm 0.319 \\ & 0.447 \pm 0.302 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | n.s |
|  | Quantity | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{gathered} 54 \\ 3 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.426 \pm 0.317 \\ & 0.463 \pm 0.028 \end{aligned}$ | n.s |
| Nalidixic Acid | Dissolution | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.088 \pm 0.0411 \\ & 0.109 \pm 0.086 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | n.s |
|  | Content uniformity | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $0.102 \pm 0.024$ | - |
|  | Quantity | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $0.102 \pm 0.024$ | - |
| Ofloxacin | Dissolution | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{gathered} 49 \\ 8 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.072 \pm 0.318 \\ & 0.118 \pm 0.502 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | n.s |
|  | Content uniformity | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \\ & 13 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.078 \pm 0.039 \\ & 0.079 \pm 0.038 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | n.s |
|  | Quantity | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{aligned} & 46 \\ & 11 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.076 \pm 0.040 \\ & 0.88 \pm 0.034 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | n.s |
| Phenoxymethylpenicillin | Dissolution | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{gathered} 56 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $0.063 \pm 0.112$ | - |
|  | Quantity | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{gathered} 55 \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.064 \pm 0.113 \\ & 0.05 \end{aligned}$ | - |
| Roxithromycin | Dissolution | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \\ & 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.0952 \pm 0.014 \\ & 0.082 \pm 0.022 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ |
|  | Content uniformity | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{gathered} 55 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.080 \pm 0.088 \\ & 0.785 \pm 0.048 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | n.s |
|  | Quantity | Pass <br> Fail | $\begin{gathered} 57 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $0.091 \pm 0.0921$ | - |

Table 2.10 Factors associated with quality test found in roxithromycin samples which were originated from Cambodia and other countries

| Factors |  | Manufactured Country | Number of samples | Test Result |  | $p$ (Fisher's exact test) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass |  | Fail |  |
| Ciprofloxacin | Content uniformity |  | Cambodia | 18 | 18 | 0 | - |
|  |  | other | 38 | 38 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Quantity | Cambodia | 18 | 18 | 0 | - |  |
|  |  | other | 38 | 36 | 2 |  |  |
|  | Dissolution | Cambodia | 18 | 18 | 0 | - |  |
|  |  | other | 38 | 36 | 2 |  |  |
| Fluconazole | Content uniformity | Cambodia | 10 | 7 | 3 | n.s |  |
|  |  | other | 47 | 33 | 14 |  |  |
|  | Quantity | Cambodia | 10 | 10 | 0 | - |  |
|  |  | other | 47 | 44 | 3 |  |  |
|  | Dissolution | Cambodia | 10 | 5 | 5 | n.s |  |
|  |  | other | 47 | 24 | 23 |  |  |
| Nalidixic Acid | Content uniformity | Cambodia | 6 | 6 | 0 | - |  |
|  |  | other | 3 | 3 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Quantity | Cambodia | 6 | 6 | 0 | - |  |
|  |  | other | 3 | 3 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Dissolution | Cambodia | 6 | 1 | 5 | n.s |  |
|  |  | other | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| Ofloxacin | Content uniformity | Cambodia | 13 | 11 | 2 | n.s |  |
|  |  | other | 42 | 33 | 9 |  |  |
|  | Quantity | Cambodia | 13 | 11 | 2 | n.s |  |
|  |  | other | 42 | 35 | 7 |  |  |
|  | Dissolution | Cambodia | 13 | 12 | 1 | n.s |  |
|  |  | other | 42 | 37 | 5 |  |  |
| Phenoxymethyl penicillin | Quantity | Cambodia | 24 | 23 | 1 | - |  |
|  |  | other | 32 | 32 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Dissolution | Cambodia | 24 | 24 | 0 | - |  |
|  |  | other | 32 | 32 | 0 |  |  |
| Roxithromycin | Content uniformity | Cambodia | 10 | 10 | 0 | - |  |
|  |  | other | 45 | 45 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Quantity | Cambodia | 10 | 10 | 0 | - |  |
|  |  | other | 47 | 47 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Dissolution | Cambodia | 10 | 3 | 7 | $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ |  |
|  |  | other | 47 | 37 | 10 |  |  |
| Clarithromycin | Content uniformity | Cambodia | 14 | 12 | 2 |  |  |
|  |  | other | 36 | 31 | 5 |  |  |
|  | Quantity | Cambodia | 14 | 13 | 1 | - |  |
|  |  | other | 36 | 36 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Dissolution | Cambodia | 14 | 9 | 5 | n.s |  |
|  |  | other | 36 | 27 | 9 |  |  |
| Sulfamethoxazole/ <br> Trimethoprim | Content uniformity | Cambodia | 42 | 40 | 2 | - |  |
|  |  | other | 30 | 30 | 0 |  |  |
|  | Quantity | Cambodia | 42 | 32 | 10 | n.s |  |
|  |  | other | 30 | 21 | 9 |  |  |
|  | Dissolution | Cambodia | 42 | 36 | 6 | n.s |  |
|  |  | other | 30 | 26 | 4 |  |  |

### 2.5 Discussion

Falsified antibiotics have been found in previous surveys in Cambodia [43]. For this reason, our four-year survey covered a range of different regions in the country. Overall, we found that 424 ( $80.5 \%$ ), 406 ( $86 \%$ ), 533 ( $90.6 \%$ ), 647 ( $100 \%$ ), 120 ( $100 \%$ ), $120(100 \%)$ and $59(100 \%)$ samples passed the dissolution, content uniformity, quantity, identification, sterility, endotoxin, and microbial assay tests respectively (Table 2.8). Thus, poor-quality medicines were still available in Cambodia during the study period. Possible reasons include poor GMP implementation by manufacturers and inadequate storage conditions in outlets in Cambodia. Only 51 of 353 outlets were air-conditioned. Cambodia is situated in a tropical region, and the summer season is hot and humid. Our statistical investigation we did not get significance association, the effect of temperature on pass or fail samples of medicines compare with those outlets containing airconditioning. But it is well established that these conditions can markedly impair the quality of medicines [40-42]. In our investigation, failed samples were significantly cheaper than passed samples in the cases of cefuroxime and roxithromycin. Thus, it may be important to focus quality checks especially on cheaper medicines (Table 2.9). Foreign manufacturers not only supply poor quality medicines in the markets but also domestic manufactures were produced and supply this type of medicines to the markets. We found 10 roxithromycin products which were produced domestically. Significance was associated in number of pass and fail samples which compared with the foreign products (Table 2.10). We also found one expired sample, and this could present a health hazard to patients. About medicine indication information get from insert which must compulsory inside of box or container. We found $13.1 \%$ samples did not contain insert. Unregistered samples which may causes to increase poor quality medicines in the markets.

We found $1.9 \%$ samples were not registered in DDF (Table 2.6). In our investigation maximum unregistered samples did not pass according to their pharmacopoeial test.

Non-licenced drug outlets were found in Cambodia in previous studies [13, 16, $43,60]$, but have since been almost completely closed down, and only permitted clinics continue to sell medicines, thanks to the vigorous efforts of the Cambodian government to strengthen pharmaceutical control (Table 2.2). But, our statistical analysis among of these outlets did not get any significance (Table 2.4)

More than $10 \%$ of the antibiotics sampled failed in various tests, except for levofloxacin, ciprofloxacin and phenoxymethyl penicillin (table 2.8). Among the failures, $28 \%$ of clarithromycin and $49.1 \%$ of fluconazole samples failed only in the dissolution test. On the other hand, $20 \%$ of ofloxacin and $26.4 \%$ of sulfamethoxazole/trimethoprim samples failed in content uniformity and quality tests, respectively. These results are unsatisfactory from the viewpoint of public health, and are also likely to promote bacterial resistance to antibiotics [12]. This is a serious issue, because it has been reported that $60 \%$ and $18 \%$ of Klebsiella pneumonia and Neisseria gonorrhea, respectively, have developed resistance even to third-generation cephalosporin [44, 45]. In North Okkalapa General Hospital in Myanmar, $60 \%$ of Acinetobacter species, $60 \%$ of E. coli, $55 \%$ of Klebsiella, $60 \%$ of Pseudomonas and $36 \%$ of Staphylococcus species were resistant to gentamicin [46]. In addition, resistance to old quinolones such as nalidixic acid, fluoroquinolones such as ciprofloxacin and ofloxacin, penicillins such as phenoxymethyl penicillin, macrolides such as roxithromycin and triazole antifungal drugs such as fluconazole has been documented globally. According to the 2014 WHO report, E. coli and Shigella
strains resistant to fluoroquinolones amounted to $31-32 \%$ and $11.8 \%$, respectively, in Cambodia. Streptococcus pneumoniae resistant to penicillin has also been detected at a rate of $64 \%$ in Cambodia [45]. However, action against substandard or falsified medicines has improved the quality of medicines in recent years [13, 15,16]. In our four-year investigation we found poor-quality medicines, but we did not find any falsified medicines, which is consistent with the view that the quality of medicines in Cambodian markets has improved. The results of registration verification from DDF were also satisfactory.

The prevalence of poor-quality medicines found in our investigation is broadly consistent with that in other lower-income countries [62]. But, although no falsified medicine has been identified among the collected samples, it has not been possible to confirm the authenticity of all the samples.

### 2.6 Conclusion

Poor-quality antibiotics remained prevalent in Cambodia during 2011 to 2014. Efforts are needed to encourage manufacturers to follow GMP, and to ensure proper handling of medicines throughout the supply chain. Also, continuous monitoring of manufacturers' products by MRAs is needed to ensure all products are licensed.

Chapter three Quality survey of selected medicines in Cambodia, 2011-2013

### 3.1 Introduction

Poor quality medicines are a serious issue for public health; for example, 200 children died in a Bangladesh hospital in 1990-93 after being given counterfeit paracetamol that had been substituted by diethylene glycol [17,19]. In 2016, the Supreme Court of Bangladesh ordered about twenty pharmaceutical companies identified as responsible for production of substandard drugs to cease operation [63]. Counterfeit medicines impact not only developing countries, but also high-income countries [64-68], although it has been estimated that $30 \%$ of counterfeit drugs are distributed in Africa, Asia, Middle East, compared with less than $1 \%$ in the USA and European countries [5, 69-71]. In addition to counterfeit medicines, substandard medicines are also an important issue; for example, in 1999 more than 30 people died after being given substandard sulfadoxine-pyrimethamine as an anti-malarial [53].

Since the 1990s, the Ministry of Health and law-enforcement agencies in Cambodia have been trying to identify and suppress the distribution of falsified medicines, in cooperation with various international organizations, including the World Health Organization (WHO), INTERPOL, USAID, US Pharmacopeial Convention (USP), and Japan Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association (JPMA) [13, 60, 72-76]. Various surveys have found that the prevalence of counterfeit and substandard medicines in Cambodia ranged from $4 \%$ to $90 \%$ [13-16]. In a previous survey in 2010, we also found falsified and poor quality medicines in Cambodian markets [43, 62].

As a part of Cambodia's continuing efforts to eliminate falsified medicines, the Ministry of Health of Cambodia in collaboration with Kanazawa University carried out a further survey designed to evaluate the quality of selected key medicines in the country.

### 3.2 Methods

### 3.2.1 Sample collection

We decided to collect samples from regions of high population density, border regions and locations along national highways. In consultation with the Department of Drugs and Food (DDF), we selected Phnom Penh as an urban area, and Battambang, Kandal, Takeo, Kampong speu and Svay rieng as rural areas. A list of licensed drug outlets was obtained from DDF. The selected target drugs were cimetidine in 2011, amlodipine [77]; esomeprazole and rabeprazole [78] in 2012, glibenclamide [79] and metformin [80] in 2013. Samples were collected from four types of drug outlets: pharmacies, Depot-A, Depot-B and non-licensed drug outlets. Depot-A was defined as an outlet with a pharmacist who had at least 3 years' pharmacy training, and Depot-B was defined as an outlet that contained a doctor or retired nurse [81]. Some samples were also collected from wholesalers. Each of the two sampling teams contained a research investigator, a local officer who had received training, and a sampling assistant. A sampling form was used to record information about each sample at the time of purchase, and samples were keep $20-25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ until analyzed.

### 3.2.2 Observation

The condition of each package, the colour of the box, the appearance of the medicines, and the insert in each package were carefully examined at Kanazawa University, and compared with those of other samples of the same brand, and the logo on the box was compared with that on the labeled supplier's internet home page. The manufacturing date, expiry date, lot number, license number, and Cambodian registration
number were also recorded. Samples were photographed, and scans of the box and insert were made.

### 3.2.3 Authenticity

Authenticity investigation was conducted according to the recommendations of the World Health Organization (WHO) [16, 48]. Information on the label, photographs of samples, scans of the box and insert, and a short questionnaire were sent to manufacturers by E-mail, and manufacturers were also contacted by telephone using the number on their internet home page. We asked the responsible MRAs whether or not the manufacturers were registered. We also asked the DDF whether or not the collected medicines were registered in Cambodia.

### 3.2.4 Quality analysis

Sample quality was evaluated according to the Pharmacopeia stated on the label, using the USP 34, USP 35 and BP 2012 versions of the pharmacopeias [82-84]. Content uniformity tests were performed with 10 tablets/capsules of all samples. The HPLC columns and parameters used during the content uniformity tests are listed in Table 3.1. Quantity and dissolution tests followed the relevant pharmacopeial descriptions. Dissolution tests for all samples were performed with 6 tablets/capsules by using an NTRVS6P dissolution tester (Toyama, Osaka, Japan).

### 3.2.5 Statistical analysis

Data analysis was performed using SPSS release 19.0.0 (Chicago: SPSS Inc.). When appropriate, Fisher's exact test was performed to identify significant relationships among variables. Statistical significance was evaluated at 5\% level.

Table 3.1 HPLC conditions for pharmacopoeial tests

| Items | Brand name of <br> HPLC system | Column size | Wave- <br> length | Oven <br> temperature | AV | Quantity \% | Q value for 30 <br> min. in dissolution |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Amlodipine | Hitachi, Japan | $4.6 \mathrm{mmX15} \mathrm{~cm}$ | 237 nm | $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 15 | $90-110$ | $\geq 75 \%$ |
| Cimetidine | Shimadzu, Japan | 4.6 mmX 25 cm | 220 nm | $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 15 | $90-110$ | $\geq 80 \%$ |
| Esomeprazole | Shimadzu, Japan | $4.0 \mathrm{mmX10cm}$ | 302 nm | $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 15 | $90-110$ | $\geq 75 \%$ |
| Glibenclamide | Waters, USA | $4.6 \mathrm{mmX15} \mathrm{~cm}$ | 254 nm | $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 15 | $90-110$ | $\geq 70 \%$ |
| Metformin | Shimadzu, Japan | 4.6 mmX 25 cm | 218 nm | $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 15 | $90-110$ | $\geq 70 \%$ |
| Rabeprazole | Waters, USA | $4.6 \mathrm{mmX15} \mathrm{~cm}$ | 290 nm | $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 15 | $90-110$ | $\geq 75 \%$ |

### 3.3 Results

As summarized in Table 3.2, we collected 86 (25.1\%) samples of cimetidine (40 mg tablet), 79 (23.1\%) amlodipine ( $\mathrm{n}=310 \mathrm{mg}$ capsule \& n=76 5 mg tablet) [77], 54 (15.8\%) esomeprazole ( $20 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{n}=14$ capsule \& $\mathrm{n}=12$ tablets; 40 mg tablet $\mathrm{n}=16$ \& $\mathrm{n}=12$ capsule), 11 ( $3.2 \%$ ) rabeprazole ( $10 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{n}=1$ capsule \& $20 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{n}=10$ tablet) [78], 60 (17.5\%) metformin (500 mg tablet) [80] and 52 (15.2\%) glibenclamide (5 mg tablet) [79]. Most of the samples (223, 65.2\%) were collected from Phnom Penh, and the others (119, $34.8 \%$ ) were collected from rural areas.

### 3.3.1 Drug Outlets

We collected total 342 samples from 263 drug outlets in the investigated regions.
We obtained 156 (45.6\%) from pharmacies, 62 (18.1\%) from Depot-A, 96 (28.1\%) from Depot-B, and 30 (8.2\%) from wholesalers (Table 3.2).

Table 3.2 Number of samples collected from different outlets

| Year/Name of samples | No. of samples | Area |  | Type of drug outlet |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Urban | Rural | Pharmacy | Depot-A | Depot-B | Wholesaler |
| 2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cimetidine | 86 | 57 | 29 | 30 | 19 | 34 | 3 |
| 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Amlodipine | 79 | 45 | 34 | 33 | 12 | 27 | 7 |
| Esomeprazole | 54 | 38 | 16 | 28 | 4 | 13 | 9 |
| Rabeprazole | 11 | 10 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Glibenclamide | 52 | 33 | 19 | 25 | 14 | 10 | 3 |
| Metformin | 60 | 40 | 20 | 32 | 13 | 10 | 5 |
| Total | 342 | 223 | 119 | 156 | 62 | 96 | 28 |

### 3.3.2 Observations

Among 263 outlets, only 18 were air-conditioned. The samples originated from 78 manufacturers, and 38 (11.1\%) were domestically produced. Three samples of cimetidine and one of amlodipine were in boxes or containers of nonstandard colour (Fig. $1 \mathrm{a}, 1 \mathrm{~b})$. The colour of the tablets in two different samples did not match among the samples of cimetidine and amlodipine (Fig. 1c). The inserts in the two samples did not match those in other samples of the same brand. In addition, 32 (9.4\%) samples had no insert.

### 3.3.3 Authenticity

The DDF reported that 14 samples out of 342 were not registered (Table 3.3). Replies stating that products were authentic were received from 8 out of 27 manufacturers in 2011, 7 out of 35 manufacturers in 2012 and 6 out of 19 manufacturers in 2013. Thus, the response rate was quite poor. On the other hand, we received replies from 7 out of 12 MRAs in 2011, 7 out of 13 MRAs in 2012 and 2 out of 10 MRAs in 2013, stating that manufacturers were registered in their country.

## Figure 3.1

a: Different boxes or containers of cimetidine.
a.

b: Different colour of the box of amlodipine sample

c: Different tablets of amlodipine


Table 3.3 Samples without registration or insert

| Items | Unregistered | No insert in box |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Cimetidine | 3 | 23 |
| Amlodipine | 7 | 3 |
| Esomeprazole | 1 | 2 |
| Rabeprazole | 0 | 0 |
| Glibenclamide | 1 | 1 |
| Metformin | 2 | 3 |
| Total | 14 | 32 |

### 3.3.4 Quality evaluation

The test results for the 342 samples are summarized in Table 3.4. We found that 38 (11.1\%) samples failed the dissolution test, and 52 ( $15.2 \%$ ) failed the content uniformity test. In addition, 48 (14\%) samples out of 342 failed the quantity test. In the case of rabeprazole, 11 samples originated from Japan passed all the tests, whereas 16 ( $42.1 \%$ ) samples out of 38 produced domestically failed in one or more tests. Failure rates in quality tests were significantly associated with anomalies in visual observation of the samples (Fisher`s exact test, $\mathrm{p}<0.01 \& \mathrm{p}<0.05$ ) (Table 3.5).

Table 3.4 Summary of quality test of samples

| Sample name | No. of samples | Dissolution |  | Content uniformity |  | Quantity |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| Cimetidine | 86 | 79 | 7 | 65 | 21 | 71 | 15 |
| Amlodipine | 79 | 77 | 2 | 73 | 6 | 78 | 1 |
| Esomeprazole | 54* | 31 | 22 | 32 | 22 | 33 | 21 |
| Rabeprazole | 11 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| Glibenclamide | 52 | 47 | 5 | 49 | 3 | 46 | 6 |
| Metformin | 60 | 58 | 2 | 60 | 0 | 55 | 5 |
| Total | 342 | 303 | 38 | 290 | 52 | 294 | 48 |

[^0]Table 3.5 Statistical analysis


### 3.5 Discussion

Cambodia lies in a tropical region, and is very hot and humid in the summer season. These factors can seriously impact on the quality of improperly stored medicines [40-42]. Among the outlets from which samples were collected, we found that all the wholesalers were equipped with air-conditioning, but very few other outlets had airconditioning. There seems to be a clear need to improve the storage conditions in retail outlets in order to improve the quality of medicines.

We observed some samples of boxes that had been imported, but showed a different colour compared with other samples of the same brand. The fact that these were on sale suggests that customers were not necessarily familiar with the authentic products. On the other hand, printing technology makes it quite easy to prepare packages for falsified medicines that resemble authentic products [47, 85]. In our investigation we also found two samples of tablets that had nonstandard colours. Among samples from both foreign and domestic manufacturers, we found that 32 (9.4\%) lacked sample inserts in the box, although it was not clear whether inserts had been omitted by the manufacturers or removed by retailers. Among 14 samples that had been imported but not registered with the DDF (Table 3.3), 4 (28.6\%) failed pharmacopoeial tests in Kanazawa University. A major issue in authenticity investigation was the poor response rate from manufacturers. We could not get any responses from 57 manufacturers, although 86 samples were confirmed to be genuine by 21 manufacturers.

Among all the samples collected, 38, 52 and 48 samples failed in dissolution, content uniformity and/or quality tests at Kanazawa University. Most of the esomeprazole samples failed in all tests (Table 3.4). In the case of amlodipine, which is used to treat
hypertension and chest pain in adults or children, and we found that 6 samples failed the content uniformity test. It is noteworthy that 14 (42.1\%) out of 38 samples of domestically produced rabeprazole were of poor quality. Thus, the manufacturers (Cambodian) which are produced poor quality medicines should avoid and imported good quality medicines from the manufacturers.

Finally, it should be noted that our survey had a number of limitations. In particular, budgetary restrictions limited the number of samples that could be collected and the number of outlets that could be sampled. We did not visit all of the same sites in each of the 3 years. Nevertheless, our survey clearly shows that substandard and counterfeit medicines are widely available in Cambodia.

### 3.6 Conclusion

Poor-quality medicines were still prevalent in Cambodia during 2011-2013. It is desirable to conduct further surveys to continue monitoring the situation. Measures are also needed to improve the quality of domestically manufactured products.

## Chapter four <br> Comparative study between Myanmar and Cambodia

## Comparative study between two-countries

According to pharmacopoeial analysis, from the investigation samples in Myanmar we found that $79.7 \%, 84.7 \%, 82 \%, 100 \%, 100 \%, 98.7 \%$, and $94.8 \%$ samples were passed in assay, content uniformity, dissolution, endotoxin, sterility, identification and microbial assay test respectively (Table 1.5). In the case of antimicrobial samples from Cambodia we found that $90.6 \%, 86 \%, 80.4 \%, 100 \%, 100 \%, 100 \%, 100 \%$ samples were passed in assay, content uniformity, dissolution, endotoxin, sterility, identification and microbial assay test respectively (Table 2.8). While in the case in Cambodian lifesaving medicines we found that $86 \%, 84.8 \%$ and $88.9 \%$ samples were passed in assay, content uniformity and dissolution test respectively (Table3.4). In Myanmar three GM samples which were failed in both identification and microbial assay test which were counterfeited. Myanmar government confirmed it and announced.

- In our one-year investigation, we found counterfeit GM medicines which were sold in Yangon a commercial city in Myanmar. While in Cambodia we conducted above these surveys which included Phnom Penh the capital of Cambodia with five different provinces. In Cambodia we found only poor quality medicines but counterfeit medicines were not detected. It is our hypothesis regarding these surveys, since 1999 there were no systematic survey occurred in Myanmar. Manufacturers took this opportunity and to supply of these type of medicines in Myanmar. In the case in Cambodia regular survey monitoring was in there. We have been reporting each year to the Cambodian authority. Robust action from the Cambodian authority and comparatively better quality of medicines were found in Cambodian markets.
- Statistically we found that the average price of failed samples was significantly cheaper than that of passed samples in both of these countries. Manufacturers who did follow GMP might sell these products cheaper than those produced in comply with GMP.
- Previously we stablished the evidences about the relationship between the quality of medicines and environmental conditions like as temperature and humidity. These conditions directly enhanced to decrease the quality of medicines. In our investigations, air-conditioning system of drug outlets in both countries were not satisfactory. Above evidences to obtain good quality medicines, it is highly necessary to improve airconditioning in any type of drug outlet.
- We found some samples which were not registered in DDF, Cambodia and Myanmar FDA. But in the case of unregistered samples (all most) from Myanmar were counterfeited which were showing spelling errors on the package of the box. Unregister samples should not be allowed for use in future.
- We had collected GM injection from both countries. In Cambodia we found all GM were ampoules. But in the case of Myanmar samples which were collected and some were ampoules and some were vials. We found counterfeit three gentamicin sample which were in ampoule. But, about the vial samples we observed that the samples colour were changed white to yellow before the expiration date. We also observed that the volume of samples were not equal (vial sample). In our laboratory investigation, we realized the samples which containing in to the vials were not properly shield. In this type of medicines should not be used to the patients.
- Investigations to Myanmar, we were collected samples from government hospital, privet hospital, community pharmacies, clinical pharmacies and wholesalers. We found counterfeit samples which were keep into only community pharmacies outlets. In this type of drug outlets must be needed special monitoring.


## Conclusion of these surveys:

Our surveys were occurred in two low income countries. We found lot of foreign medicines from different manufacturers and countries. In these surveys we found lot of problems such as spelling error on the box, low volume, different package colour, insert messing in a sample box, insert information and package information not matching, loose samples, colour changed before the expiration, not registered samples and non-licenced samples were observed during the observation of samples. In authenticity investigation, from few manufacturers and MRAs replied to us. From both countries, we found huge amounts of poor quality or substandard medicines of samples those were produced in both foreign and domestically. It is our assumption that counterfeit medicine was not found in Cambodia because we have been investigating continuously in this country. But in the case of Myanmar we found counterfeit gentamicin (foreign manufacturers) from their markets and there was no survey occurred in Myanmar from the long time. We observed fail samples were cheaper in both countries than the pass samples.

People not only in this two countries but also all developing countries can get good quality medicines in the future as well as remove counterfeit or poor quality medicines from their markets could be the following ways. If it will occur continuously monitoring (surveys for the evaluation of medicines) or manufacturers which are
producing cheaper medicines cordially must follow actual guideline as well as drug outlets are needed to maintain air-conditioning.
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Annex 1.1 Map of Myanmar


## Annex 1.2 Sampling form



## Annex 1.3 Tool for Visual Inspection of Medicines



| 1.2.4 The manufacturer's full address | ${ }^{-}$ | ${ }^{-}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Is the manufacturer's full address legible and correct? |  |  |  |
| Has this company or its agent registered the product in the country? |  |  |  |
| 1.2.5 The medicine strength (mg/unit) |  |  |  |
| Is the strength - the amount of active ingredient <br> per unit - clearly stated on the label? |  |  |  |
| For blister or foil strip packed products, is the medicine strength indelibly impressed or imprinted onto the strip? |  |  |  |
| 1.2.6 The dosage form (e.g., tablet/capsule) |  |  |  |
| Is the dosage form clearly indicated on the container label? |  |  |  |
| Does the dosage form stated on the label match <br> the actual dosage form of the medication? |  |  |  |
| Is the indicated madicine under this dosage form registered and authorised for sale in the country? |  |  |  |
| 1.2.7 The number of units per container |  |  |  |
| Does the number of dosage units listed on the label match the number of dosage units staated on the container? |  |  |  |
| 1.2.8 Dosage statement (if appropriate) |  |  |  |
| Is the dosage clearly indicated on the label? |  |  |  |
| Is the dosage stated on the label appropriate for the madicine in this form and strength? |  |  |  |
| Is the product registered and authorised for sale in the country with this dosage? |  |  |  |
| 1.2.9 The batch (or lot) number |  |  |  |
| Does the numbering system on the package correspond to that of the producting company? |  |  |  |
| For blister or foil strip packed medicines, is the batch number indelibly impressed or imprinted onto the strip? |  |  |  |
| 1.2.10 The date of manufacture and the expiry date |  | $>$ |  |
| Are the manufacture and expiry dates clearly indicated on the label? |  |  |  |
| For blister or foil strip packed products, is the expiry date indelibly impressed or imprinted onto the strip? |  |  |  |


| 1.2.11 Storage information |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Are the storage conditions indicated on the <br> label? |  |  |  |
| Has the product been properly stored? |  |  |  |
| 1.3 Leaflet or package insert |  |  |  |
| Is the package insert printed on the same <br> coloured or same quality paper as the original <br> (If <br> available to compare) or does it look <br> familiar? |  |  |  |
| Is the ink on the package insert or packaging <br> smudge-proof? |  |  |  |
| Does the informationb on the package insert <br> match the information on the product <br> container? |  |  |  |
| 2. PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF |  |  |  |
| Does the medicine smell the same as the <br> original <br> (If available)? <br> Does it smell peculiar? |  |  |  |
| TABLETS/CAPSULES |  |  |  |

## Annex 1.4 Authenticity form for manufactures

KANAZAWA University Institute of Medical, Pharmaceutical and Health Sciences

## QUESTIONNAIRE FOR AUTHENTICITY INVESTIGATION

 MANUFACTURER:Scope: The purpose of this questionnaire is to authenticate a medicinal sample/s collected in conjunction with the anti-counterfeit initiatives of the Ministry Health, Myanmar

## Instructions:

- Please refer to the attached sample(s) or photos and check appropriate boxes $\sqrt{ }$ for your answer.
- Please provide detailed information whenever it is required


## REGISTRATION

Do you have a License Number in the manufacturing country issued by the Medicine Regulatory Authority?
$\square$ Yes/ Detailed number; $\qquad$ $\square$ No

2 Are you certified on Good Manufacturing Practices?
םYes
$\square$ No
3 If certified, please detail the name of certifying authority.

## PACKAGING AND MARKETING

Are these packages/containers of the samples made by your company originally?
If you checked 'No' for the above question, please let us know who prepare the package:


| CONTACT INFORMATION |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Responded by- | Date: |  |  |
| Name: |  |  |  |
| Professional affiliation/position: |  |  |  |
| Company full address: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Tel / Fax: | E-mail: |  |  |

## Annex 1.5 authenticity form for sample



If you checked 'Counterfeit' for the above question, please indicate the details about the difference of Genuine product and the Counterfeit one

## MARKETING IN SAMPLING COUNTRY

Is the sample medicine approved by the Drug Regulatory Authority in the manufacturing country?
$\square$ Yes / Provide approval / registration number: $\qquad$
$\square$ No
22 Is the sample medicine approved for marketing in Myanmar? $\square$ Yes $\square$ No

23 If you checked ' $N o$ ' to the above question, please answer following two additional questions: i. Please write the countries where this medicine is approved for marketing.
$\qquad$
ii. Do you know that this medicine is sold in Myanmar? $\square$ Yes $\square$ No

Pictures of Sample:

## Annex 1.6 authenticity e-mail to MRAs

KANAZAWA UNIVERSITY<br>Institute of Medical, Pharmaceutical and Health Sciences $23^{\text {rd }}$ Dec, 2014

To

Subject: Medicine Authentication for Medicine Regulatory Authority of the Project on Counterfeit Program in Myanmar, 2014

Dear whom it may concern,
Greetings from Japan. In reference to the above subject, I am taking the opportunity to brief you that the Department of Drug Management and Policy, Kanazawa University, Japan have been collaborating on a project with the Food and Drug Administration, Myanmar, with the objectives of improving pharmaceutical situation and more specifically to combat counterfeit medicines. As the crisis of counterfeit medicines is a worldwide phenomenon, cooperation from the medicine regulatory authorities and other relevant agencies are crucial to counteract against this public health problem.

We are requesting medicine regulatory authorities of relevant countries to cooperate us in verifying legitimacy of the manufacturers and their products, which were being identified during our surveys in Myanmar, 2014. Currently, we are checking legitimacy of the manufacturers and their medicines which were collected in 2014. Among them, we have medicine samples of "Name of manufacturers" from Pakistan.

It would be much appreciated, if you could confirm approval of the manufacturers and their samples, mentioned in the attached questionnaire and send us back your comments, preferably by 6 th Jan 2015.

Thanking you in advance and we are looking forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,
Kazuko KIMURA, PhD
Professor
Drug Management \& Policy, Kanazawa University
Kakuma-machi, Kanazawa city, Ishikawa, Japan 920-1192
http://www.p.kanazawa-u.ac.jp/e/lab/kokusai.html
Tel./Fax: +8176234 4402/+81762646286
Email: dmpc10@p.kanazawa-u.ac.jp

KANAZAWA UNIVERSITY
Institute of Medical, Pharmaceutical and Health Sciences $23^{\text {rd }}$ Dec, 2014

## MEDICINE AUTHENTICATION FORM

For Drug Regulatory Authority of Manufacturing Country

Please provide necessary information for each of the manufacturers and their medicine products mentioned below. If you have additional information that might be important to judge whether the medicine is counterfeit or not, please indicate such in the remarks column

| Name of the Manufacturer: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Country: |
| 1. Is this manufacturer licensed by the Drug Regulatory Authority of your country? <br> 2. If Yes, please mention manufacturer's License Number: <br> 3. Is this a GMP qualified manufacturer of your country? <br> Products <br> Please check an appropriate box, if the regulatory authority of your country approves the manufacturer to <br> produce mentioned medicine(s). <br> Trade Name, strength, form |

Thank you very much for your kind cooperation

## Annex 1.7 Result of quantity test and content uniformity test (1 ${ }^{\text {st }}$ stage) [CXM]



## Content uniformity test for second stage (CXM)



## Cefuroxime tablets Myanmar project 2014





 が











Result of quantity test and content uniformity test [OM] 1st stage- BP


Result of quantity test and content uniformity test [OM] 1st stage- USP


## Result of quantity test and content uniformity test [OM] 2nd stage-BP**



Omeprazole Dissolution 1st Stage-BP


Omeprazole Dissolution $1^{\text {st }}$ Stage-USP

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.NW | MAMHWMHYOMW: |  | 116 | 111 | 1 lb | 18 | 131 | 1.14 | 113 | 18 | 6.1 | 88 | 09 | 94, | 485 | 91.6 | 21. | 88 | 911 | 39 | 41 | 18 | \% |
| 9,402. |  |  | 20 | 4.6 | $3]$ | 0 | 18 | 4 | 3.1 | 16 | 31 | 88 | 81 | 954 | 457 | 03 | 80 | 131 | 92. | 4 | 4 | 18 | 18 |
| 12.104 |  |  | 117 | 3. | 18 | 11. | 13 | 98 | 87 | 4 | 4.45 | 88 | 88 | 89 | 88 | 9.15 | 4.1 | 95 | 971 | 30 | 41 | 188 | 48 |
| 314.1. |  |  | 171 | 11. | 78 | 176 | 167 | 37 | 4 | 3 | 171 | \|id | 81 | 71.6 | N0. | 18.6 | 7.3 | 75 | 8.4 | 1. | 15 | Fial | fil |
| 1380.2 |  |  | 4.3 | 81 | 6. | 9 | 19 | 8. | 7.4 | 20 | 16 | 88 | 18 | 978 | 938 |  | 27 | 916 | 83 | 18 | 3. | 88 | 18 |
| 14.10 .6 | BMbunuty |  | 10.1 | 10.8 | 40 | 18 | 88 | 6 | 7.4 | 35 | 48 | 88 | 04 | 78 | W5 | 976 | 21. | 05 | 0.3 | 18 | 10 | 188 | 18 |
| 168N3 | AW3) Whaty |  | 98 | 83 | 4 | 1. | 4. | 4 | 6. | 4 | 86 | 88 | 0.1 | 48. | 43. | 8.9 | 9.1 | 9.9 | W6 | 24 | 11 | 88 | 98 |
| 10 PNW |  |  | 0 | 18 | 16 | 31. | 4 | 6 | 36 | 15 | 70.1 | \% 8 | 834 | 81 | 88 | 8. | 85 | M | 88. | 2 | 15 | $8 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| 19880 |  |  | 1.6 | 115 | 6 | 1.1 | 48 | 11 | 6. | 46 | 71. | $8 \%$ | $\mathbb{4}$ | 03 | 88.4 | 815 | 33 | 8.8 | M8 | 24 | 41 | $8 \%$ | 88 |
| 1880/V |  |  | 4.3 | 11. | 4 | 10.1 | 4. | 14.4 | 13 | 1. | 11. | $8 \%$ | 7.1. | 81 | 80. | 78 | 84 | 7.1 | 78.4 | 1. | 4 | Fibl | \|ib |
| W10.V8 | PWIMMUHMOM: |  | 1. | 1. | 3 | 4 | 1. | 131 | 3 | 4 | 112 | 88 | 6.6 | 01 | 86 | 815 | M | 8.6 | 8.1 | 16 | 18 | 78 | 818 |

Omeprazole Dissolution 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Stage-BP


Omeprazole Dissolution $2^{\text {nd }}$ Stage-USP


Omeprazole Dissolution 3rdStage-BP





## Result of Quantity and content uniformity test:



Result of quality test（DN）

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | M 5 Smix ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$$ | 10 | Jutay | Nall <br> IV． <br> saity｜ bx <br> ｜ $\mathrm{tax} \mid$ | Jdy |
|  | 4.4 | 4010 | 480 | 104 | 40 | 480 | 10．3 | 44N | 10780 | 960 | 4，40 | 19 | 19 | 明 | 4， | 吆 |
|  | \％ 40 | 104 | 10010 | 104） | 140 ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 104 | 1040 | 10 | 1910 | 14040 | 14.10 | 18 | 10 | max | 10.10 | 媛 |
|  | 10：3 | 4， | （40） | 1010 | （193） | （50） | 104 | \％ 4 | 19.5 | 40 | 100 | 4 | 44 | \％ | 100 | 檢 |

Result of dissolution test（DN）


## Result of Identification test [GM]


Sample code 5
$\qquad$
 20140628 GENTAMICIN SULLFATE INUE zzzzzzzz

GENTAMYOIN SULLATE INUE
近



2
0
0
0
0
2






140603
${ }_{1}^{140602}$
13032802
-



$$
y_{0}^{2}
$$






** All GM samples were passed in sterility and endotoxin tests

## Annex 1.8

## CXM dissolution test

| ID Serial No. | . Sample Code $\quad$Trade name of <br> the product | Name of Manufacturer | Manufacturing Country | $\%$ of Quantity | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of } \\ \text { Quantity } \end{gathered}$ | $\%$ of Quantity | \% of Quantity | \% of Quantity | \% of Quantity | Mean \% of Quantity | \% of Quantity | \% of Quantity | Initial Judge | New Judge |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ - | $\checkmark 1$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\bigcirc$ | $\square$ | , | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3 A-005 | A005/MM14/YG/01/HG/ SPIZEF | Orchid HEALTHCA | India | 101.01 | 96.57 | 95.96 | 96.92 | 99.78 | 95.69 | 97.65 | 2.2 | 2.26 | Pass |  |
| 4 A-006 | A006/MM14/YG/01/HG/ Zinnat | GlaxoSmithKline | UK | 77.86 | 86.26 | 87.94 | 87.54 | 91.17 | 91.77 | 87.09 | 5.01 | 5.75 | Pass |  |
| 5 A-007 | A007/MM14/YG/01/HG/ ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratoril | India | 94.80 | 96.21 | 95.20 | 98.97 | 95.40 | 97.02 | 96.27 | 1.54 | 1.60 | Pass |  |
| 6 A-016 | A016/MM14/YG/01/HG/ ZiNNASAV-250 | SAVIOUR PHARMA | India | 86.13 | 86.73 | 80.62 | 77.52 | 85.79 | 82.70 | 83.25 | 3.66 | 4.39 | Pass |  |
| $7 \mathrm{~A}-017$ | A017/MM14/YG/01/HG/ ZIFATIL-250 | Galpha Laborato II | India | 108.91 | 95.81 | 110.33 | 106.09 | 107.70 | 113.48 | 107.05 | 6.06 | 5.66 | Pass |  |
| 8 A-018 | A018/MM14/YG/01/HG/ CETIL | LUPIN LTD. | India | 100.74 | 93.64 | 93.71 | 101.42 | 102.10 | 97.87 | 98.25 | 3.82 | 3.89 | Pass |  |
| $9 \mathrm{~A}-019$ | A019/MM14/YG/01/HG/ FUROCEF | renata limited | Bangladesh | 69.59 | 77.86 | 74.23 | 86.87 | 83.51 | 82.50 | 79.09 | 6.43 | 8.13 | Pass |  |
| 10 A-025 | A025/MM14/YG/04/C/CX SPIZEF | Orchid Healthca | India | 84.11 | 96.75 | 94.19 | 78.87 | 95.81 | 91.57 | 90.22 | 7.18 | 7.96 | Pass |  |
| 11 A-030 | A030/MM14/YG/02/C/CX RUFEX-250 | Global Pharma H | India | 80.68 | 87.20 | 71.81 | 60.60 | 86.93 | 77.86 | 77.52 | 10.11 | 13.05 | Fail | Pass |
| 12 A-036 | A036/MM14/YG/01/Ocl , ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratoril | India | 100.40 | 94.87 | 87.70 | 95.28 | 92.61 | 92.96 | 93.97 | 4.15 | 4.41 | Pass |  |
| 13 A-037 | A037/MM14/YG/01/Ocl/ Cefusan 250 | SRS pharmaceutil | India | 94.46 | 94.66 | 96.71 | 95.89 | 95.55 | 93.84 | 95.19 | 1.05 | 1.11 | Pass |  |
| 14 A-048 | A048/MM14/YG/06/C/CX RUFEX-250 | Global Pharma H | India | 66.77 | 63.95 | 65.56 | 66.37 | 66.57 | 68.99 | 66.37 | 1.65 | 2.48 | Fail | Pass |
| 15 A-052 | A052/MM14/vG/02/HG/ ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | India | 96.81 | 97.35 | 98.50 | 97.22 | 100.85 | 101.05 | 98.63 | 1.88 | 1.91 | Pass |  |
| 16 A-054 | A054/MM14/YG/02/C/CXZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratoril | India | 96.88 | 100.24 | 93.79 | 97.82 | 98.63 | 98.83 | 97.70 | 2.22 | 2.27 | Pass |  |
| 17 A-057 | A057/MM14/YG/01/HP/(RUFEX-250 | Global Pharma H | India | 51.24 | 71.52 | 79.71 | 71.72 | 79.92 | 72.54 | 71.11 | 10.48 | 14.73 | Fail | Pass |
| 18 A-058 | A058/MM14/YG/HP/CXN Zinnat | GlaxoSmithKline | UK | 94.19 | 91.57 | 91.17 | 88.14 | 96.81 | 93.39 | 92.55 | 2.96 | 3.20 | Pass |  |
| 19 A-063 | A063/MM14/YG/01/Ocl/ZIFTUM 250 | ALKEM LABORATO | India | 101.01 | 93.84 | 91.59 | 92.00 | 94.39 | 95.89 | 94.79 | 3.43 | 3.62 | Pass |  |
| 20 A-068 | A068/MM14/YG/02/C/C R RUFEX-250 | Global Pharma H | India | 78.46 | 80.68 | 70.40 | 63.34 | 69.59 | 71.61 | 72.35 | 6.32 | 8.74 | Fail | Pass |
| 21 A-071 | A071/MM14/YG/01/HG/ ZIFTUM 250 | ALKEM LABORATO | India | 96.61 | 96.68 | 104.14 | 97.82 | 92.78 | 94.40 | 97.07 | 3.91 | 4.03 | Pass |  |
| 22 A-074 | A074/MM14/YG/01/C/CXZIFTUM 250 | ALKEM Laborato |  | 90.77 | 91.98 | 87.74 | 91.17 | 88.88 | 86.73 | 89.54 | 2.08 | 2.32 | Pass |  |
| 23 A-079 | A079/MM14/YG/02/OCl/ RUFEX-250 | Global Pharma H |  | 64.69 | 62.27 | 63.95 | 81.09 | 58.91 | 62.00 | 65.48 | 7.90 | 12.07 | Fail | Pass |
| 24 A-085 | A085/MM14/YG/02/HP/(RUFEX-250 | Global Pharma H | India | 64.35 | 59.23 | 66.88 | 59.03 | 63.94 | 70.22 | 63.94 | 4.35 | 6.80 | Fail | Pass |
| 25 A-086 | A086/MM14/YG/02/HP/(Zinnat | GlaxoSmithKline | UK | 82.97 | 81.89 | 85.32 | 89.62 | 85.12 | 87.94 | 85.48 | 2.92 | 3.41 | Pass |  |
| 26 A-089 | A089/MM14/YG/01/W/C Cefotil | SQUARE PHARMAI | Bangladesh | BP | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| 27 A-095 | A095/MM14/VG/03/W/CKEFROX | CCL Pharmaceutic | Pakistan | BP | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| 28 A-099 | A099/MM14/YG/01/HG/RUFEX-500 | Global Pharma H | India | 65.56 | 57.43 | 52.65 | 66.16 | 62.13 | 64.55 | 61.41 | 5.34 | 8.70 | Fail | Pass |
| 29 A-102 | A102/MM14/YG/01/OCl/ CETIL | LUPIN LTD. | India | 73.42 | 72.28 | 70.60 | 76.05 | 70.80 | 69.66 | 72.14 | 2.33 | 3.24 | Pass |  |
| 30 A-104 | A104/MM14/YG/02/HP/(ZIFTUM 250 | ALKEM LABORATO | India | 106.90 | 103.07 | 100.65 | 105.99 | 99.03 | 106.29 | 103.65 | 3.28 | 3.16 | Pass |  |
| 32 B-002 | B-002/MM14/YG/01/HP/ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | India | 126.66 | 131.50 | 131.09 | 122.42 | 131.30 | 136.54 | 129.92 | 4.83 | 3.71 | Pass |  |
| $33 \mathrm{~B}-003$ | B-003/MM14/YG/01/HP/SPIZEF | Orchid HEALTHCA | India | 98.43 | 96.21 | 94.60 | 92.78 | 96.41 | 94.19 | 95.44 | 1.99 | 2.08 | Pass |  |
| 34 B-004 | B-004/MM14/YG/01/HP/CETIL | LUPIN LTD. | India | 73.42 | 74.84 | 73.89 | 75.31 | 80.48 | 74.23 | 75.36 | 2.60 | 3.44 | Pass |  |
| 35 B-023 | B-023/MM14/YG/07/C/C RUFEX | Global Pharma H | India | 62.33 | 64.15 | 62.13 | 65.36 | 65.09 | 63.34 | 63.73 | 1.37 | 2.14 | Fail | Pass |
| 36 B-027 | B-027/MM14/YG/01/C/C Zinnat | GlaxoSmithKline | UK | 91.77 | 93.19 | 89.96 | 87.74 | 94.19 | 93.59 | 91.74 | 2.48 | 2.70 | Pass |  |
| 37 B-029 | B-029/MM14/YG/02/C/C ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratoril |  | 80.88 | 82.50 | 81.15 | 89.62 | 85.12 | 87.94 | 84.54 | 3.65 | 4.32 | Pass |  |
| 38 B-030 | B-030/MM14/VG/08/C/C Zinnat | GlaxoSmithKline | UK | 89.54 | 79.58 | 89.54 | 84.29 | 86.06 | 82.99 | 85.33 | 3.89 | 4.56 | Pass |  |
| $39 \mathrm{~B}-031$ | B-031/MM14/YG/08/C/C ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratoril | India | 98.83 | 97.02 | 97.42 | 97.22 | 101.25 | 96.41 | 98.02 | 1.77 | 1.81 | Pass |  |
| 40 B-034 | B-034/MM14/YG/01/HP/ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratoril | India | 95.14 | 97.46 | 98.14 | 92.41 | 96.51 | 96.92 | 96.10 | 2.07 | 2.15 | Pass |  |
| 41 B-038 | B-038/MM14/YG/01/HP/ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | India | 127.26 | 122.02 | 127.47 | 124.04 | 122.09 | 123.84 | 124.45 | 2.41 | 1.94 | Pass |  |
| $42 \mathrm{~B}-042$ | B-042/MM14/VG/01/HG , ZIFATIL | Galpha Laborato I | India | 88.93 | 88.31 | 84.83 | 87.43 | 90.36 | 90.77 | 88.44 | 2.16 | 2.45 | Pass |  |
| 43 B-044 | B-044/MM14/YG/01/HG, Zinmax | DOMESCO MEDICA | VietNam | 90.77 | 91.17 | 92.38 | 88.55 | 89.15 | 89.56 | 90.26 | 1.43 | 1.58 | Pass |  |
| $44 \mathrm{~B}-047$ | B-047/MM14/YG/01/C/C RUFEX | Global Pharma H | India | 60.52 | 59.51 | 59.71 | 62.94 | 60.52 | 60.32 | 60.59 | 1.23 | 2.03 | Fail | Pass |
| 45 B-052 | B-052/MM14/YG/01/HP/ CETIL | LUPIN LTD. | India | 109.12 | 107.50 | 103.74 | 100.18 | 112.14 | 105.89 | 106.43 | 4.19 | 3.93 | Pass |  |
| 46 B-053 | B-053/MM14/YG/01/HP/Zinnat | GlaxoSmithKline | UK | 88.75 | 94.19 | 86.13 | 79.67 | 74.43 | 88.35 | 85.25 | 7.08 | 8.31 | Pass |  |
| 47 B-063 | B-063/MM14/YG/01/O(C ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | India | 93.43 | 88.93 | 105.52 | 98.14 | 93.23 | 103.13 | 97.06 | 6.38 | 6.57 | Pass |  |
| 48 B-066 | B-066/MM14/YG/01/C/C ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratoril |  | 91.59 | 87.90 | 96.92 | 95.69 | 94.25 | 100.60 | 94.49 | 4.39 | 4.65 | Pass |  |
| $49 \mathrm{~B}-067$ | B-067/MM14/YG/01/C/C RUFEX-250 | Global Pharma H | India | 84.92 | 72.82 | 78.46 | 81.96 | 77.66 | 79.67 | 79.25 | 4.10 | 5.18 | Pass |  |
| 50 B-076 | B-076/MM14/YG/01/HG, ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratoril |  | 99.23 | 92.98 | 93.99 | 95.60 | 94.19 | 96.21 | 95.37 | 2.22 | 2.33 | Pass |  |
| 51 B-079 | B-079/MM14/YG/01/O(CZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | India | 93.39 | 93.99 | 90.36 | 91.57 | 92.98 | 95.47 | 92.96 | 1.80 | 1.94 | Pass |  |
| $52 \mathrm{~B}-080$ | B-080/Mm14/YG/01/00c Zinnat | GlaxoSmithKline |  | 91.37 | 89.76 | 83.10 | 91.77 | 86.33 | 90.97 | 88.88 | 3.45 | 3.88 | Pass |  |
| $53 \mathrm{~B}-086$ | B-086/MM14/YG/03/C/C Zinnat | GlaxoSmithKline |  | 77.26 | 88.61 | 85.19 | 80.88 | 82.50 | 81.15 | 82.60 | 3.91 | 4.73 | Pass |  |
| 54 B-089 | B-089/MM14/YG/04/W/Zinnat | GlaxoSmithKline | UK | 77.66 | 89.89 | 75.64 | 81.69 | 73.02 | 78.67 | 79.43 | 5.89 | 7.42 | Pass |  |
| 55 B-093 | B-093/MM14/vG/01/C/C RUFEX | Global Pharma H |  | 65.56 | 64.75 | 87.54 | 85.12 | 81.49 | 89.76 | 79.04 | 11.10 | 14.04 | Fail | Pass |
| 56 B-100 | B-100/MM14/YG/04/C/C ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | India | 100.04 | 98.43 | 100.04 | 98.83 | 96.41 | 102.06 | 99.30 | 1.90 | 1.91 | Pass |  |
| 57 B -101 | B-101/MM14/VG/05/C/C Zinnat | GlaxoSmithKline |  | 89.15 | 85.52 | 92.51 | 88.35 | 89.15 | 91.17 | 89.31 | 2.41 | 2.70 | Pass |  |
| 58 B-102 | B-102/MM14/YG/02/C/C Zinnat | GlaxoSmithKline |  | 83.91 | 89.62 | 87.81 | 88.28 | 95.60 | 91.37 | 89.43 | 3.91 | 4.37 | Pass |  |
| $59 \mathrm{~B}-104$ | B104/MM14/vG/01/HG/ ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratoril | India | 94.80 | 98.23 | 90.36 | 93.99 | 96.01 | 92.18 | 94.26 | 2.78 | 2.95 | Pass |  |
| 60 B-111 | B111/MM14/YG/02/C/Cx RUFEX-250 | Global Pharma H | India | 76.91 | 67.63 | 74.18 | 89.13 | 89.13 | 85.99 | 80.50 | 8.92 | 11.08 | Pass |  |
| 1 PA-001 | PA001/MM14/YG/01/C/CZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | India | 158.05 | 134.52 | 153.14 | 152.94 | 136.54 | 146.22 | 146.90 | 9.60 | 6.53 | Pass |  |
| 2 PA-002 | PA002/MM14/VG/01/C/CSPIZEF | Orchid Healthca | India | 73.83 | 98.97 | 100.24 | 97.22 | 85.79 | 83.04 | 89.85 | 10.63 | 11.83 | Pass |  |
| 31 PB-001 | PB-001/MM14/YG/01/O(ZINNASAV-250 | SAVIOUR Pharmal | India | 75.96 | 82.78 | 83.19 | 85.86 | 82.58 | 81.35 | 81.95 | 3.29 | 4.02 | Pass |  |

CXM content uniformity $1^{\text {st }}$ stage

| \% of Quantity Tablet 1 | \% of Quantity Tablet 2 | \% of Quantity <br> Tablet 3 | \% of Quantity Tablet 4 | $\%$ of Quantity Tablet 5 | $\%$ of Quantity Tablet 6 | \% of Quantity Tablet 7 |  | \% of Quantity Tablet 9 | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of } \\ \text { Quantity } \end{gathered}$ $\text { Tablet } 10$ | Mean \% of Quantity | \% of Quantity SD | \% of Quantity \%CV | AV <br> (Acceptance Value) | Judge | New Judge $\mathrm{AV}=18$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 104.92 | 104.54 | 100.00 | 102.70 | 95.88 | 99.40 | 94.86 | 105.87 | 101.22 | 96.94 | 100.6 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 9.372893126 | Pass |  |
| 104.21 | 103.39 | 98.63 | 97.51 | 93.65 | 103.10 | 106.08 | 98.50 | 95.83 | 102.27 | 100.3 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 9.731768808 | Pass |  |
| 102.27 | 103.86 | 100.48 | 102.58 | 98.18 | 97.12 | 100.36 | 100.98 | 97.48 | 92.73 | 99.6 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 7.89 | Pass |  |
| 92.41 | 93.57 | 91.85 | 95.51 | 95.75 | 90.01 | 89.77 | 84.34 | 88.41 | 101.55 | 92.3 | 4.7 | 5.1 | 17.48 | Fail | Pass |
| 84.42 | 99.25 | 100.84 | 85.26 | 90.85 | 90.97 | 97.08 | 91.92 | 93.14 | 92.91 | 92.7 | 5.4 | 5.8 | 18.72 | Fail | Fail |
| 85.61 | 97.53 | 104.85 | 104.61 | 90.77 | 107.86 | 98.31 | 94.87 | 97.54 | 98.02 | 98.0 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 16.58 | Fail | Pass |
| 99.58 | 97.87 | 93.20 | 95.87 | 93.71 | 103.43 | 100.62 | 95.39 | 98.09 | 95.14 | 97.3 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 9.00 | Pass |  |
| 94.08 | 101.01 | 89.89 | 94.86 | 93.99 | 95.64 | 99.03 | 101.53 | 94.92 | 92.86 | 95.8 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 11.55 | Pass |  |
| 92.98 | 91.66 | 89.14 | 90.87 | 92.74 | 88.74 | 88.45 | 86.30 | 82.74 | 82.84 | 88.6 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 18.76 | Fail | Fail |
| 104.08 | 102.32 | 92.47 | 95.41 | 111.73 | 93.88 | 93.39 | 101.14 | 92.26 | 94.69 | 98.1 | 6.4 | 6.6 | 15.45 | Fail | Pass |
| 91.27 | 93.27 | 96.13 | 88.28 | 98.09 | 91.63 | 91.59 | 94.10 | 87.74 | 79.11 | 91.1 | 5.3 | 5.8 | 20.06 | Fail | Fail |
| 95.65 | 100.96 | 82.79 | 86.92 | 84.50 | 92.64 | 87.53 | 87.83 | 84.09 | 83.79 | 88.7 | 5.9 | 6.7 | 24.08 | Fail | Fail |
| 92.28 | 99.85 | 94.71 | 96.54 | 95.82 | 98.57 | 99.74 | 103.67 | 107.73 | 105.66 | 99.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 11.90 | Pass |  |
| 101.48 | 100.22 | 91.88 | 103.28 | 95.38 | 105.52 | 97.11 | 98.08 | 92.65 | 95.07 | 98.1 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 11.28 | Pass |  |
| 87.87 | 87.87 | 87.65 | 82.96 | 87.90 | 82.50 | 85.36 | 79.08 | 77.86 | 80.46 | 84.0 | 3.9 | 4.7 | 23.95 | Fail | Fail |
| 95.38 | 104.18 | 100.01 | 98.10 | 103.39 | 99.45 | 93.58 | 100.25 | 90.67 | 91.76 | 97.7 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 12.04 | Pass |  |
| 99.58 | 95.59 | 96.90 | 102.68 | 100.60 | 103.08 | 94.12 | 99.93 | 98.40 | 95.48 | 98.6 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 7.38 | Pass |  |
| 85.13 | 80.97 | 74.62 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 80.2 | - | - | - | - |  |
| 107.29 | 97.04 | 100.25 | 99.21 | 101.42 | 104.80 | 95.76 | 99.53 | 94.60 | 89.71 | 99.0 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 12.13 | Pass |  |
| 105.17 | 99.99 | 101.85 | 103.65 | 98.37 | 100.92 | 98.68 | 93.11 | 93.86 | 98.67 | 99.4 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 9.21 | Pass |  |
| 86.23 | 86.08 | 82.00 | 86.17 | 84.76 | 88.14 | 83.31 | 89.02 | 81.19 | 82.07 | 84.9 | 2.7 | 3.2 | 20.05 | Fail | Fail |
| 98.68 | 88.40 | 99.10 | 101.87 | 98.65 | 93.01 | 98.22 | 95.66 | 96.45 | 97.29 | 96.7 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 10.77 | Pass |  |
| 94.85 | 92.47 | 90.91 | 95.96 | 99.71 | 94.09 | 96.69 | 97.74 | 93.76 | 94.46 | 95.1 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 9.60 | Pass |  |
| 97.95 | 97.60 | 93.43 | 92.10 | 101.08 | 87.19 | 96.73 | 96.72 | 93.55 | 94.45 | 95.1 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 12.63 | Pass |  |
| 89.41 | 99.51 | 95.97 | 94.42 | 103.65 | 96.10 | 90.11 | 97.75 | 94.44 | 90.99 | 95.2 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 13.88 | Pass |  |
| 79.62 | 80.37 | 82.34 | 80.60 | 76.43 | 78.62 | 81.50 | 79.29 | 78.70 | 75.53 | 79.3 | 2.1 | 2.7 | 24.28 | Fail | Fail |
| 98.44 | 99.04 | 95.46 | 93.58 | 98.00 | 95.74 | 100.25 | 97.12 | 98.56 | 87.30 | 96.3 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 11.12 | Pass |  |
| 103.02 | 98.07 | 99.18 | 103.84 | 101.83 | 103.11 | 94.54 | 97.96 | 102.81 | 97.01 | 100.1 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 7.67 | Pass |  |
| 96.55 | 104.47 | 106.58 | 100.60 | 100.41 | 102.25 | 90.34 | 103.61 | 96.69 | 99.31 | 100.1 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 11.27 | Pass |  |
| 94.9 | 96.3 | 96.4 | 94.2 | 99.8 | 100.9 | 95.0 | 95.7 | 91.2 | 103.1 | 96.7 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 10.22 | Pass |  |
| 98.99 | 100.25 | 99.81 | 95.66 | 94.94 | 97.36 | 89.83 | 90.59 | 94.11 | 93.58 | 95.5 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 11.71 | Pass |  |
| 86.47 | 88.94 | 86.99 | 95.59 | 93.94 | 92.55 | 73.24 | 90.08 | 89.30 | 82.01 | 87.9 | 6.5 | 7.4 | 26.13 | Fail | Fail |
| 96.26 | 93.06 | 95.03 | 91.98 | 95.18 | 90.38 | 93.66 | 86.06 | 98.76 | 92.34 | 93.3 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 13.57 | Pass |  |
| 98.08 | 99.17 | 97.64 | 88.44 | 89.52 | 93.13 | 83.94 | 84.61 | 78.65 | 95.15 | 90.8 | 6.9 | 7.6 | 24.34 | Fail | Fail |
| 97.84 | 98.27 | 109.33 | 101.97 | 98.36 | 104.72 | 97.52 | 111.74 | 108.12 | 93.15 | 102.1 | 6.1 | 6.0 | 15.27 | Pass |  |
| 96.67 | 101.02 | 94.08 | 96.38 | 93.86 | 95.06 | 93.75 | 96.25 | 96.24 | 97.52 | 96.1 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 7.63 | Pass |  |
| 101.07 | 100.73 | 104.94 | 106.81 | 101.49 | 97.11 | 102.96 | 106.33 | 102.82 | 102.79 | 102.7 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 8.11 | Pass |  |
| 105.30 | 92.74 | 104.55 | 105.08 | 97.92 | 98.05 | 98.24 | 100.54 | 98.83 | 98.10 | 99.9 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 9.59 | Pass |  |
| 83.66 | 84.52 | 86.32 | 91.22 | 84.44 | 85.86 | 91.58 | 84.65 | 93.10 | 80.82 | 86.6 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 21.48 | Fail | Fail |
| 102.47 | 102.35 | 102.44 | 104.48 | 103.97 | 103.72 | 102.78 | 98.97 | 97.20 | 96.30 | 101.5 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 6.98 | Pass |  |
| 71.12 | 69.88 | 88.62 | 76.65 | 74.10 | 77.86 | 88.15 | 85.61 | 73.36 | 74.00 | 77.9 | 7.0 | 9.0 | 37.37 | Fail | Fail |
| 91.71 | 97.36 | 88.44 | 93.86 | 88.52 | 96.88 | 92.86 | 90.31 | 92.94 | 92.51 | 92.5 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 13.24 | Pass |  |
| 104.46 | 85.18 | 85.58 | 83.73 | 90.96 | 104.88 | 89.09 | 90.42 | 102.98 | 103.08 | 94.0 | 8.8 | 9.3 | 25.50 | Fail | Fail |
| 98.72 | 91.94 | 97.51 | 92.91 | 97.18 | 91.92 | 109.19 | 92.38 | 98.29 | 102.77 | 97.3 | 5.5 | 5.7 | 14.50 | Pass |  |
| 97.47 | 99.41 | 97.77 | 99.32 | 92.59 | 92.40 | 94.94 | 95.56 | 96.13 | 101.41 | 96.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 8.88 | Pass |  |
| 97.63 | 100.15 | 107.00 | 101.46 | 107.64 | 106.13 | 101.37 | 101.88 | 100.85 | 101.86 | 102.6 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 8.89 | Pass |  |
| 97.22 | 96.14 | 92.13 | 89.04 | 90.90 | 91.00 | 95.82 | 93.73 | 84.56 | 92.74 | 92.3 | 3.8 | 4.1 | 15.21 | Pass |  |
| 101.08 | 94.44 | 98.21 | 99.11 | 103.97 | 102.67 | 97.27 | 97.77 | 97.49 | 97.75 | 99.0 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 6.80 | Pass |  |
| 97.64 | 99.42 | 97.71 | 100.36 | 97.58 | 96.02 | 98.42 | 96.52 | 96.50 | 96.74 | 97.7 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 4.12 | Pass |  |
| 92.29 | 98.58 | 98.56 | 91.81 | 102.01 | 90.37 | 90.05 | 93.33 | 92.23 | 94.00 | 94.3 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 13.81 | Pass |  |
| 109.93 | 105.57 | 104.26 | 115.00 | 103.68 | 107.96 | 107.55 | 110.73 | 101.57 | 102.22 | 106.8 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 15.48 | Pass |  |
| 88.76 | 91.12 | 80.84 | 80.41 | 75.56 | 87.75 | 83.93 | 82.01 | 89.50 | 86.58 | 84.6 | 4.9 | 5.8 | 25.68 | Fail | Fail |
| 93.01 | 94.13 | 107.34 | 91.54 | 94.24 | 102.22 | 93.05 | 92.89 | 89.85 | 90.01 | 94.8 | 5.6 | 5.9 | 17.08 | Fail | Pass |
| 101.68 | 103.63 | 103.61 | 99.44 | 102.50 | 115.40 | 101.56 | 97.35 | 95.65 | 98.59 | 101.9 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 13.47 | Pass |  |
| 94.09 | 96.03 | 98.31 | 97.15 | 93.26 | 92.67 | 95.69 | 99.97 | 95.30 | 96.11 | 95.9 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 8.01 | Pass |  |
| 99.74 | 105.46 | 105.23 | 100.22 | 101.84 | 95.14 | 97.11 | 101.63 | 90.14 | 102.08 | 99.9 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 11.22 | Pass |  |
| 77.76 | 80.96 | 83.08 | 77.55 | 76.53 | 76.92 | 78.97 | 79.20 | 74.70 | 77.48 | 78.3 | 2.4 | 3.0 | 25.88 | Fail | Fail |
| 93.01 | 94.13 | 101.56 | 91.54 | 94.24 | 102.22 | 93.05 | 92.89 | 89.85 | 90.01 | 94.3 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 14.57 | Pass |  |
| 103.65 | 100.90 | 102.00 | 99.25 | 97.83 | 96.97 | 102.27 | 102.52 | 93.13 | 99.91 | 99.8 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 7.64 | Pass |  |
| 88.20 | 90.25 | 93.58 | 92.14 | 90.62 | 79.25 | 94.40 | 95.94 | 85.54 | 88.40 | 89.83 | 4.87 | 5.42 | 20.36 | Fail | Fail |



OM Dissolution test BP: 1st stage acid resistance stage

| ID Serial No. | Sample Code | Trade name of the Name of Manufacturer |  | Manufact | \% of <br> Quantity <br> Capsule 1 | $\%$ of Quantity Capsule 2 | $\%$ of <br> Quantity <br> Capsule 3 | $\%$ of <br> Quantity <br> Capsule 4 | $\%$ of <br> Quantity <br> Capsule 5 | \% of Quantity Capsule 6 | Mean \% of Quantity | \% of <br> Quantity <br> SD | \% of Quantity SCV | Judge | New Judge $10 \% * 1.2=$ 12\% dissolved |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27 A-096 | A096/MM14/YG/ | Omep-20 | ARISTOPHARMA LTD. | Banglade | 22.3 | 10.4 | 8.9 | 11.6 | 9.6 | 10.2 | 12.2 | 5.0 | 41.4 | Fail | Fail |
| 189 B-065 | B-065/MM14/YG, |  | ARISTOPHARMA LTD. | Banglade | 11.1 | 11.3 | 10.9 | 11.0 | 11.2 | 10.9 | 11.1 | 0.2 | 1.7 | Fail | Pass |
| 23 A-076 | A076/MM14/YG/ | ASMOZOL-20 | ASMOH LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Pass |  |
| 215 B-092 | B-092/MM14/YG, | OMEPREN | BLUE CROSS LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 2.5 | 2.4 | 1.8 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 36.5 | Pass |  |
| 221 B-098 | B-098/MM14/YG, | OMEPREN | blue Cross laboratories lid. | India | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 0.1 | 4.6 | Pass |  |
| 129 B-005 | B-005/MM14/YG, |  | Cadila Health Limited | India | 6.0 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 5.8 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 1.1 | 24.6 | Pass |  |
| 135 B-011 | B-011/MM14/YG, |  | Cadila Health Limited | India | 5.3 | 4.0 | 7.2 | 4.4 | 7.2 | 5.4 | 5.6 | 1.4 | 24.2 | Pass |  |
| 194 B-070 | B-070/MM14/YG, |  | Cadila Health Limited | India | 3.7 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 2.5 | 3.1 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 0.6 | 19.7 | Pass |  |
| $213 \mathrm{~B}-090$ | B-090/MM14/YG, |  | Cadila Health Limited | India | 2.2 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.1 | 6.4 | Pass |  |
| 3 PA-006 | PA006/MM14/VG |  | Cadila Healthcare Limited | India | 5.4 | 4.0 | 7.2 | 4.4 | 7.2 | 5.5 | 5.6 | 1.4 | 24.2 | Pass |  |
| 5 A-002 | A002/MM14/YG/ | OCID | Cadila Healthcare Limited | India | 3.0 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 4.0 | 2.9 | 0.6 | 19.1 | Pass |  |
| 10 A-026 | A026/MM14/YG/ | OCID | Cadila Healthcare Limited | India | 9.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 5.8 | 4.1 | 5.1 | 2.3 | 46.0 | Pass |  |
| 16 A-042 | A042/MM14/YG/ | OCID | Cadila Healthcare Limited | India | 5.6 | 5.0 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 5.0 | 5.4 | 4.7 | 0.8 | 17.2 | Pass |  |
| 18 A-060 | A060/MM14/YG/ | OCID | Cadila Healthcare Limited | India | 2.4 | 2.5 | 4.4 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 0.7 | 24.9 | Pass |  |
| 25 A-084 | A084/MM14/YG/ | OCID | Cadila Healthcare Limited | India | 9.9 | 9.5 | 7.3 | 9.6 | 9.7 | 10.0 | 9.3 | 1.0 | 10.8 | Pass |  |
| 12 A-034 | A034/MM14/YG/ | LOMAC-20 | Cipla Ltd. | India | 26.9 | 27.7 | 27.7 | 27.3 | 28.1 | 23.5 | 26.9 | 1.7 | 6.3 | Fail | Fail |
| 13 A-038 | A038/MM14/YG/ | LOMAC-20 | Cipla Ltd. | India | 12.5 | 11.6 | 12.6 | 13.0 | 14.1 | 15.1 | 13.1 | 1.2 | 9.5 | Fail | Fail |
| 131 B-007 | B-007/MM14/YG, | LOMAC | Cipla Ltd. | India | 39.9 | 38.1 | 42.5 | 40.3 | 39.5 | 42.3 | 40.4 | 1.7 | 4.2 | Fail | Fail |
| 233 B-110 | B110/MM14/YG/ | LOMAC | Cipla Ltd. | India | 24.4 | 25.4 | 25.1 | 24.7 | 25.4 | 21.1 | 24.4 | 1.7 | 6.8 | Fail | Fail |
| 124 PB-003 | PB-003/MM14/YC | OMEZ | Dr. REDDY'S LABORATORIES | India | 9.0 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 5.7 | 3.4 | 5.1 | 6.8 | 2.4 | 35.4 | Pass |  |
| $130 \mathrm{~B}-006$ | B-006/MM14/YG, | OMEZ | Dr. REDDY'S LABORATORIES | India | 5.8 | 2.9 | 5.3 | 9.1 | 8.8 | 8.7 | 6.8 | 2.5 | 37.1 | Pass |  |
| $132 \mathrm{~B}-008$ | B-008/MM14/YG, | OMEZ | Dr. REDDY'S LABORATORIES | India | 14.4 | 13.3 | 14.5 | 14.4 | 8.4 | 11.0 | 12.7 | 2.5 | 19.6 | Fail | Fail |
| $137 \mathrm{~B}-013$ | B-013/MM14/YG, | OMEZ | Dr. REDDY'S Laboratories | India | 16.5 | 15.9 | 8.5 | 15.0 | 10.6 | 15.9 | 13.7 | 3.4 | 24.4 | Fail | Fail |
| 160 B-036 | B-036/MM14/YG, | OMEZ | Dr. REDDY'S LABORATORIES | India | 8.8 | 7.6 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 8.0 | 4.6 | 3.9 | 85.4 | Pass |  |
| 178 B-054 | B-054/MM14/YG, |  | Dr. REDDY'S LABORATORIES | India | 22.8 | 26.4 | 28.2 | 24.0 | 25.3 | 27.4 | 25.7 | 2.1 | 8.0 | Fail | Fail |
| $229 \mathrm{~B}-106$ | B106/MM14/YG/ | OMEZ | Dr. REDDY'S LABORATORIES | India | 12.4 | 7.6 | 14.8 | 20.7 | 19.3 | 20.7 | 15.9 | 5.3 | 33.1 | Fail | Fail |
| 2 PA-005 | PA005/MM14/YG | OMEZ | Dr.REDDY'S LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 26.9 | 9.3 | 15.9 | 26.6 | 9.3 | 15.7 | 17.3 | 7.9 | 45.6 | Fail | Fail |
| 4 A-001 | A001/MM14/YG/ | OMEZ | Dr.REDDY'S LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 9.8 | 5.9 | 7.5 | 9.3 | 6.9 | 7.4 | 7.8 | 1.5 | 19.1 | Pass |  |
| 8 A-015 | A015/MM14/YG/ | OMEZ | Dr.REDDY'S LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 14.3 | 9.3 | 16.8 | 15.2 | 15.9 | 9.7 | 13.5 | 3.2 | 23.9 | Fail | Fail |
| 14 A-039 | A039/MM14/YG/ | OMEZ | Dr.REDDY'S LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 9.5 | 8.5 | 14.7 | 14.6 | 13.1 | 14.5 | 12.5 | 2.8 | 22.1 | Fail | Fail |
| 17 A-050 | A050/MM14/YG/ | OMEZ | Dr.REDDY'S LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 10.5 | 9.2 | 20.2 | 17.3 | 17.9 | 24.3 | 16.6 | 5.8 | 34.9 | Fail | Fail |
| 19 A-061 | A061/MM14/YG/ | OMEZ | Dr.REDDY's LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 9.9 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 9.1 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 9.6 | 0.3 | 3.5 | Pass |  |
| 20 A-065 | A065/MM14/YG/ | OMEZ | Dr.REDDY's LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 9.2 | 9.2 | 9.1 | 9.8 | 7.0 | 7.4 | 8.6 | 1.1 | 13.3 | Pass |  |
| 29 A-101 | A101/MM14/YG/ | OMEz | Dr.REDDY'S LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 8.9 | 12.5 | 9.4 | 14.3 | 11.1 | 14.1 | 11.7 | 2.3 | 19.8 | Fail | Pass |
| 30 A-106 | A106/MM14/YG/ | OMEz | Dr.REDDY'S LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Pass |  |
| 31 A-107 | A107/MM14/YG/ | OMEZ | Dr.REDDY's LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 4.8 | 4.7 | 4.6 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 0.1 | 3.3 | Pass |  |
| 33 A-114 | A114/MM14/YG/ | OMEZ | Dr.REDDY's LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Pass |  |
| 7 A-012 | A012/MM14/YG/ | Zosec | Emcure PHARMACETICALS LTD. | India | 7.2 | 5.7 | 5.0 | 7.1 | 5.8 | 5.0 | 6.0 | 1.0 | 16.2 | Pass |  |
| 141 B-017 | B-017/MM14/YG, | Zosec | Emcure PHARMACEUTICAL LTD. | India | 2.6 | 2.4 | 1.8 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 37.4 | Pass |  |
| 161 B-037 | B-037/MM14/YG, | OMFIL | Fourrts Laboratories Pvt Ltd, | India | 3.5 | 7.1 | 5.1 | 4.2 | 6.8 | 5.0 | 5.3 | 1.4 | 26.7 | Pass |  |
| 11 A.033 | A033/MM14/YG/ | OMFIL 20 | Fourrts Laboratories Pvt.Ltd. | India | 8.3 | 8.4 | 8.3 | 8.6 | 8.9 | 8.7 | 8.5 | 0.3 | 3.0 | Pass |  |
| 169 B-045 | B-045/MM14/YG, | OMPREZ | Global Pharma Healthcare Pvt, L | -India | 2.6 | 3.0 | 4.4 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 4.4 | 3.3 | 0.9 | 26.6 | Pass |  |
| 15 A-041 | A041/MM14/YG/ | TRISEC | GREAT HIMALAYAN PTE LTD. | India | 12.0 | 25.0 | 11.5 | 11.8 | 24.9 | 11.6 | 16.1 | 6.8 | 42.4 | Fail | Fail |
| 201 B-077 | B-077/MM14/YG, | Ometab | Intas Pharmaceutical Ltd. | India | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Pass |  |
| 231 B-108 | B108/MM14/YG/ | Ometab | Intas Pharmaceutical Ltd. | India | 3.5 | 7.2 | 4.9 | 4.2 | 6.9 | 4.9 | 5.3 | 1.5 | 28.3 | Pass |  |
| 123 PB-002 | PB-002/MM14/YC | Ome-M | Rainbow Life Sciences Pvt. Ltd. | India | 11.0 | 18.1 | 11.0 | 17.7 | 18.2 | 11.2 | 14.5 | 3.8 | 26.1 | Fail | Fail |
| 24 A-078 | A078/MM14/YG/ | Reloc-20 | Rhydburg Pharmaceuticals Ltd. | India | 23.0 | 34.4 | 17.1 | 23.3 | 33.1 | 16.6 | 24.6 | 7.6 | 31.1 | Fail | Fail |
| 6 A-011 | A011/MM14/YG/ | Omesec | The United Drug (1996) Co,ltd. | Thailand | 2.7 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 0.2 | 7.0 | Pass |  |
| 26 A-091 | A091/MM14/YG/ | Omesec | The United Drug (1996) Co,ltd. | Thailand | 2.7 | 3.2 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 2.8 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 0.9 | 24.7 | Pass |  |
| 183 B-059 | B-059/MM14/YG, | Omesec | The United Drug(1996) CO., Ltd | Thailand | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 0.2 | 8.2 | Pass |  |
| 28 A-097 | A097/MM14/YG/ | Omesafe | UNIVERSAL PHARMACEUTICALS LII |  | 2.8 | 2.7 | 6.7 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 1.6 | 46.1 | Pass |  |
| 173 B-049 | B-049/MM14/MG, | Virom | Virchow Healthcare Drivate Limi |  | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 54.1 | Pass |  |
| $139 \mathrm{~B}-015$ | B-015/MM14/MG, |  | XL LABORATORIES PVT. LTD. | India | 17.9 | 17.2 | 17.7 | 18.0 | 17.5 | 17.7 | 17.7 | 0.3 | 1.7 | Fail | Fail |
| 22 A-067 | A067/MM14/YG/ | HYCID | XL LABORATORIES PVT.LTD. | India | 3.3 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 8.0 | 5.1 | 9.1 | 7.3 | 2.5 | 33.8 | Pass |  |

Dissolution test BP: Buffer Stage

| \% of Quantity Capsule 1 | \% of Quantity Capsule 2 | \% of Quantity Capsule 3 | \% of Quantity Capsule 4 | \% of Quantity Capsule 5 | \% of Quantity Capsule 6 | Mean \% of Quantity | \% of Quantity SD | \% of <br> Quantity \%CV | Judge | Disso Final Initial Judge | Disso Final <br> New Judge $\begin{gathered} Q=65 * 0.8+ \\ 5 \%=57 \end{gathered}$ | Disso New Final Judge |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 51.3 | 79.2 | 76.0 | 65.2 | 77.9 | 70.0 | 70.0 | 10.5 | 15.1 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 56.0 | 52.7 | 47.6 | 56.4 | 54.1 | 48.6 | 52.6 | 3.7 | 7.1 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 82.7 | 94.3 | 95.4 | 96.0 | 95.4 | 96.1 | 93.3 | 5.2 | 5.6 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 92.8 | 95.2 | 98.8 | 97.5 | 97.3 | 94.7 | 96.0 | 2.2 | 2.3 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 81.6 | 92.7 | 89.7 | 83.0 | 93.3 | 91.8 | 88.7 | 5.1 | 5.8 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 96.0 | 92.6 | 95.2 | 91.6 | 94.0 | 95.8 | 94.2 | 1.8 | 1.9 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 96.6 | 97.9 | 98.3 | 66.4 | 98.5 | 97.3 | 92.5 | 12.8 | 13.9 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 82.7 | 94.3 | 93.5 | 94.2 | 95.4 | 95.7 | 92.7 | 4.9 | 5.3 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 77.0 | 79.8 | 80.1 | 81.4 | 80.1 | 77.2 | 79.3 | 1.8 | 2.2 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 83.1 | 84.9 | 82.2 | 82.7 | 83.6 | 82.1 | 83.1 | 1.0 | 1.2 | Pass | pass |  |  |
| 96.9 | 99.5 | 98.2 | 96.1 | 96.4 | 98.4 | 97.6 | 1.3 | 1.4 | Pass | pass |  |  |
| 86.9 | 72.9 | 75.2 | 76.9 | 75.4 | 86.8 | 79.0 | 6.2 | 7.9 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 97.9 | 95.6 | 97.7 | 95.1 | 96.2 | 95.7 | 96.4 | 1.2 | 1.2 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 99.3 | 98.1 | 98.6 | 95.4 | 99.0 | 98.0 | 98.1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 77.0 | 79.8 | 80.1 | 94.3 | 94.4 | 95.4 | 86.8 | 8.7 | 10.0 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 52.1 | 53.8 | 47.6 | 51.8 | 50.9 | 48.5 | 50.8 | 2.3 | 4.6 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 85.4 | 84.1 | 83.3 | 81.7 | 85.2 | 83.6 | 83.9 | 1.3 | 1.6 | Pass | Fail |  | Fail |
| 49.5 | 49.7 | 63.4 | 55.7 | 50.7 | 50.7 | 53.3 | 5.5 | 10.2 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 53.6 | 62.8 | 62.1 | 52.8 | 53.4 | 62.6 | 57.9 | 5.1 | 8.8 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 30.7 | 34.4 | 26.5 | 54.9 | 71.2 | 57.6 | 45.9 | 17.9 | 39.0 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 54.7 | 72.7 | 57.1 | 31.1 | 34.2 | 27.9 | 46.3 | 17.9 | 38.7 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 70.3 | 67.7 | 73.1 | 72.3 | 77.4 | 74.8 | 72.6 | 3.4 | 4.7 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 50.2 | 47.5 | 80.7 | 58.6 | 68.2 | 56.9 | 60.4 | 12.3 | 20.4 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 78.3 | 70.7 | 78.4 | 69.3 | 68.3 | 66.6 | 71.9 | 5.1 | 7.1 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 31.4 | 32.1 | 35.5 | 31.8 | 73.9 | 73.2 | 46.3 | 21.2 | 45.7 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 49.7 | 47.1 | 79.3 | 48.8 | 77.9 | 77.0 | 63.3 | 16.2 | 25.6 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 60.1 | 65.2 | 61.7 | 60.1 | 65.1 | 61.7 | 62.3 | 2.3 | 3.7 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 73.8 | 79.3 | 71.4 | 72.4 | 71.1 | 70.8 | 73.1 | 3.9 | 5.4 | Pass | pass |  |  |
| 56.6 | 70.7 | 55.2 | 54.5 | 48.1 | 74.7 | 60.0 | 10.4 | 17.3 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 73.9 | 77.7 | 62.1 | 75.0 | 60.7 | 60.8 | 68.4 | 8.0 | 11.6 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 75.3 | 75.8 | 60.7 | 73.7 | 63.2 | 74.1 | 70.5 | 6.7 | 9.5 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 76.8 | 68.0 | 70.6 | 76.9 | 71.1 | 76.5 | 73.3 | 3.9 | 5.3 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 72.5 | 72.1 | 67.3 | 67.6 | 73.4 | 72.5 | 70.9 | 2.7 | 3.8 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 77.6 | 69.5 | 77.7 | 55.7 | 66.9 | 53.7 | 66.9 | 10.4 | 15.5 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 69.0 | 73.1 | 66.6 | 71.7 | 67.5 | 72.5 | 70.1 | 2.8 | 3.9 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 18.3 | 19.5 | 17.9 | 18.5 | 18.9 | 18.3 | 18.6 | 0.6 | 3.0 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 69.4 | 67.9 | 75.2 | 67.4 | 67.6 | 72.5 | 70.0 | 3.2 | 4.5 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 80.0 | 74.7 | 91.1 | 80.0 | 76.4 | 90.3 | 82.1 | 7.0 | 8.5 | Pass | pass |  |  |
| 99.6 | 98.6 | 98.8 | 97.7 | 97.4 | 94.6 | 97.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 92.2 | 86.9 | 87.1 | 91.1 | 88.9 | 92.9 | 89.9 | 2.6 | 2.9 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 67.6 | 81.2 | 79.8 | 80.6 | 68.5 | 68.2 | 74.3 | 6.8 | 9.2 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 71.7 | 94.3 | 86.6 | 73.1 | 93.9 | 86.8 | 84.4 | 9.9 | 11.7 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 59.7 | 98.8 | 61.0 | 59.7 | 98.7 | 61.4 | 73.2 | 19.8 | 27.1 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 87.1 | 86.9 | 87.2 | 86.4 | 88.0 | 87.9 | 87.2 | 0.6 | 0.7 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 92.2 | 87.5 | 87.3 | 91.2 | 88.4 | 92.3 | 89.8 | 2.3 | 2.6 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 51.5 | 60.6 | 59.9 | 50.7 | 51.3 | 60.4 | 55.7 | 5.0 | 9.0 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 49.4 | 43.5 | 50.8 | 49.9 | 44.1 | 50.9 | 48.1 | 3.4 | 7.1 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 93.5 | 91.0 | 92.9 | 89.3 | 92.8 | 94.3 | 92.3 | 1.8 | 2.0 | Pass | pass |  |  |
| 89.9 | 93.5 | 95.8 | 99.9 | 95.9 | 98.2 | 95.5 | 3.5 | 3.7 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 93.9 | 97.7 | 99.8 | 93.3 | 93.4 | 91.2 | 94.9 | 3.2 | 3.4 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 94.6 | 95.2 | 78.9 | 96.5 | 80.6 | 82.9 | 88.1 | 8.1 | 9.2 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 66.4 | 85.3 | 84.9 | 65.6 | 83.7 | 66.3 | 75.4 | 10.2 | 13.5 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 39.7 | 38.5 | 42.8 | 39.8 | 38.9 | 42.6 | 40.4 | 1.9 | 4.6 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 82.2 | 71.8 | 73.5 | 86.2 | 70.2 | 76.3 | 76.7 | 6.3 | 8.2 | Pass | Pass |  |  |

## 2nd Stage-Acid Stage

| \% of Quantity Capsule 1 | \% of Quantity capsule 2 | $\%$ of Quantity Capsule 3 | \% of Quantity capsule 4 | \% of Quantity Capsule 5 | \% of Quantity capsule 6 | Mean \% of Quantity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% of } \\ & \text { Quantity } \\ & \text { SD } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% of } \\ & \text { Quantity } \\ & \text { \%CV } \end{aligned}$ | Judge | $\begin{gathered} \text { New Judge } \\ 10 \% * 1.2= \\ 12 \% \\ \text { dissolved } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10.2 | 8.7 | 3.0 | 8.9 | 8.7 | 10.5 | 10.3 | 4.4 | 42.4 | Pass |  |
| 7.8 | 8.3 | 6.8 | 7.7 | 6.8 | 9.5 | 9.4 | 1.8 | 19.4 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33.7 | 31.6 | 34.5 | 34.8 | 35.5 | 39.3 | 24.0 | 11.5 | 47.9 | Fail | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25.0 | 25.8 | 22.1 | 26.5 | 27.9 | 32.4 | 25.5 | 2.8 | 11.1 | Fail | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7.0 | 6.5 | 8.8 | 4.3 | 6.9 | 8.4 | 9.8 | 3.6 | 36.4 | Pass |  |
| 3.8 | 6.8 | 3.9 | 5.1 | 3.6 | 4.6 | 9.2 | 5.3 | 58.0 | Pass |  |
| 8.8 | 10.7 | 9.1 | 10.0 | 8.2 | 12.8 | 7.3 | 4.0 | 55.2 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12.0 | 16.3 | 11.1 | 12.1 | 14.2 | 11.2 | 14.4 | 4.1 | 28.8 | Fail | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.4 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 5.7 | 18.3 | 6.8 | 10.4 | 5.4 | 52.6 | Pass |  |
| 1.3 | 5.6 | 6.8 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 3.8 | 8.4 | 4.8 | 57.0 | Pass |  |
| 3.7 | 4.3 | 6.6 | 3.8 | 3.3 | 5.1 | 10.5 | 7.5 | 71.0 | Fail | Pass |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15.6 | 11.1 | 11.7 | 13.1 | 11.7 | 12.7 | 14.4 | 5.1 | 35.2 | Fail | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11.6 | 3.0 | 13.5 | 12.7 | 11.0 | 12.3 | 12.6 | 4.2 | 33.0 | Fail | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8.0 | 7.5 | 6.8 | 6.7 | 6.4 | 7.8 | 4.4 | 3.0 | 67.2 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 2nd Stage-Buffer

| \% of Quantity Capsule 1 | \% of Quantity Capsule 2 | \% of Quantity Capsule 3 | \% of Quantity Capsule 4 | $\%$ of Quantity Capsule 5 | \% of Quantity Capsule 6 | Mean \% of Quantity | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { Quantity } \\ \text { SD } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { Quantity } \\ \% \mathrm{CV} \end{gathered}$ | Initial Judge | Disso Initial Fina Judge | New Judge Q=52 | Disso New <br> Final <br> Judge |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 63.5 | 71.2 | 102.5 | 64.7 | 76.4 | 46.9 | 70.4 | 14.3 | 20.3 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 71.2 | 64.9 | 74.5 | 64.9 | 73.3 | 61.8 | 60.5 | 9.4 | 15.5 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 37.1 | 49.6 | 41.5 | 37.8 | 49.6 | 40.3 | 63.2 | 21.9 | 34.6 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35.2 | 34.1 | 32.5 | 34.1 | 35.7 | 37.1 | 46.3 | 12.6 | 27.2 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.3 | 52.7 | 60.6 | 51.7 | 42.5 | 50.0 | 63.0 | 11.4 | 18.2 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 65.6 | 54.7 | 62.1 | 63.1 | 63.3 | 64.9 | 61.3 | 8.8 | 14.3 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 74.9 | 64.9 | 61.2 | 65.5 | 62.3 | 75.3 | 69.6 | 5.9 | 8.5 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34.0 | 27.7 | 31.1 | 32.4 | 28.6 | 26.2 | 46.6 | 20.7 | 44.3 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 58.8 | 81.4 | 72.6 | 67.6 | 73.9 | 64.5 | 64.9 | 10.2 | 15.7 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 80.5 | 74.6 | 75.1 | 60.4 | 64.0 | 67.9 | 69.4 | 7.5 | 10.8 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 67.2 | 52.1 | 62.3 | 79.2 | 65.7 | 76.5 | 68.8 | 8.2 | 12.0 | Pass | Fail |  | Pass |
| 38.4 | 71.2 | 56.3 | 41.9 | 38.2 | 69.0 | 62.9 | 15.2 | 24.1 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 60.6 | 41.1 | 48.6 | 52.5 | 64.5 | 50.4 | 61.9 | 11.1 | 18.0 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 69.8 | 61.6 | 66.0 | 53.7 | 60.9 | 68.5 | 65.1 | 8.3 | 12.7 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 39.2 | 67.8 | 56.7 | 43.5 | 41.6 | 69.6 | 61.6 | 12.9 | 20.9 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 53.0 | 69.8 | 66.7 | 60.4 | 61.1 | 66.8 | 66.5 | 5.9 | 8.9 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 61.7 | 78.7 | 77.4 | 71.1 | 81.4 | 81.0 | 74.8 | 6.9 | 9.2 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24.3 | 18.1 | 29.6 | 19.4 | 22.9 | 18.6 | 47.7 | 30.0 | 62.9 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 61.8 | 90.6 | 60.5 | 64.9 | 57.5 | 53.4 | 60.2 | 10.7 | 17.7 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65.6 | 72.1 | 81.4 | 78.6 | 78.2 | 80.4 | 75.7 | 8.0 | 10.5 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Content uniformity test BP (1st stage)

| \% of <br> Quantity <br> Capsule 1 | \% of <br> Quantity Capsule 2 | \% of <br> Quantity Capsule 3 | \% of <br> Quantity <br> Capsule 4 | \% of <br> Quantity Capsule 5 | 8 of <br> Quantity <br> Capsule 6 | $\%$ of <br> Quantity Capsule 7 | \% of Quantity Capsule 8 | \% of <br> Quantity Capsule 9 | \% of <br> Quantity Capsule 10 | Mean \% of <br> Quantity | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of } \\ \text { Quantity } \\ \text { SD } \end{gathered}$ | \% of Quantity SCV | AV (Acceptano e Value) | Judge | New Judge $A V=18$ | Mean \% of Quantity | Judge | New Judge <br> BP <br> $76.0 \leqq_{\text {mea }}$ <br> $n \leqq 126$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 98.4 | 103.4 | 96.8 | 103.9 | 100.1 | 99.0 | 94.2 | 99.7 | 98.1 | 95.7 | 98.9 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 7.4 | Pass |  | 98.9 | Pass |  |
| 90.5 | 91.9 | 91.6 | 95.1 | 95.2 | 96.6 | 91.0 | 90.8 | 91.1 | 96.5 | 93.0 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 11.5 | Pass |  | 93.0 | Fail | Pass |
| 88.2 | 87.8 | 86.7 | 97.1 | 83.7 | 84.2 | 88.3 | 93.3 | 85.2 | 105.7 | 90.0 | 6.9 | 7.6 | 25.0 | Fail | Fail | 90.0 | Fail | Pass |
| 99.9 | 103.1 | 98.4 | 102.9 | 105.9 | 94.3 | 102.8 | 101.5 | 98.1 | 103.8 | 101.1 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 8.2 | Pass |  | 101.1 | Pass |  |
| 97.5 | 95.4 | 81.2 | 90.8 | 100.2 | 98.4 | 100.1 | 94.5 | 93.9 | 101.2 | 95.3 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 17.5 | Fail | Pass | 95.3 | Pass |  |
| 99.1 | 108.0 | 100.1 | 99.8 | 99.6 | 106.5 | 103.0 | 100.4 | 104.1 | 107.9 | 102.9 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 7.2 | Pass |  | 102.9 | Pass |  |
| 102.7 | 102.6 | 105.7 | 101.5 | 96.8 | 106.0 | 106.1 | 105.5 | 101.0 | 106.7 | 103.5 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 5.6 | Pass |  | 103.5 | Pass |  |
| 95.9 | 94.0 | 97.5 | 91.8 | 91.4 | 90.8 | 99.0 | 100.9 | 96.1 | 104.8 | 96.2 | 4.5 | 4.7 | 13.0 | Pass |  | 96.2 | Pass |  |
| 97.1 | 94.1 | 95.2 | 100.0 | 99.5 | 100.9 | 92.6 | 105.0 | 97.8 | 102.7 | 98.5 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 9.4 | Pass |  | 98.5 | Pass |  |
| 107.7 | 105.9 | 104.9 | 101.8 | 99.9 | 104.6 | 103.2 | 104.3 | 107.8 | 105.1 | 104.5 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.8 | Pass |  | 104.5 | Pass |  |
| 101.6 | 106.5 | 107.0 | 106.7 | 106.5 | 105.2 | 106.5 | 104.5 | 109.7 | 109.8 | 106.4 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 0.8 | Pass |  | 106.4 | Fail | Pass |
| 101.4 | 106.5 | 106.8 | 106.7 | 106.5 | 105.1 | 107.9 | 107.4 | 109.2 | 109.7 | 106.7 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 0.3 | Pass |  | 106.7 | Fail | Pass |
| 99.5 | 107.6 | 104.4 | 106.9 | 104.4 | 109.8 | 107.9 | 109.4 | 108.3 | 105.4 | 106.4 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.5 | Pass |  | 106.4 | Fail | Pass |
| 99.6 | 108.0 | 99.8 | 98.9 | 106.3 | 105.3 | 104.0 | 99.5 | 100.2 | 102.9 | 102.4 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 7.0 | Pass |  | 102.4 | Pass |  |
| 99.8 | 107.9 | 104.5 | 107.2 | 104.5 | 109.8 | 107.8 | 109.6 | 108.4 | 105.8 | 106.5 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 2.2 | Pass |  | 106.5 | Fail | Pass |
| 91.1 | 91.6 | 92.7 | 97.9 | 99.0 | 97.1 | 94.9 | 96.7 | 93.7 | 93.8 | 94.9 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 10.2 | Pass |  | 94.9 | Pass |  |
| 89.8 | 92.1 | 89.0 | 88.8 | 90.8 | 93.0 | 92.2 | 93.5 | 90.0 | 84.7 | 90.4 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 14.3 | Pass |  | 90.4 | Fail | Pass |
| 89.8 | 92.1 | 89.1 | 88.9 | 91.0 | 93.0 | 92.3 | 93.5 | 89.9 | 84.8 | 90.4 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 14.2 | Pass |  | 90.4 | Fail | Pass |
| 87.9 | 89.2 | 89.3 | 87.9 | 90.6 | 87.9 | 88.6 | 85.5 | 91.0 | 93.8 | 89.2 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 5.4 | Pass |  | 89.2 | Fail | Pass |
| 92.1 | 96.0 | 90.3 | 91.2 | 92.0 | 95.0 | 94.2 | 93.6 | 95.9 | 96.5 | 93.7 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 10.1 | Pass |  | 93.7 | Fail | Pass |
| 96.4 | 94.7 | 95.8 | 91.6 | 97.6 | 92.5 | 97.6 | 96.6 | 98.5 | 98.0 | 95.9 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 8.2 | Pass |  | 95.9 | Pass |  |
| 102.0 | 95.8 | 110.0 | 107.2 | 107.8 | 108.5 | 106.7 | 98.2 | 105.6 | 105.3 | 104.7 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 7.9 | Pass |  | 104.7 | Pass |  |
| 90.7 | 95.5 | 93.6 | 91.0 | 99.3 | 90.8 | 96.0 | 91.3 | 98.0 | 91.7 | 93.8 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 12.4 | Pass |  | 93.8 | Fail | Pass |
| 96.2 | 97.8 | 99.7 | 95.8 | 98.9 | 94.6 | 93.0 | 93.6 | 98.6 | 90.6 | 95.9 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 9.7 | Pass |  | 95.9 | Pass |  |
| 93.5 | 94.2 | 102.0 | 93.3 | 96.1 | 93.1 | 98.5 | 100.9 | 92.9 | 93.8 | 95.8 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 10.9 | Pass |  | 95.8 | Pass |  |
| 98.9 | 93.0 | 95.9 | 96.4 | 100.3 | 99.5 | 92.0 | 96.3 | 100.5 | 103.6 | 97.6 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 9.5 | Pass |  | 97.6 | Pass |  |
| 96.3 | 101.6 | 92.5 | 98.5 | 99.4 | 96.6 | 97.9 | 96.6 | 100.0 | 98.2 | 97.8 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 6.7 | Pass |  | 97.8 | Pass |  |
| 101.2 | 94.0 | 105.6 | 98.6 | 101.9 | 98.5 | 95.0 | 95.6 | 102.6 | 102.7 | 99.6 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 8.2 | Pass |  | 99.6 | Pass |  |
| 90.0 | 90.9 | 92.3 | 92.2 | 95.9 | 95.4 | 92.5 | 94.4 | 93.4 | 92.2 | 92.9 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 10.1 | Pass |  | 92.9 | Fail | Pass |
| 93.2 | 98.1 | 96.6 | 99.7 | 95.5 | 94.3 | 97.0 | 97.2 | 96.9 | 101.7 | 97.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 7.4 | Pass |  | 97.0 | Pass |  |
| 90.1 | 95.5 | 92.5 | 95.0 | 96.7 | 103.7 | 98.3 | 90.8 | 95.4 | 97.0 | 95.5 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 12.4 | Pass |  | 95.5 | Pass |  |
| 92.1 | 102.4 | 99.3 | 96.7 | 92.8 | 98.1 | 95.1 | 100.4 | 98.0 | 98.5 | 97.3 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 9.0 | Pass |  | 97.3 | Pass |  |
| 92.3 | 94.7 | 98.9 | 100.1 | 99.6 | 95.7 | 93.9 | 95.3 | 92.7 | 97.2 | 96.0 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 9.1 | Pass |  | 96.0 | Pass |  |
| 95.2 | 90.3 | 96.8 | 103.7 | 95.0 | 92.6 | 98.2 | 90.7 | 95.9 | 97.1 | 95.5 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 12.4 | Pass |  | 95.5 | Pass |  |
| 92.5 | 92.6 | 96.1 | 92.2 | 92.3 | 90.0 | 91.1 | 93.6 | 94.5 | 95.4 | 93.0 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 10.0 | Pass |  | 93.0 | Fail | Pass |
| 94.8 | 92.6 | 97.8 | 98.2 | 97.0 | 92.0 | 98.3 | 96.7 | 99.3 | 96.0 | 96.3 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 8.2 | Pass |  | 96.3 | Pass |  |
| 97.1 | 93.7 | 96.7 | 97.7 | 94.0 | 93.4 | 94.0 | 96.9 | 91.6 | 93.9 | 94.9 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 8.5 | Pass |  | 94.9 | Pass |  |
| 56.5 | 47.1 | 95.7 | 99.2 | 77.9 | 47.6 | 83.0 | 72.5 | 85.2 | 99.6 | 76.4 | 20.1 | 26.4 | 70.4 | Fail | Fail | 76.4 | Fail | Pass |
| 89.0 | 91.5 | 96.7 | 95.8 | 98.8 | 100.1 | 88.1 | 90.3 | 93.3 | 92.7 | 93.6 | 4.1 | 4.4 | 14.7 | Pass |  | 93.6 | Fail | Pass |
| 92.4 | 93.0 | 94.0 | 99.5 | 100.6 | 98.6 | 96.3 | 98.2 | 94.8 | 95.2 | 96.3 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 9.1 | Pass |  | 96.3 | Pass |  |
| 75.6 | 84.7 | 81.9 | 86.5 | 101.0 | 80.1 | 99.1 | 100.1 | 95.9 | 91.3 | 89.6 | 9.1 | 10.2 | 30.8 | Fail | Fail | 89.6 | Fail | Pass |
| 93.0 | 78.3 | 77.4 | 76.2 | 89.1 | 94.1 | 91.4 | 97.8 | 82.9 | 87.6 | 86.8 | 7.7 | 8.8 | 30.1 | Fail | Fail | 86.8 | Fail | Pass |
| 109.2 | 107.2 | 107.9 | 106.3 | 102.1 | 105.1 | 104.5 | 105.3 | 106.4 | 100.3 | 105.4 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.4 | Pass |  | 105.4 | Pass |  |
| 86.1 | 91.8 | 87.7 | 83.8 | 90.4 | 86.5 | 88.2 | 89.4 | 84.2 | 90.7 | 87.9 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 17.2 | Fail | Pass | 87.9 | Fail | Pass |
| 101.2 | 101.4 | 98.2 | 99.3 | 96.9 | 96.9 | 98.6 | 96.0 | 99.1 | 101.5 | 98.9 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 4.7 | Pass |  | 98.9 | Pass |  |
| 90.9 | 81.7 | 99.9 | 92.7 | 93.5 | 85.0 | 85.6 | 87.3 | 85.5 | 86.5 | 88.8 | 5.4 | 6.0 | 22.5 | Fail | Fail | 88.8 | Fail | Pass |
| 99.8 | 94.0 | 62.2 | 62.5 | 76.6 | 45.5 | 73.8 | 90.3 | 76.0 | 78.7 | 75.9 | 16.4 | 21.5 | 61.8 | Fail | Fail | 75.9 | Fail | Fail |
| 100.0 | 93.9 | 99.7 | 95.4 | 96.7 | 97.9 | 98.4 | 98.9 | 104.0 | 103.3 | 98.8 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 7.6 | Pass |  | 98.8 | Pass |  |
| 93.3 | 94.5 | 96.5 | 91.2 | 96.4 | 95.7 | 93.8 | 92.6 | 98.3 | 98.7 | 95.1 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 9.3 | Pass |  | 95.1 | Pass |  |
| 98.3 | 90.0 | 97.8 | 90.3 | 99.0 | 101.3 | 101.6 | 104.2 | 103.4 | 103.3 | 98.9 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 12.2 | Pass |  | 98.9 | Pass |  |
| 94.1 | 103.4 | 99.3 | 101.9 | 96.4 | 104.2 | 97.3 | 103.5 | 98.6 | 104.0 | 100.3 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 8.7 | Pass |  | 100.3 | Pass |  |
| 80.6 | 69.2 | 77.8 | 80.0 | 89.5 | 78.4 | 85.0 | 85.6 | 82.6 | 83.4 | 81.2 | 5.5 | 6.8 | 30.5 | Fail | Fail | 81.2 | Fail | Pass |
| 98.6 | 113.1 | 90.3 | 98.3 | 116.2 | 96.6 | 100.7 | 108.9 | 113.3 | 113.5 | 104.9 | 9.1 | 8.6 | 18.3 | Fail | Fail | 104.9 | Pass |  |
| 88.1 | 99.5 | 100.1 | 94.7 | 95.0 | 89.9 | 98.0 | 87.3 | 90.8 | 91.6 | 93.5 | 4.7 | 5.0 | 16.2 | Fail | Pass | 93.5 | Fail | Pass |

## Content uniformity test BP (2nd stage)

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sof } \\ & \text { Quarity } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bof } \\ & \text { Qalarity } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sof } \\ & \text { Cararity } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sof } \\ & \text { Quartity } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sof } \\ & \text { Qamitity } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sof } \\ \text { Quartity } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sof } \\ & \text { Quarnity } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lof } \\ & \text { Cantity } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { sof } \\ \text { Caratity } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sof } \\ \text { Caratity } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | of lof | $\begin{aligned} & \text { sof } \\ & \text { Cararity } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Judse | Neen ulige |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cassule 1 | Capsule? | Capsile 3 | Capasie 4 | Capsule 5 | Capasule 6 | Capasule 7 | Capsule 8 | Capsule 9 | Cansule 10 | Capsule 11 | Cassuse 12 | Cansile 13 | Caspuie 14 | Capsile 15 | Capsule 16 | Capavie 17 | $1{ }^{18}$ | de 19 | mosule 20 |  | So | 40V |  | (elve) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.4 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 115 | Pass |  |
| 88.9 | 85.0 | 897 | 878 | 10.7 | 973 | 989 | 10.5 | 97.1 | 90.5 | 926 | 929 | 88.6 | 95.2 | 98.7 | 1089 | 96.7 | 8.17 | 95.7 | 95.7 | 93.2 | 73 | 7.8 | 985 | 199 | fail | fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.2 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 175 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.2 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.6 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13.0 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.4 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 28 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.8 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 03 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.0 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.2 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.2 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.3 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.2 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 54 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.1 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.2 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 79 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 124 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.7 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 109 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 95 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.7 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.2 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.1 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.4 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 124 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.0 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.1 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 124 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10.0 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8. | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 85 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 00.4 | fail | ${ }_{\text {fail }}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.7 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9.1 | Pass |  |
| 1092 | 95.3 | 93.1 | 914 | 975 | 98.6 | 1099 | 98.7 | 943 | 89.2 | 927 | 1031 | 958 | 90.7 | 90.1 | 88.0 | 993 | 88.9 | 853 | 98.8 | 935 | 79 | 8.4 | 985 | 208 | ${ }^{\text {fail }}$ | ${ }_{\text {fail }}$ |
| 799 | 911 | 909 | 95.6 | 95.4 | 1043 | 12.6 | 1043 | 87.3 | 91.6 | 918 | 934 | 969 | 898 | 938 | 94.0 | 85.5 | 95.2 | 955 | 97.6 | 915 | 73 | 7.9 | 98.5 | 21.6 | ${ }^{\text {fail }}$ | fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 24 | Pass |  |
| 90.0 | 90.2 | 87.1 | 939 | 90.6 | 922 | 223 | 945 | 924 | 93.0 | 939 | 940 | 90.7 | 95.6 | 915 | 943 | 920 | 93.7 | 927 | 93.5 | 909 | 3.1 | 3.4 | 985 | 138 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.7 | Pass |  |
| 98.8 | 10.9 | 939 | 89.2 | 884 | 925 | 936 | 10.4 | 90.5 | 966 | 1027 | 94.0 | 959 | 10.6 | 98.1 | 929 | 1044 | 928 | 969 | 10.1 | 938 | 6.0 | 6.4 | 985 | 16.7 | Fail | Pass |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 61.8 | ${ }^{\text {fail }}$ | fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.6 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 93 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12.2 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.7 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 305 | ${ }^{\text {fail }}$ | ${ }_{\text {fil }}$ |
| 106.1 | 96.1 | 1097 | 1111 | 98.0 | 10.1 | 1065 | 923 | 975 | 1082 | 1074 | 1085 | 1087 | 1076 | 1075 | 98.5 | 1109 | 99.6 | 1086 | 107.2 | 104.7 | 68 | 65 | 10.5 | 104 | Pass |  |
| 90.3 | 96.0 | 1020 | 980 | 10.1 | 93.0 | 924 | 1016 | 1400 | 951 | 980 | 1035 | 935 | 96.2 | 979 | 87.3 | 883 | 220 | 97.4 | 81.7 | 950 | 50 | 53 | 985 | 13.6 | Pass |  |

Comparisons the results BP in QTY, DS and all test

| Kanazawa Univ. <br> Quantity test <br> (10 caps) | Judixe | New Judge | DS Final Judice | DS New Final Judge | All test pass or any fail | New All test pass or amy fail |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 98.9 | pass |  | Pass |  | pass |  |
| 93.0 | Fall | Pass | Fall | Pass | Fail | Fail |
| 90.0 | Fall | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Fail |
| 101.1 | pass |  | Pass |  | pass |  |
| 95.3 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 102.9 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 103.5 | pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 96.2 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 98.5 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 104.5 | Pass |  | Pass |  | pass |  |
| 106.4 | Fall | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Pass |
| 106.7 | Fall | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Pass |
| 106.4 | Fall | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Pass |
| 102.4 | pass |  | Pass |  | pass |  |
| 106.5 | Fall | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | pass |
| 94.9 | pass |  | Fall | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 90.4 | Fall | Pass | Fall | Fall | Fail | Fall |
| 90.4 | Fall | Pass | Fall | Fall | Fail | Fall |
| 89.2 | Fall | Pass | Fall | Fall | Fail | Fall |
| 93.7 | Fall | Pass | Fall | Fall | Fail | Fall |
| 95.9 | pass |  | Fall | Fall | Fail | Fall |
| 104.7 | Pass |  | pass |  | pass |  |
| 93.8 | Fall | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Pass |
| 95.9 | pass |  | Pass |  | pass |  |
| 95.8 | Pass |  | Fall | Fall | Fail | Fall |
| 97.6 | pass |  | Fall | Fall | Fail | Fall |
| 97.8 | pass |  | Fall | Fall | Fail | Fall |
| 99.6 | pass |  | Pass |  | pass |  |
| 92.9 | Fall | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | pass |
| 97.0 | pass |  | Pass |  | pass |  |
| 95.5 | pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 97.3 | pass |  | Fall | Pass | Fail | pass |
| 96.0 | pass |  | Pass |  | pass |  |
| 95.5 | pass |  | Pass |  | pass |  |
| 93.0 | Fall | Pass | Fall | Pass | Fail | pass |
| 96.3 | pass |  | Fall | Fall | Fail | Fall |
| 94.9 | Pass |  | Pass |  | pass |  |
| 76.4 | Fall | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | pass |
| 93.6 | Fall | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Pass |
| 96.3 | pass |  | Pass |  | pass |  |
| 89.6 | Fall | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Fall |
| 86.8 | Fall | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Fall |
| 105.4 | pass |  | Fall | Fall | Fail | Fall |
| 87.9 | Fall | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | pass |
| 98.9 | pass |  | Pass |  | pass |  |
| 88.8 | Fall | Pass | Fall | Fall | Fail | Fall |
| 75.9 | Fall | Fall | Fall | Fail | Fail | Fall |
| 98.8 | pass |  | Pass |  | pass |  |
| 95.1 | pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 98.9 | pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 100.3 | pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 81.2 | Fall | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Fall |
| 104.9 | pass |  | Fall | Fall | Fail | Fall |
| 93.5 | Fall | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | pass |


| Serial No. | Sample Code Trade name of | Nane of Manufacturer | Manufact | \%of Quantity Capsule 1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yof } \\ & \text { Quantity } \\ & \text { Capsule } 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yof } \\ & \text { Quantity } \\ & \text { Capsule } 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Y of } \\ & \text { Quantity } \\ & \text { Capsule } 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yof } \\ & \text { Quaratity } \\ & \text { Capsule } 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% of } \\ & \text { Quantity } \\ & \text { Capsule } 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mean \% of } \\ & \text { Quantity } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sof } \\ & \text { Quantiy } \\ & \text { SD } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yof } \\ & \text { Quaratity } \\ & \text { Yov } \end{aligned}$ | Jugge | New Judge $10 \% * 1.2=$ <br> 120 dissolved |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8.016 | B.016/MML1/GGSunicef | AWW Life Sience Pit Lto., | India | 10.9 | 10.8 | 4.0 | 2.8 | 8.9 | 6.9 | 7.4 | 3.5 | 46.8 | Pass |  |
| 8.443 | B.0.3//MM14/GG Sumicef | AWW Life Sience Pritto., | India | 5.8 | 8.3 | 4.0 | 1.6 | 14.0 | 4.4 | 6.3 | 4.3 | 68.4 | Pass |  |
| A.021 | AO21/MML1/GG/ OMAPN/ 20 | Braw Laboratores LT. | India | 2.0 | 4.6 | 3.7 | 0.5 | 2.9 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 1.6 | 52.7 | Pass |  |
| 8.0.12 | B.012/MML1/GG, OMAPN | Braw Laboratores LT. | India | 4.3 | 8.4 | 6.1 | 9.8 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 7.4 | 2.0 | 26.3 | Pass |  |
| 8.074 | 8.074/M114/G, OMEPPRZOLE | GOLDEN MBAA PTE. LTD | Singapor | 14.3 | 113 | 14.3 | 10.7 | 14.1 | 14.4 | 13.2 | 1.7 | 12.9 | Pass |  |
| 8.446 | B.06//MM14/GGOMAC | MDCPHARMACEUTICALS (P)\|Ld | India | 0.8 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 5.8 | 4.5 | 6.9 | 3.6 | 2.5 | 70.0 | Pass |  |
| 8.071 | B.071/MM12/GGOMAC | MOCPHARMACEUTICALS (P)\|Ld | India | 0.6 | 12.5 | 6.3 | 10.1 | 4.8 | 2.2 | 6.1 | 4.6 | 75.1 | Pass |  |
| B.078 | B.078/MM14/G/ OMAC | MDCPHARMACEUTICALS PP\|LLd | India | 1.2 | 1.3 | 3.4 | 2.7 | 1.4 | 13.5 | 3.9 | 4.8 | 122.3 | Pass |  |
| PA-O4 | PaOO/MML//G ${ }^{\text {OMAC }}$ | mDCPharnaceuticalsp lid. | India | 12.6 | 11.2 | 12.6 | 12.8 | 13.2 | 11.4 | 12.3 | 0.8 | 6.7 | Pass |  |
| A.066 | AO66/[M11//G/ OMAC | MDCPHARMACEUTICCLSIP LTD. | India | 11.7 | 5.3 | 1.8 | 12.2 | 11.3 | 9.8 | 8.7 | 4.2 | 48.5 | Pass |  |
| A.113 | A113/MM14//G/ OMAC | MOCPHARMACEUTICCLISP [ LTD. | India | 17.1 | 11.2 | 7.8 | 17.6 | 16.7 | 15.3 | 14.3 | 3.9 | 27.6 | Fail | Fail |


|  |  |  |  |  | 咨 |  |  |  |  |  | ＂ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 珮 |  |  |  |  |  | 㿻 |
|  | 染 | 吕 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 容 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 望 | 픈 | 䍗 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 峟 } \end{aligned}$ | 珮 | 㕸 | 㿻 | $\overline{\bar{\sim}}$ |
| － | 㿻 | 会 | 望 | 资 | ＂ | 㟔 | 资 | 綅 | 㿻 | 凬 | $\overline{\bar{i}}$ |
|  | 이 | స | ¢ | 잉 | J | む | ה | 9 | 7 | \％ | ฟ |
|  | $\cdots$ | N | \％ |  | 9 | ন | $\pm$ | $\stackrel{\square}{-1}$ | $\stackrel{\text { m }}{ }$ | \％ | $\because$ |
|  | 关 | ゅ. | 曻 | \％ | 宫 | ö | $\underset{\AA}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\substack{0}}{ }$ | \％ | İ | 员 |
|  | 染 | 영 | ल̈ | Øั | $\stackrel{\text { F }}{ }$ | \％ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\varrho}{\infty}$ | 宮 | 응 | \％ |
|  | สี | $\stackrel{3}{8}$ | Oi | ส̇ | $\stackrel{\square}{\infty}$ | $\check{\infty}$ | \% | 응 | ฐ̃ | ने | $\stackrel{\cong}{亡}$ |
|  | ®í | ¢ | $\ddot{8}$ | \％ | ゅ. | O | $\underset{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\text { ®i }}$ | 웅 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\text { ® }}$ |
|  | 隔 | \%í | 표 | \% | O. | 용 | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\infty}$ | $\stackrel{\curvearrowleft}{\infty}$ | に! | \% | 응 |
|  | $\underset{\infty}{9}$ | 용 | 曻 | ํㅡㅇ | $\stackrel{\sqrt{\prime}}{1}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty}$ | ¢్ | \％ | 令 | 표 | $\stackrel{\oplus}{\stackrel{1}{2}}$ |
|  | 灾 | \％i8 | $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{o}}$ | สั | $\vec{F}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\mathbb{\infty}}$ | \％ | 川i | 灾 | $\underset{\infty}{\infty}$ | \％ |

Content uniformity $1^{\text {st }}$ considered range USP

|  |  |  |  | 溪 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 突 | 忿 | 桬 | 㿽 | 푼 | 盆 | 空 | 通 | 嵒 | 突 | 愛 |
| 乭 | 을 | 옹 | 合 | 产 | 合 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | ® | 兑 | 888 | 웅 |
|  |  |  |  | $\overline{\overline{\text { ¢ }}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 突 | 发 | 资 | 辰 | $\overline{\overline{\text { ¢ }}}$ | 遃 | 荌 | 遃 | 遂 | 荢 | 辰 |
| $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty}$ | $\infty$ | 䂞 | $=$ | $\stackrel{5}{5}$ | $\sqsupset$ | 열 | $\Xi$ | ＠ | 刍 | $\Xi$ |
| $\%$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\because$ | $\cdots$ | I | 2 | $\cdots$ | $F$ | $\bigcirc$ | ¢ | 5 |
| $\ni$ | $\mp$ | 家 | $\because$ | $\cong$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\sim}$ | $F$ | $F$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\square}$ | ¢ | 2 |
| 乭 | 을 | 응 | 亳 | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | 을 | $\stackrel{\infty}{5}$ | 犮 | 兑 | 8 | 응 |
| 을 | 宫 | 㝓 | 兑 | 공 | 号 | ※ | 중 | 咨 | \％ | ® |
| $\underset{\text { ® }}{\text { ® }}$ | 管 | 5 | 兑 | 퐁 | 㐌 | 亏 | 骂 | 뇽 | ® | F |
| \％ | 害 | $\underset{ঞ}{\circ}$ | 8 | 을 | 岩 | 召 | 家 | 家 | ® | 퐁 |
| 痤 | ® | 示 | $\stackrel{\infty}{\text { ® }}$ | 응 | 莒 | 귱 | چ̈ | 兑 | ® | 옹 |
| 응 | 응 | 宫 | 哭 | F | 吕 | 률 | $\stackrel{8}{8}$ | 宫 | ন | F |
| 응 | 吡 | 玉 | 을 | \％ | 兑 | 兑 | 꾱 | F | 亳 | 救 |
| 㐁 | 宫 | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ}$ | 喜 | \＃ | 喜 | 喜 | \％ | 合 | 咢 | $\overline{\%}$ |
| ※ | 宫 | ※ | 兑 | $\cong$ | \％ | \％ | 을 | 管 | 䂞 | B |
| 劀 | 兑 | S | 중 | 8 | ® | 亏 | F | 율 | F | 喜 |
| 宫 | 宵 | 5 | ミ | \％ | 兑 | 8 | $\stackrel{3}{5}$ | 官 | 을 | $\stackrel{\square}{\infty}$ |



Annex 1.9 To observed unacceptable samples with new (considered) judge

Cefuroxime tablets Myanmar project 2014

| ID Serial No. | Trade name of the product | Name of Manufacturer | Manufacturing Country |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of } \\ \text { Quantity } \\ \text { Tablet } 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% of } \\ & \text { Quantity } \\ & \text { Tablet 3 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% of } \\ & \text { Quantity } \\ & \text { Tablet } 4 \end{aligned}$ | \% of <br> Quantity <br> Tablet 5 | \% of Quantity Tablet 6 | Mean \% of Quantity | $\%$ of Quantity SD $\qquad$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% of } \\ & \text { Quantity } \\ & \text { YCV } \end{aligned}$ | Initial Judge | New Judge |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | , | $\square$ | $\square$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\square$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 3 A-005 | A005/MM14/YG/01/HG/ SPIZEF | Orchid HEALTHCA | IIndia | 101.01 | 96.57 | 95.96 | 96.92 | 99.78 | 95.69 | 97.65 | 2.2 | 2.26 | Pass |  |
| 4 A-006 | A006/MM14/VG/01/HG/Zinnat | GlaxoSmithKline |  | 77.86 | 86.26 | 87.94 | 87.54 | 91.17 | 91.77 | 87.09 | 5.01 | 5.75 | Pass |  |
| 5 A-007 | A007/MM14/YG/01/HG/ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | ilndia | 94.80 | 96.21 | 95.20 | 98.97 | 95.40 | 97.02 | 96.27 | 1.54 | 1.60 | Pass |  |
| 6 A-016 | A016/MM14/YG/01/HG/ZiNNASAV-250 S | SAVIOUR PHARMA | AIndia | 86.13 | 86.73 | 80.62 | 77.52 | 85.79 | 82.70 | 83.25 | 3.66 | 4.39 | Pass |  |
| 7 A-017 | A017/MM14/YG/01/HG/ ZIFATLL-250 | Galpha Laborato | India | 108.91 | 95.81 | 110.33 | 106.09 | 107.70 | 113.48 | 107.05 | 6.06 | 5.66 | Pass |  |
| 8 A-018 | A018/MM14/YG/01/HG/ CETIL | LUPIN LTD. | India | 100.74 | 93.64 | 93.71 | 101.42 | 102.10 | 97.87 | 98.25 | 3.82 | 3.89 | Pass |  |
| $9 \mathrm{~A}-019$ | A019/MM14/YG/01/HG/FUROCEF | Renata limited | Bangladesh | 69.59 | 77.86 | 74.23 | 86.87 | 83.51 | 82.50 | 79.09 | 6.43 | 8.13 | Pass |  |
| 10 A-025 | A025/MM14/YG/04/C/CX SPIZEF | Orchid HEALTHCA | IIndia | 84.11 | 96.75 | 94.19 | 78.87 | 95.81 | 91.57 | 90.22 | 7.18 | 7.96 | Pass |  |
| 11 A-030 | A030/MM14/YG/02/C/CX RUFEX-250 | Global Pharma H | India | 80.68 | 87.20 | 71.81 | 60.60 | 86.93 | 77.86 | 77.52 | 10.11 | 13.05 | Fail | Pass |
| $12 \mathrm{~A}-036$ | A036/MM14/YG/01/Ocl , ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | ilndia | 100.40 | 94.87 | 87.70 | 95.28 | 92.61 | 92.96 | 93.97 | 4.15 | 4.41 | Pass |  |
| 13 A-037 | A037/MM14/YG/01/Ocl/Cefusan 250 | SRS pharmaceuti | IIIdia | 94.46 | 94.66 | 96.71 | 95.89 | 95.55 | 93.84 | 95.19 | 1.05 | 1.11 | Pass |  |
| 14 A-048 | A048/MM14/YG/06/C/Cx RUFEX-250 | Global Pharma H | India | 66.77 | 63.95 | 65.56 | 66.37 | 66.57 | 68.99 | 66.37 | 1.65 | 2.48 | Fail | Pass |
| 15 A-052 | A052/MM14/YG/02/HG/ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | ilndia | 96.81 | 97.35 | 98.50 | 97.22 | 100.85 | 101.05 | 98.63 | 1.88 | 1.91 | Pass |  |
| 16 A-054 | A054/MM14/VG/02/C/CXIIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | ilndia | 96.88 | 100.24 | 93.79 | 97.82 | 98.63 | 98.83 | 97.70 | 2.22 | 2.27 | Pass |  |
| $17 \mathrm{~A}-057$ | A057/MM14/YG/01/HP/R RUFEX-250 | Global Pharma H | India | 51.24 | 71.52 | 79.71 | 71.72 | 79.92 | 72.54 | 71.11 | 10.48 | 14.73 | Fail | Pass |
| 18 A-058 | A058/MM14/YG/HP/CXN Zinnat | GlaxoSmithKline |  | 94.19 | 91.57 | 91.17 | 88.14 | 96.81 | 93.39 | 92.55 | 2.96 | 3.20 | Pass |  |
| 19 A-063 | A063/MM14/YG/01/OCl/ZIFTUM 250 | alkem laborato | India | 101.01 | 93.84 | 91.59 | 92.00 | 94.39 | 95.89 | 94.79 | 3.43 | 3.62 | Pass |  |
| 20 A-068 | A068/MM14/YG/02/C/CX RUFEX-250 | Global Pharma H | 4 India | 78.46 | 80.68 | 70.40 | 63.34 | 69.59 | 71.61 | 72.35 | 6.32 | 8.74 | Fail | Pass |
| 21 A-071 | A071/MM14/YG/01/HG/ZIFTUM 250 | alkem laborato | India | 96.61 | 96.68 | 104.14 | 97.82 | 92.78 | 94.40 | 97.07 | 3.91 | 4.03 | Pass |  |
| $22 \mathrm{~A}-074$ | A074/MM14/YG/01/C/CX ZIFTUM 250 | ALKEM Laborato | India | 90.77 | 91.98 | 87.74 | 91.17 | 88.88 | 86.73 | 89.54 | 2.08 | 2.32 | Pass |  |
| 23 A-079 | A079/MM14/YG/02/Ocl/RUFEX-250 | Global Pharma H | India | 64.69 | 62.27 | 63.95 | 81.09 | 58.91 | 62.00 | 65.48 | 7.90 | 12.07 | Fail | Pass |
| 24 A-085 | A085/MM14/VG/02/HP//RUFEX-250 | Global Pharma H | India | 64.35 | 59.23 | 66.88 | 59.03 | 63.94 | 70.22 | 63.94 | 4.35 | 6.80 | Fail | Pass |
| 25 A-086 | A086/MM14/VG/02/HP//Zinnat | GlaxoSmithkline |  | 82.97 | 81.89 | 85.32 | 89.62 | 85.12 | 87.94 | 85.48 | 2.92 | 3.41 | Pass |  |
| 26 A-089 | A089/MM14/YG/01/W/C Cefotil | SQUARE PHARMA | (Bangladesh | BP | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| 27 A-095 | A095/MM14/YG/03/W/C KEFROX | CCL Pharmaceutic | CPakistan | BP | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| 28 A-099 | A099/MM14/YG/01/HG/RUFEX-500 | Global Pharma H | India | 65.56 | 57.43 | 52.65 | 66.16 | 62.13 | 64.55 | 61.41 | 5.34 | 8.70 | Fail | Pass |
| 29 A-102 | A102/MM14/YG/01/OCl/ CETIL | LUPIN LTD. | India | 73.42 | 72.28 | 70.60 | 76.05 | 70.80 | 69.66 | 72.14 | 2.33 | 3.24 | Pass |  |
| 30 A-104 | A104/MM14/YG/02/HP/(ZIFTUM 250 | ALKEM Laborato | India | 106.90 | 103.07 | 100.65 | 105.99 | 99.03 | 106.29 | 103.65 | 3.28 | 3.16 | Pass |  |
| 32 B-002 | B-002/MM14/YG/01/HP/ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | ilndia | 126.66 | 131.50 | 131.09 | 122.42 | 131.30 | 136.54 | 129.92 | 4.83 | 3.71 | Pass |  |
| 33 B-003 | B-003/MM14/YG/01/HP/ SPIZEF | Orchid HEALTHCA | IIndia | 98.43 | 96.21 | 94.60 | 92.78 | 96.41 | 94.19 | 95.44 | 1.99 | 2.08 | Pass |  |
| 34 B-004 | B-004/MM14/YG/01/HP/ CETIL | LUPIN LTD. | India | 73.42 | 74.84 | 73.89 | 75.31 | 80.48 | 74.23 | 75.36 | 2.60 | 3.44 | Pass |  |
| 35 B-023 | B-023/MM14/YG/07/C/C RUFEX | Global Pharma H | India | 62.33 | 64.15 | 62.13 | 65.36 | 65.09 | 63.34 | 63.73 | 1.37 | 2.14 | Fail | Pass |
| 36 B-027 | B-027/MM14/YG/01/C/C Zinnat | GlaxoSmithKline |  | 91.77 | 93.19 | 89.96 | 87.74 | 94.19 | 93.59 | 91.74 | 2.48 | 2.70 | Pass |  |
| $37 \mathrm{~B}-029$ | B-029/MM14/YG/02/C/C ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | i India | 80.88 | 82.50 | 81.15 | 89.62 | 85.12 | 87.94 | 84.54 | 3.65 | 4.32 | Pass |  |
| 38 B-030 | B-030/MM14/YG/88/C/C Zinnat | GlaxoSmithkline |  | 89.54 | 79.58 | 89.54 | 84.29 | 86.06 | 82.99 | 85.33 | 3.89 | 4.56 | Pass |  |
| $39 \mathrm{~B}-031$ | B-031/MM14/YG/08/C/CZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | ilndia | 98.83 | 97.02 | 97.42 | 97.22 | 101.25 | 96.41 | 98.02 | 1.77 | 1.81 | Pass |  |
| $40 \mathrm{~B}-034$ | B-034/MM14/YG/01/HP/ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | ilndia | 95.14 | 97.46 | 98.14 | 92.41 | 96.51 | 96.92 | 96.10 | 2.07 | 2.15 | Pass |  |
| 41 B-038 | B-038/MM14/YG/01/HP/ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | ilndia | 127.26 | 122.02 | 127.47 | 124.04 | 122.09 | 123.84 | 124.45 | 2.41 | 1.94 | Pass |  |
| $42 \mathrm{~B}-042$ | B-042/MM14/YG/01/HG,ZIFATIL | Galpha Laborato | India | 88.93 | 88.31 | 84.83 | 87.43 | 90.36 | 90.77 | 88.44 | 2.16 | 2.45 | Pass |  |
| $43 \mathrm{~B}-044$ | B-044/MM14/YG/01/HG,Zinmax | DOMESCO MEDIC | VietNam | 90.77 | 91.17 | 92.38 | 88.55 | 89.15 | 89.56 | 90.26 | 1.43 | 1.58 | Pass |  |
| 44 B-047 | B-047/MM14/YG/01/C/C RUFEX | Global Pharma H | India | 60.52 | 59.51 | 59.71 | 62.94 | 60.52 | 60.32 | 60.59 | 1.23 | 2.03 | Fail | Pass |
| 45 B-052 | B-052/MM14/YG/01/HP/ CETIL | LUPIN LTD. | India | 109.12 | 107.50 | 103.74 | 100.18 | 112.14 | 105.89 | 106.43 | 4.19 | 3.93 | Pass |  |
| 46 B-053 | B-053/MM14/YG/01/HP/Zinnat | GlaxoSmithKline |  | 88.75 | 94.19 | 86.13 | 79.67 | 74.43 | 88.35 | 85.25 | 7.08 | 8.31 | Pass |  |
| 47 B-063 | B-063/MM14/YG/01/O(C ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | ilndia | 93.43 | 88.93 | 105.52 | 98.14 | 93.23 | 103.13 | 97.06 | 6.38 | 6.57 | Pass |  |
| 48 B-066 | B-066/MM14/YG/01/C/C ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | ilndia | 91.59 | 87.90 | 96.92 | 95.69 | 94.25 | 100.60 | 94.49 | 4.39 | 4.65 | Pass |  |
| $49 \mathrm{~B}-067$ | B-067/MM14/YG/01/C/C RUFEX-250 | Global Pharma H | India | 84.92 | 72.82 | 78.46 | 81.96 | 77.66 | 79.67 | 79.25 | 4.10 | 5.18 | Pass |  |
| 50 B-076 | B-076/MM14/YG/01/HG, ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | ilndia | 99.23 | 92.98 | 93.99 | 95.60 | 94.19 | 96.21 | 95.37 | 2.22 | 2.33 | Pass |  |
| 51 B-079 | B-079/MM14/YG/01/OCC ClFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | ilndia | 93.39 | 93.99 | 90.36 | 91.57 | 92.98 | 95.47 | 92.96 | 1.80 | 1.94 | Pass |  |
| $52 \mathrm{~B}-080$ | B-080/MM14/YG/01/O(cZinnat | GlaxoSmithkline |  | 91.37 | 89.76 | 83.10 | 91.77 | 86.33 | 90.97 | 88.88 | 3.45 | 3.88 | Pass |  |
| $53 \mathrm{~B}-086$ | B-086/MM14/YG/03/C/C Zinnat | GlaxoSmithkline |  | 77.26 | 88.61 | 85.19 | 80.88 | 82.50 | 81.15 | 82.60 | 3.91 | 4.73 | Pass |  |
| 54 B-089 | B-089/MM14/YG/04/W/Zinnat | GlaxoSmithkline |  | 77.66 | 89.89 | 75.64 | 81.69 | 73.02 | 78.67 | 79.43 | 5.89 | 7.42 | Pass |  |
| 55 B-093 | B-093/MM14/YG/01/C/C RUFEX | Global Pharma H | India | 65.56 | 64.75 | 87.54 | 85.12 | 81.49 | 89.76 | 79.04 | 11.10 | 14.04 | Fail | Pass |
| $56 \mathrm{~B}-100$ | B-100/MM14/YG/00/C/C ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | ilndia | 100.04 | 98.43 | 100.04 | 98.83 | 96.41 | 102.06 | 99.30 | 1.90 | 1.91 | Pass |  |
| 57 B-101 | B-101/MM14/YG/05/C/CZinnat | GlaxoSmithkline |  | 89.15 | 85.52 | 92.51 | 88.35 | 89.15 | 91.17 | 89.31 | 2.41 | 2.70 | Pass |  |
| 58 B-102 | B-102/MM14/YG/02/C/C Zinnat | GlaxoSmithKline |  | 83.91 | 89.62 | 87.81 | 88.28 | 95.60 | 91.37 | 89.43 | 3.91 | 4.37 | Pass |  |
| $59 \mathrm{~B}-104$ | B104/MM14/YG/01/HG/ ZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | ilndia | 94.80 | 98.23 | 90.36 | 93.99 | 96.01 | 92.18 | 94.26 | 2.78 | 2.95 | Pass |  |
| 60 B-111 | B111/MM14/YG/02/C/CX RUFEX-250 | Global Pharma H | India | 76.91 | 67.63 | 74.18 | 89.13 | 89.13 | 85.99 | 80.50 | 8.92 | 11.08 | Pass |  |
| 1 PA-001 | PA001/MM14/YG/01/C/CZIFTUM 250 | Alkem Laboratori | ilndia | 158.05 | 134.52 | 153.14 | 152.94 | 136.54 | 146.22 | 146.90 | 9.60 | 6.53 | Pass |  |
| 2 PA-002 | PA002/MM14/YG/01/C/CSPIZEF | Orchid HEALTHCA | India | 73.83 | 98.97 | 100.24 | 97.22 | 85.79 | 83.04 | 89.85 | 10.63 | 11.83 | Pass |  |
| 31 PB-001 | PB-001/MM14/YG/01/O(ZINNASAV-250 S | SAVIOUR PHARMA | AIndia | 75.96 | 82.78 | 83.19 | 85.86 | 82.58 | 81.35 | 81.95 | 3.29 | 4.02 | Pass |  |



| \% of Quantity Tablet 1 | \% of Quantity Tablet 2 | \% of <br> Quantity <br> Tablet 3 | \% of Quantity Tablet 4 | \% of Quantity Tablet 5 | \% of Quantity Tablet 6 | \% of Quantity Tablet 7 | \% of Quantity Tablet 8 | \% of Quantity Tablet 9 | \% of Quantity <br> Tablet 10 | Mean \% of Quantity | \% of Quantity SD | \% of Quantity \%CV | AV (Acceptance Value) | Judge | New Judge $\mathrm{AV}=18$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 104.92 | 104.54 | 100.00 | 102.70 | 95.88 | 99.40 | 94.86 | 105.87 | 101.22 | 96.94 | 100.6 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 9.372893126 | Pass |  |
| 104.21 | 103.39 | 98.63 | 97.51 | 93.65 | 103.10 | 106.08 | 98.50 | 95.83 | 102.27 | 100.3 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 9.731768808 | Pass |  |
| 102.27 | 103.86 | 100.48 | 102.58 | 98.18 | 97.12 | 100.36 | 100.98 | 97.48 | 92.73 | 99.6 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 7.89 | Pass |  |
| 92.41 | 93.57 | 91.85 | 95.51 | 95.75 | 90.01 | 89.77 | 84.34 | 88.41 | 101.55 | 92.3 | 4.7 | 5.1 | 17.48 | Fail | Pass |
| 84.42 | 99.25 | 100.84 | 85.26 | 90.85 | 90.97 | 97.08 | 91.92 | 93.14 | 92.91 | 92.7 | 5.4 | 5.8 | 18.72 | Fail | Fail |
| 85.61 | 97.53 | 104.85 | 104.61 | 90.77 | 107.86 | 98.31 | 94.87 | 97.54 | 98.02 | 98.0 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 16.58 | Fail | Pass |
| 99.58 | 97.87 | 93.20 | 95.87 | 93.71 | 103.43 | 100.62 | 95.39 | 98.09 | 95.14 | 97.3 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 9.00 | Pass |  |
| 94.08 | 101.01 | 89.89 | 94.86 | 93.99 | 95.64 | 99.03 | 101.53 | 94.92 | 92.86 | 95.8 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 11.55 | Pass |  |
| 92.98 | 91.66 | 89.14 | 90.87 | 92.74 | 88.74 | 88.45 | 86.30 | 82.74 | 82.84 | 88.6 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 18.76 | Fail | Fail |
| 104.08 | 102.32 | 92.47 | 95.41 | 111.73 | 93.88 | 93.39 | 101.14 | 92.26 | 94.69 | 98.1 | 6.4 | 6.6 | 15.45 | Fail | Pass |
| 91.27 | 93.27 | 96.13 | 88.28 | 98.09 | 91.63 | 91.59 | 94.10 | 87.74 | 79.11 | 91.1 | 5.3 | 5.8 | 20.06 | Fail | Fail |
| 95.65 | 100.96 | 82.79 | 86.92 | 84.50 | 92.64 | 87.53 | 87.83 | 84.09 | 83.79 | 88.7 | 5.9 | 6.7 | 24.08 | Fail | Fail |
| 92.28 | 99.85 | 94.71 | 96.54 | 95.82 | 98.57 | 99.74 | 103.67 | 107.73 | 105.66 | 99.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 11.90 | Pass |  |
| 101.48 | 100.22 | 91.88 | 103.28 | 95.38 | 105.52 | 97.11 | 98.08 | 92.65 | 95.07 | 98.1 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 11.28 | Pass |  |
| 87.87 | 87.87 | 87.65 | 82.96 | 87.90 | 82.50 | 85.36 | 79.08 | 77.86 | 80.46 | 84.0 | 3.9 | 4.7 | 23.95 | Fail | Fail |
| 95.38 | 104.18 | 100.01 | 98.10 | 103.39 | 99.45 | 93.58 | 100.25 | 90.67 | 91.76 | 97.7 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 12.04 | Pass |  |
| 99.58 | 95.59 | 96.90 | 102.68 | 100.60 | 103.08 | 94.12 | 99.93 | 98.40 | 95.48 | 98.6 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 7.38 | Pass |  |
| 85.13 | 80.97 | 74.62 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 80.2 | - | - | - | - |  |
| 107.29 | 97.04 | 100.25 | 99.21 | 101.42 | 104.80 | 95.76 | 99.53 | 94.60 | 89.71 | 99.0 | 5.1 | 5.1 | 12.13 | Pass |  |
| 105.17 | 99.99 | 101.85 | 103.65 | 98.37 | 100.92 | 98.68 | 93.11 | 93.86 | 98.67 | 99.4 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 9.21 | Pass |  |
| 86.23 | 86.08 | 82.00 | 86.17 | 84.76 | 88.14 | 83.31 | 89.02 | 81.19 | 82.07 | 84.9 | 2.7 | 3.2 | 20.05 | Fail | Fail |
| 98.68 | 88.40 | 99.10 | 101.87 | 98.65 | 93.01 | 98.22 | 95.66 | 96.45 | 97.29 | 96.7 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 10.77 | Pass |  |
| 94.85 | 92.47 | 90.91 | 95.96 | 99.71 | 94.09 | 96.69 | 97.74 | 93.76 | 94.46 | 95.1 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 9.60 | Pass |  |
| 97.95 | 97.60 | 93.43 | 92.10 | 101.08 | 87.19 | 96.73 | 96.72 | 93.55 | 94.45 | 95.1 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 12.63 | Pass |  |
| 89.41 | 99.51 | 95.97 | 94.42 | 103.65 | 96.10 | 90.11 | 97.75 | 94.44 | 90.99 | 95.2 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 13.88 | Pass |  |
| 79.62 | 80.37 | 82.34 | 80.60 | 76.43 | 78.62 | 81.50 | 79.29 | 78.70 | 75.53 | 79.3 | 2.1 | 2.7 | 24.28 | Fail | Fail |
| 98.44 | 99.04 | 95.46 | 93.58 | 98.00 | 95.74 | 100.25 | 97.12 | 98.56 | 87.30 | 96.3 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 11.12 | Pass |  |
| 103.02 | 98.07 | 99.18 | 103.84 | 101.83 | 103.11 | 94.54 | 97.96 | 102.81 | 97.01 | 100.1 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 7.67 | Pass |  |
| 96.55 | 104.47 | 106.58 | 100.60 | 100.41 | 102.25 | 90.34 | 103.61 | 96.69 | 99.31 | 100.1 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 11.27 | Pass |  |
| 94.9 | 96.3 | 96.4 | 94.2 | 99.8 | 100.9 | 95.0 | 95.7 | 91.2 | 103.1 | 96.7 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 10.22 | Pass |  |
| 98.99 | 100.25 | 99.81 | 95.66 | 94.94 | 97.36 | 89.83 | 90.59 | 94.11 | 93.58 | 95.5 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 11.71 | Pass |  |
| 86.47 | 88.94 | 86.99 | 95.59 | 93.94 | 92.55 | 73.24 | 90.08 | 89.30 | 82.01 | 87.9 | 6.5 | 7.4 | 26.13 | Fail | Fail |
| 96.26 | 93.06 | 95.03 | 91.98 | 95.18 | 90.38 | 93.66 | 86.06 | 98.76 | 92.34 | 93.3 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 13.57 | Pass |  |
| 98.08 | 99.17 | 97.64 | 88.44 | 89.52 | 93.13 | 83.94 | 84.61 | 78.65 | 95.15 | 90.8 | 6.9 | 7.6 | 24.34 | Fail | Fail |
| 97.84 | 98.27 | 109.33 | 101.97 | 98.36 | 104.72 | 97.52 | 111.74 | 108.12 | 93.15 | 102.1 | 6.1 | 6.0 | 15.27 | Pass |  |
| 96.67 | 101.02 | 94.08 | 96.38 | 93.86 | 95.06 | 93.75 | 96.25 | 96.24 | 97.52 | 96.1 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 7.63 | Pass |  |
| 101.07 | 100.73 | 104.94 | 106.81 | 101.49 | 97.11 | 102.96 | 106.33 | 102.82 | 102.79 | 102.7 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 8.11 | Pass |  |
| 105.30 | 92.74 | 104.55 | 105.08 | 97.92 | 98.05 | 98.24 | 100.54 | 98.83 | 98.10 | 99.9 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 9.59 | Pass |  |
| 83.66 | 84.52 | 86.32 | 91.22 | 84.44 | 85.86 | 91.58 | 84.65 | 93.10 | 80.82 | 86.6 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 21.48 | Fail | Fail |
| 102.47 | 102.35 | 102.44 | 104.48 | 103.97 | 103.72 | 102.78 | 98.97 | 97.20 | 96.30 | 101.5 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 6.98 | Pass |  |
| 71.12 | 69.88 | 88.62 | 76.65 | 74.10 | 77.86 | 88.15 | 85.61 | 73.36 | 74.00 | 77.9 | 7.0 | 9.0 | 37.37 | Fail | Fail |
| 91.71 | 97.36 | 88.44 | 93.86 | 88.52 | 96.88 | 92.86 | 90.31 | 92.94 | 92.51 | 92.5 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 13.24 | Pass |  |
| 104.46 | 85.18 | 85.58 | 83.73 | 90.96 | 104.88 | 89.09 | 90.42 | 102.98 | 103.08 | 94.0 | 8.8 | 9.3 | 25.50 | Fail | Fail |
| 98.72 | 91.94 | 97.51 | 92.91 | 97.18 | 91.92 | 109.19 | 92.38 | 98.29 | 102.77 | 97.3 | 5.5 | 5.7 | 14.50 | Pass |  |
| 97.47 | 99.41 | 97.77 | 99.32 | 92.59 | 92.40 | 94.94 | 95.56 | 96.13 | 101.41 | 96.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 8.88 | Pass |  |
| 97.63 | 100.15 | 107.00 | 101.46 | 107.64 | 106.13 | 101.37 | 101.88 | 100.85 | 101.86 | 102.6 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 8.89 | Pass |  |
| 97.22 | 96.14 | 92.13 | 89.04 | 90.90 | 91.00 | 95.82 | 93.73 | 84.56 | 92.74 | 92.3 | 3.8 | 4.1 | 15.21 | Pass |  |
| 101.08 | 94.44 | 98.21 | 99.11 | 103.97 | 102.67 | 97.27 | 97.77 | 97.49 | 97.75 | 99.0 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 6.80 | Pass |  |
| 97.64 | 99.42 | 97.71 | 100.36 | 97.58 | 96.02 | 98.42 | 96.52 | 96.50 | 96.74 | 97.7 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 4.12 | Pass |  |
| 92.29 | 98.58 | 98.56 | 91.81 | 102.01 | 90.37 | 90.05 | 93.33 | 92.23 | 94.00 | 94.3 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 13.81 | Pass |  |
| 109.93 | 105.57 | 104.26 | 115.00 | 103.68 | 107.96 | 107.55 | 110.73 | 101.57 | 102.22 | 106.8 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 15.48 | Pass |  |
| 88.76 | 91.12 | 80.84 | 80.41 | 75.56 | 87.75 | 83.93 | 82.01 | 89.50 | 86.58 | 84.6 | 4.9 | 5.8 | 25.68 | Fail | Fail |
| 93.01 | 94.13 | 107.34 | 91.54 | 94.24 | 102.22 | 93.05 | 92.89 | 89.85 | 90.01 | 94.8 | 5.6 | 5.9 | 17.08 | Fail | Pass |
| 101.68 | 103.63 | 103.61 | 99.44 | 102.50 | 115.40 | 101.56 | 97.35 | 95.65 | 98.59 | 101.9 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 13.47 | Pass |  |
| 94.09 | 96.03 | 98.31 | 97.15 | 93.26 | 92.67 | 95.69 | 99.97 | 95.30 | 96.11 | 95.9 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 8.01 | Pass |  |
| 99.74 | 105.46 | 105.23 | 100.22 | 101.84 | 95.14 | 97.11 | 101.63 | 90.14 | 102.08 | 99.9 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 11.22 | Pass |  |
| 77.76 | 80.96 | 83.08 | 77.55 | 76.53 | 76.92 | 78.97 | 79.20 | 74.70 | 77.48 | 78.3 | 2.4 | 3.0 | 25.88 | Fail | Fail |
| 93.01 | 94.13 | 101.56 | 91.54 | 94.24 | 102.22 | 93.05 | 92.89 | 89.85 | 90.01 | 94.3 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 14.57 | Pass |  |
| 103.65 | 100.90 | 102.00 | 99.25 | 97.83 | 96.97 | 102.27 | 102.52 | 93.13 | 99.91 | 99.8 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 7.64 | Pass |  |
| 88.20 | 90.25 | 93.58 | 92.14 | 90.62 | 79.25 | 94.40 | 95.94 | 85.54 | 88.40 | 89.83 | 4.87 | 5.42 | 20.36 | Fail | Fail |


| Yof <br> Quantity <br> Tablet 1 | Yof <br> Quantity <br> Tablet2 | Yof Quantity Tablet 3 | Yof <br> Quantity <br> Tablet 4 | Yof <br> Quantity <br> Tablet 5 | Yof <br> Quantity <br> Tablet 6 | Yof Quantity Tablet 7 | Yof <br> Quantity <br> Tablet 8 | Yof <br> Quantity <br> Tablet 9 | Yof <br> Quantity <br> Tablet 10 | hof <br> Quantity <br> Tablet 11 | hof Quantity Tablet 12 | Sof <br> Quantity <br> Tablet 13 | Bof <br> Quantity <br> Tablet 14 | Sof <br> Quantity <br> Tablet 15 | Sof <br> Quantity <br> Tablet 16 | Sof <br> Quantity <br> Tablet 17 | Sof <br> Quantity <br> Tablet 18 | Sof <br> Quantity <br> Tablet 19 | Sof <br> Quantity <br> , | Mean 1 of Quantity $\qquad$ | bof <br> Quantity <br> SO $\qquad$ | bof <br> vantity <br> SCV | AV (Acceptance Value) ₹ | Judge for Content Uniformity | New Judge for Content Uniform |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
| - | . | - | . | - | . | . | . | . | - | . | - | . | . | . | . | - | . | $\cdot$ | . |  |  |  | , | Fail | Fail |
| . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | - | . | - | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | - P | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
| 92.27 | 92.42 | 92.10 | 92.27 | 92.68 | 91.66 | 88.43 | 90.69 | 83.91 | 80.84 | 91.06 | 90.78 | 85.74 | 8597 | 87.09 | 82.13 | 85.49 | 81.53 | 88.53 | 89.05 | 88.51 | 3.94 | 4.46 | 17.88 Fa |  | Pass |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
| 103.74 | 97.31 | 100.95 | 96.99 | 97.34 | 94.32 | 93.53 | 99.38 | 94.32 | 10071 | 97.08 | 90.13 | 99.63 | 93.98 | 97.15 | 83.28 | 93.22 | 92.56 | 90.18 | 97.62 | 94.15 | 5.19 | 5.51 | 14.72 P |  |  |
| 106.26 | 97.80 | 10.148 | 92.52 | 10054 | 10.06 | 10.164 | 85.36 | 10.57 | 99.83 | 88.92 | 9443 | 94.28 | 95.97 | 91.60 | 9493 | 95.01 | 93.71 | 10.98 | 91.35 | 94.22 | 6.92 | 7.34 | 18.11 F |  | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
| 80.29 | 84.28 | 77.86 | 84.57 | 81.54 | 82.89 | 80.56 | 76.34 | 77.11 | 77.13 | 83.49 | 83.87 | 86.29 | 80.73 | 85.28 | 83.90 | 86.82 | 8335 | 82.47 | 86.22 | 82.88 | 3.48 | 4.20 | 22.58 Fa |  | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Fail |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
| 93.91 | 93.25 | 92.28 | 91.09 | 92.01 | 8891 | 88.93 | 87.13 | 85.26 | 84.35 | 80.02 | 81.23 | 81.78 | 80.43 | 80.19 | 85.20 | 83.08 | 81.62 | 79.76 | 82.18 | 85.72 | 4.24 | 4.95 | 21.27 F |  | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
| . | . | . | . | - | . | - | . | . | - | . | . | . | - | . | . | - | - | . | . | . |  | - | - Fir | Fail | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Fail | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
| 10455 | 10439 | 10.58 | 105.96 | 95.19 | 105.45 | 10.98 | 10.07 | 103.88 | 95.14 | 107.70 | 105.54 | 10.46 | 96.45 | 103.95 | 10.83 | 102.13 | 10.19 | 99.40 | 103.23 | 98.84 | 6.98 | 7.06 | 13.96 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
| - | . | - | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | - | - | - | . | . | . | . | . |  | . | - Fir | Fail | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Fail | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
| 10632 | 96.25 | 95.82 | 97.59 | 99.85 | 102.09 | 97.49 | 91.39 | 98.72 | 96.62 | 92.69 | 93.54 | 91.32 | 91.09 | 96.74 | 99.63 | 93.44 | 97.31 | 92.81 | 97.83 | 95.20 | 6.01 | 6.31 | 15.32 P | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
| 92.16 | 91.21 | 87.91 | 88.03 | 88.11 | 86.34 | 86.50 | 83.10 | 88.83 | 91.62 | 84.15 | 84.91 | 76.84 | 79.15 | 85.28 | 78.81 | 85.54 | 81.09 | 78.4 | 82.78 | 85.26 | 4.52 | 5.31 | 22.29 F |  | Fail |
| . | - | . | - | . | - | - | - | - | . | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |  |  |  | Fail | Pass |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
| 93.21 | 89.27 | 87.18 | 90.76 | 86.50 | 86.94 | 88.76 | 92.50 | 88.72 | 82.25 | 85.54 | 8332 | 82.14 | 75.51 | 85.60 | 78.09 | 77.83 | 79.58 | 81.52 | 83.49 | 82.84 | 5.17 | 6.25 | 26.01 F |  | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pass |  |
| 85.84 | 88.33 | 10.07 | 89.15 | 94.20 | 89.80 | 87.21 | 89.31 | 87.72 | 84.92 | 90.39 | 84.84 | 89.99 | 95.62 | 94.75 | 9933 | 94.43 | 79.50 | 89.28 | 96.57 | 90.56 | 5.58 | 6.16 | 19.11 F |  | Fail |


| Kanazawa Univ. <br> Quantity test | Judge | New Judge | Kanazawa Univ. Quantity test | FinalJudge | FinalJud |  | I | New |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | $\sim$ | $\checkmark$ |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  | - |  | - |
| 100.63 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 100.32 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 99.60 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 92.32 | Pass |  | 88.96 | Fail | Pass | Fail |  | Pass |  |
| 92.66 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Fail |  | Fail |  |
| 98.00 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Fail |  | Pass |  |
| 97.29 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 95.78 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 88.65 | Fail | Pass | 88.51 | Fail | Pass | Fail |  | Pass |  |
| 98.14 | Pass |  | 101.90 | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 91.12 | Pass |  | 94.15 | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 88.67 | Fail | Pass | 94.22 | Pass |  | Fail |  | Fail |  |
| 99.46 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 98.07 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 83.95 | Fail | Pass | 82.88 | Fail | Pass | Fail |  | Fail |  |
| 97.68 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 98.64 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 80.24 | Fail | Pass | - | Fail | Pass | Fail |  | Pass |  |
| 98.96 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 99.43 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 84.90 | Fail | Pass | 85.72 | Fail | Pass | Fail |  | Fail |  |
| 96.73 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 95.06 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 95.08 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 95.24 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 79.30 | Fail | Pass | 79.30 | Fail | Pass | Fail |  | Fail |  |
| 96.35 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 100.14 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 100.08 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 96.72 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 95.51 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 87.91 | Fail | Pass | 87.91 | Fail | Pass | Fail |  | Fail |  |
| 93.27 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 90.84 | Pass |  | 98.84 | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 102.10 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 96.08 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 102.71 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 99.93 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 86.61 | Fail | Pass | 86.61 | Fail | Pass | Fail |  | Fail |  |
| 101.47 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 77.93 | Fail | Pass | 77.93 | Fail | Pass | Fail |  | Fail |  |
| 92.54 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 94.04 | Pass |  | 95.20 | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 97.28 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 96.70 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 102.60 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 92.33 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 98.98 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 97.69 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 94.32 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 106.85 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 84.65 | Fail | Pass | 85.26 | Fail | Pass | Fail |  | Fail |  |
| 94.83 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Fail |  | Pass |  |
| 101.94 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 95.14 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 99.86 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 78.32 | Fail | Pass | 82.84 | Fail | Pass | Fail |  | Fail |  |
| 94.25 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 99.84 | Pass |  | - | Pass |  | Pass |  |  |  |
| 89.83 | Pass |  | 90.56 | Pass |  | Fail |  | Fail |  |

## Omeprazole BP

| Serial No. | Sample Code | Trade name of the Name of Manufacturer |  | Manufact\| | $\%$ of <br> Quantity Capsule 1 | \% of Quantity Capsule 2 | \% of Quantity Capsule 3 | $\%$ of <br> Quantity <br> Capsule 4 | \% of Quantity Capsule 5 | \% of Quantity Capsule 6 | Mean \% of Quantity | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \% of } \\ & \text { Quantity } \\ & \text { SD } \end{aligned}$ | \% of Quantity SCV | Judge | New Judge $10 \% * 1.2=$ 12\% dissolved |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A-096 | A096/MM14/YG/ | Omep-20 | ARISTOPHARMA LTD. | Banglade | 22.3 | 10.4 | 8.9 | 11.6 | 9.6 | 10.2 | 12.2 | 5.0 | 41.4 | Fail | Fail |
| B-065 | B-065/MM14/YG |  | ARISTOPHARMA LTD. | Banglade | 11.1 | 11.3 | 10.9 | 11.0 | 11.2 | 10.9 | 11.1 | 0.2 | 1.7 | Fail | Pass |
| A-076 | A076/MM14/YG/ | (ASMOZOL-20 | ASMOH LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Pass |  |
| B-092 | B-092/MM14/VG, | , OMEPREN | BLUE CROSS LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 2.5 | 2.4 | 1.8 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 36.5 | Pass |  |
| B-098 | B-098/MM14/YG | , OMEPREN | BLUE CROSS LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 0.1 | 4.6 | Pass |  |
| B-005 | B-005/MM14/YG, |  | Cadila Health Limited | India | 6.0 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 5.8 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 1.1 | 24.6 | Pass |  |
| B-011 | B-011/MM14/vG, |  | Cadila Health Limited | India | 5.3 | 4.0 | 7.2 | 4.4 | 7.2 | 5.4 | 5.6 | 1.4 | 24.2 | Pass |  |
| B-070 | B-070/MM14/VG, |  | Cadila Health Limited | India | 3.7 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 2.5 | 3.1 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 0.6 | 19.7 | Pass |  |
| B-090 | B-090/Mm14/VG, |  | Cadila Health Limited | India | 2.2 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 0.1 | 6.4 | Pass |  |
| PA-006 | PA006/MM14/YG |  | Cadila Healthcare Limited | India | 5.4 | 4.0 | 7.2 | 4.4 | 7.2 | 5.5 | 5.6 | 1.4 | 24.2 | Pass |  |
| A-002 | A002/MM14/YG/ |  | Cadila Healthcare Limited | India | 3.0 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.5 | 4.0 | 2.9 | 0.6 | 19.1 | Pass |  |
| A-026 | A026/MM14/YG/ |  | Cadila Healthcare Limited | India | 9.6 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 5.8 | 4.1 | 5.1 | 2.3 | 46.0 | Pass |  |
| A-042 | A042/MM14/YG/ |  | Cadila Healthcare Limited | India | 5.6 | 5.0 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 5.0 | 5.4 | 4.7 | 0.8 | 17.2 | Pass |  |
| A-060 | A060/MM14/VG/ |  | Cadila Healthcare Limited | India | 2.4 | 2.5 | 4.4 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 0.7 | 24.9 | Pass |  |
| A-084 | A084/MM14/VG/ |  | Cadila Healthcare Limited | India | 9.9 | 9.5 | 7.3 | 9.6 | 9.7 | 10.0 | 9.3 | 1.0 | 10.8 | Pass |  |
| A-034 | A034/MM14/VG/ | LOMAC-20 | Cipla Ltd. | India | 26.9 | 27.7 | 27.7 | 27.3 | 28.1 | 23.5 | 26.9 | 1.7 | 6.3 | Fail | Fail |
| A-038 | A038/MM14/VG/ | LOMAC-20 | Cipla Ltd. | India | 12.5 | 11.6 | 12.6 | 13.0 | 14.1 | 15.1 | 13.1 | 1.2 | 9.5 | Fail | Fail |
| B-007 | B-007/MM14/YG, | LOMAC | Cipla Ltd. | India | 39.9 | 38.1 | 42.5 | 40.3 | 39.5 | 42.3 | 40.4 | 1.7 | 4.2 | Fail | Fail |
| B-110 | B110/MM14/VG/ | LOMAC | Cipla Ltd. | India | 24.4 | 25.4 | 25.1 | 24.7 | 25.4 | 21.1 | 24.4 | 1.7 | 6.8 | Fail | Fail |
| PB-003 | PB-003/MM14/YC |  | Dr. REDDY'S LABORATORIES | India | 9.0 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 5.7 | 3.4 | 5.1 | 6.8 | 2.4 | 35.4 | Pass |  |
| B-006 | B-006/MM14/YG, |  | Dr. REDDY'S LABORATORIES | India | 5.8 | 2.9 | 5.3 | 9.1 | 8.8 | 8.7 | 6.8 | 2.5 | 37.1 | Pass |  |
| B-008 | B-008/MM14/YG, |  | Dr. REDDY'S Laboratories | India | 14.4 | 13.3 | 14.5 | 14.4 | 8.4 | 11.0 | 12.7 | 2.5 | 19.6 | Fail | Fail |
| B-013 | B-013/MM14/vG, |  | Dr. Reddr's laboratories | India | 16.5 | 15.9 | 8.5 | 15.0 | 10.6 | 15.9 | 13.7 | 3.4 | 24.4 | Fail | Fail |
| B-036 | B-036/MM14/vG, |  | Dr. REDDY'S LABORATORIES | India | 8.8 | 7.6 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.9 | 8.0 | 4.6 | 3.9 | 85.4 | Pass |  |
| B-054 | B-054/MM14/YG, |  | Dr. REDDY'S LABORATORIES | India | 22.8 | 26.4 | 28.2 | 24.0 | 25.3 | 27.4 | 25.7 | 2.1 | 8.0 | Fail | Fail |
| B-106 | B106/MM14/VG/ |  | Dr. REDDV'S LABORATORIES | India | 12.4 | 7.6 | 14.8 | 20.7 | 19.3 | 20.7 | 15.9 | 5.3 | 33.1 | Fail | Fail |
| PA-005 | PA005/MM14/VG |  | Dr.REDDY'S Laboratories ltd. | India | 26.9 | 9.3 | 15.9 | 26.6 | 9.3 | 15.7 | 17.3 | 7.9 | 45.6 | Fail | Fail |
| A-001 | A001/MM14/VG/ |  | Dr.REDDY'S Laboratories ltd. | India | 9.8 | 5.9 | 7.5 | 9.3 | 6.9 | 7.4 | 7.8 | 1.5 | 19.1 | Pass |  |
| A-015 | A015/MM14/VG/ |  | Dr.REDDY'S LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 14.3 | 9.3 | 16.8 | 15.2 | 15.9 | 9.7 | 13.5 | 3.2 | 23.9 | Fail | Fail |
| A-039 | A039/MM14/VG/ |  | Dr.REDDY'S LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 9.5 | 8.5 | 14.7 | 14.6 | 13.1 | 14.5 | 12.5 | 2.8 | 22.1 | Fail | Fail |
| A-050 | A050/MM14/YG/ |  | Dr.REDDY'S LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 10.5 | 9.2 | 20.2 | 17.3 | 17.9 | 24.3 | 16.6 | 5.8 | 34.9 | Fail | Fail |
| A-061 | A061/MM14/YG/ |  | Dr.REDDY'S LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 9.9 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 9.1 | 9.9 | 9.9 | 9.6 | 0.3 | 3.5 | Pass |  |
| A-065 | A065/MM14/YG/ |  | Dr.REDDY'S LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 9.2 | 9.2 | 9.1 | 9.8 | 7.0 | 7.4 | 8.6 | 1.1 | 13.3 | Pass |  |
| A-101 | A101/MM14/YG/ |  | Dr.REDDY'S LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 8.9 | 12.5 | 9.4 | 14.3 | 11.1 | 14.1 | 11.7 | 2.3 | 19.8 | Fail | Pass |
| A-106 | A106/MM14/YG/ |  | Dr.REDDY'S LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Pass |  |
| A-107 | A107/MM14/YG/ |  | Dr.REDDY'S LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 4.8 | 4.7 | 4.6 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 0.1 | 3.3 | Pass |  |
| A-114 | A114/MM14/YG/ |  | Dr.REDDY'S LABORATORIES LTD. | India | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Pass |  |
| A-012 | A012/MM14/YG/ |  | Emcure PHARMACETICALS LTD. | India | 7.2 | 5.7 | 5.0 | 7.1 | 5.8 | 5.0 | 6.0 | 1.0 | 16.2 | Pass |  |
| B-017 | B-017/MM14/YG, |  | Emcure PHARMACEUTICAL LTD. | India | 2.6 | 2.4 | 1.8 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 37.4 | Pass |  |
| B-037 | B-037/MM14/YG, | OMFIL | Fourrts Laboratories Pvt Ltd, | India | 3.5 | 7.1 | 5.1 | 4.2 | 6.8 | 5.0 | 5.3 | 1.4 | 26.7 | Pass |  |
| A-033 | A033/MM14/VG/ | OMFIL 20 | Fourrts Laboratories Pvut.Ltd. | India | 8.3 | 8.4 | 8.3 | 8.6 | 8.9 | 8.7 | 8.5 | 0.3 | 3.0 | Pass |  |
| B-045 | B-045/MM14/YG, | OMPREZ | Global Pharma Healthcare Pvt, L- |  | 2.6 | 3.0 | 4.4 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 4.4 | 3.3 | 0.9 | 26.6 | Pass |  |
| A-041 | A041/MM14/VG/ | TRISEC | GREAT HIMALAYAN PTE LTD. | India | 12.0 | 25.0 | 11.5 | 11.8 | 24.9 | 11.6 | 16.1 | 6.8 | 42.4 | Fail | Fail |
| B-077 | B-077/MM14/YG, | Ometab | Intas Pharmaceutical Ltd. | India | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Pass |  |
| B-108 | B108/MM14/VG/ | Ometab | Intas Pharmaceutical Ltd. | India | 3.5 | 7.2 | 4.9 | 4.2 | 6.9 | 4.9 | 5.3 | 1.5 | 28.3 | Pass |  |
| PB-002 | PB-002/MM14/YC | Ome-M | Rainbow Life Sciences Put. Ltd. | India | 11.0 | 18.1 | 11.0 | 17.7 | 18.2 | 11.2 | 14.5 | 3.8 | 26.1 | Fail | Fail |
| A-078 | A078/MM14/VG/ | Reloc-20 | Rhydburg Pharmaceuticals Ltd. | India | 23.0 | 34.4 | 17.1 | 23.3 | 33.1 | 16.6 | 24.6 | 7.6 | 31.1 | Fail | Fail |
| A-011 | A011/MM14/VG/ | Omesec | The United Drug (1996) Co,Ltd. | Thailand | 2.7 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 0.2 | 7.0 | Pass |  |
| A-091 | A091/MM14/VG/ | Omesec | The United Drug (1996) Co,Ltd. | Thailand | 2.7 | 3.2 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 2.8 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 0.9 | 24.7 | Pass |  |
| B-059 | B-059/MM14/YG | Omesec | The United Drug(1996) Co., Ltd | Thailand | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 0.2 | 8.2 | Pass |  |
| A-097 | A097/MM14/VG/ | Omesafe | UNIVERSAL PHARMACEUTICALS LII | India | 2.8 | 2.7 | 6.7 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 1.6 | 46.1 | Pass |  |
| B.049 | B-049/MM14/YG, | Virom | Virchow Healthcare Drivate Limi | India | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 0.9 | 54.1 | Pass |  |
| B-015 | B-015/MM14/YG, | HYClD | XL LABORATORIES PVT. LTD. | India | 17.9 | 17.2 | 17.7 | 18.0 | 17.5 | 17.7 | 17.7 | 0.3 | 1.7 | Fail | Fail |
| A-067 | A067/MM14/YG/ | HYClD | XL LABORATORIES PVT.LTD. | India | 3.3 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 8.0 | 5.1 | 9.1 | 7.3 | 2.5 | 33.8 | Pass |  |


| \% of Quantity Capsule 1 | \% of Quantity Capsule 2 | \% of Quantity Capsule 3 | \% of Quantity Capsule 4 | \% of Quantity Capsule 5 | \% of Quantity Capsule 6 | Mean \% of Quantity | \% of Quantity SD | \% of <br> Quantity \%CV | Judge | Disso Final Initial Judge | Disso Final New Judge $\begin{gathered} Q=65 * 0.8+ \\ 5 \%=57 \end{gathered}$ | Disso New Final Judge |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 51.3 | 79.2 | 76.0 | 65.2 | 77.9 | 70.0 | 70.0 | 10.5 | 15.1 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 56.0 | 52.7 | 47.6 | 56.4 | 54.1 | 48.6 | 52.6 | 3.7 | 7.1 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 82.7 | 94.3 | 95.4 | 96.0 | 95.4 | 96.1 | 93.3 | 5.2 | 5.6 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 92.8 | 95.2 | 98.8 | 97.5 | 97.3 | 94.7 | 96.0 | 2.2 | 2.3 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 81.6 | 92.7 | 89.7 | 83.0 | 93.3 | 91.8 | 88.7 | 5.1 | 5.8 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 96.0 | 92.6 | 95.2 | 91.6 | 94.0 | 95.8 | 94.2 | 1.8 | 1.9 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 96.6 | 97.9 | 98.3 | 66.4 | 98.5 | 97.3 | 92.5 | 12.8 | 13.9 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 82.7 | 94.3 | 93.5 | 94.2 | 95.4 | 95.7 | 92.7 | 4.9 | 5.3 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 77.0 | 79.8 | 80.1 | 81.4 | 80.1 | 77.2 | 79.3 | 1.8 | 2.2 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 83.1 | 84.9 | 82.2 | 82.7 | 83.6 | 82.1 | 83.1 | 1.0 | 1.2 | Pass | pass |  |  |
| 96.9 | 99.5 | 98.2 | 96.1 | 96.4 | 98.4 | 97.6 | 1.3 | 1.4 | Pass | pass |  |  |
| 86.9 | 72.9 | 75.2 | 76.9 | 75.4 | 86.8 | 79.0 | 6.2 | 7.9 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 97.9 | 95.6 | 97.7 | 95.1 | 96.2 | 95.7 | 96.4 | 1.2 | 1.2 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 99.3 | 98.1 | 98.6 | 95.4 | 99.0 | 98.0 | 98.1 | 1.4 | 1.4 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 77.0 | 79.8 | 80.1 | 94.3 | 94.4 | 95.4 | 86.8 | 8.7 | 10.0 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 52.1 | 53.8 | 47.6 | 51.8 | 50.9 | 48.5 | 50.8 | 2.3 | 4.6 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 85.4 | 84.1 | 83.3 | 81.7 | 85.2 | 83.6 | 83.9 | 1.3 | 1.6 | Pass | Fail |  | Fail |
| 49.5 | 49.7 | 63.4 | 55.7 | 50.7 | 50.7 | 53.3 | 5.5 | 10.2 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 53.6 | 62.8 | 62.1 | 52.8 | 53.4 | 62.6 | 57.9 | 5.1 | 8.8 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 30.7 | 34.4 | 26.5 | 54.9 | 71.2 | 57.6 | 45.9 | 17.9 | 39.0 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 54.7 | 72.7 | 57.1 | 31.1 | 34.2 | 27.9 | 46.3 | 17.9 | 38.7 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 70.3 | 67.7 | 73.1 | 72.3 | 77.4 | 74.8 | 72.6 | 3.4 | 4.7 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 50.2 | 47.5 | 80.7 | 58.6 | 68.2 | 56.9 | 60.4 | 12.3 | 20.4 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 78.3 | 70.7 | 78.4 | 69.3 | 68.3 | 66.6 | 71.9 | 5.1 | 7.1 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 31.4 | 32.1 | 35.5 | 31.8 | 73.9 | 73.2 | 46.3 | 21.2 | 45.7 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 49.7 | 47.1 | 79.3 | 48.8 | 77.9 | 77.0 | 63.3 | 16.2 | 25.6 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 60.1 | 65.2 | 61.7 | 60.1 | 65.1 | 61.7 | 62.3 | 2.3 | 3.7 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 73.8 | 79.3 | 71.4 | 72.4 | 71.1 | 70.8 | 73.1 | 3.9 | 5.4 | Pass | pass |  |  |
| 56.6 | 70.7 | 55.2 | 54.5 | 48.1 | 74.7 | 60.0 | 10.4 | 17.3 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 73.9 | 77.7 | 62.1 | 75.0 | 60.7 | 60.8 | 68.4 | 8.0 | 11.6 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 75.3 | 75.8 | 60.7 | 73.7 | 63.2 | 74.1 | 70.5 | 6.7 | 9.5 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 76.8 | 68.0 | 70.6 | 76.9 | 71.1 | 76.5 | 73.3 | 3.9 | 5.3 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 72.5 | 72.1 | 67.3 | 67.6 | 73.4 | 72.5 | 70.9 | 2.7 | 3.8 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 77.6 | 69.5 | 77.7 | 55.7 | 66.9 | 53.7 | 66.9 | 10.4 | 15.5 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 69.0 | 73.1 | 66.6 | 71.7 | 67.5 | 72.5 | 70.1 | 2.8 | 3.9 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 18.3 | 19.5 | 17.9 | 18.5 | 18.9 | 18.3 | 18.6 | 0.6 | 3.0 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 69.4 | 67.9 | 75.2 | 67.4 | 67.6 | 72.5 | 70.0 | 3.2 | 4.5 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 80.0 | 74.7 | 91.1 | 80.0 | 76.4 | 90.3 | 82.1 | 7.0 | 8.5 | Pass | pass |  |  |
| 99.6 | 98.6 | 98.8 | 97.7 | 97.4 | 94.6 | 97.8 | 1.8 | 1.8 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 92.2 | 86.9 | 87.1 | 91.1 | 88.9 | 92.9 | 89.9 | 2.6 | 2.9 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 67.6 | 81.2 | 79.8 | 80.6 | 68.5 | 68.2 | 74.3 | 6.8 | 9.2 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 71.7 | 94.3 | 86.6 | 73.1 | 93.9 | 86.8 | 84.4 | 9.9 | 11.7 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 59.7 | 98.8 | 61.0 | 59.7 | 98.7 | 61.4 | 73.2 | 19.8 | 27.1 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 87.1 | 86.9 | 87.2 | 86.4 | 88.0 | 87.9 | 87.2 | 0.6 | 0.7 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 92.2 | 87.5 | 87.3 | 91.2 | 88.4 | 92.3 | 89.8 | 2.3 | 2.6 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 51.5 | 60.6 | 59.9 | 50.7 | 51.3 | 60.4 | 55.7 | 5.0 | 9.0 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 49.4 | 43.5 | 50.8 | 49.9 | 44.1 | 50.9 | 48.1 | 3.4 | 7.1 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 93.5 | 91.0 | 92.9 | 89.3 | 92.8 | 94.3 | 92.3 | 1.8 | 2.0 | Pass | pass |  |  |
| 89.9 | 93.5 | 95.8 | 99.9 | 95.9 | 98.2 | 95.5 | 3.5 | 3.7 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 93.9 | 97.7 | 99.8 | 93.3 | 93.4 | 91.2 | 94.9 | 3.2 | 3.4 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 94.6 | 95.2 | 78.9 | 96.5 | 80.6 | 82.9 | 88.1 | 8.1 | 9.2 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 66.4 | 85.3 | 84.9 | 65.6 | 83.7 | 66.3 | 75.4 | 10.2 | 13.5 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 39.7 | 38.5 | 42.8 | 39.8 | 38.9 | 42.6 | 40.4 | 1.9 | 4.6 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 82.2 | 71.8 | 73.5 | 86.2 | 70.2 | 76.3 | 76.7 | 6.3 | 8.2 | Pass | Pass |  |  |


| \% of Quantity Capsule 1 | \% of Quantity capsule 2 | \% of Quantity Capsule 3 | \% of Quantity capsule 4 | \% of Quantity Capsule 5 | \% of Quantity capsule 6 | Mean \% of Quantity | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { Quantity } \end{gathered}$ SD | $\%$ of Quantity \%CV | Judge | $\begin{gathered} \text { New Judge } \\ 10 \% * 1.2= \\ 12 \% \\ \text { dissolved } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10.2 | 8.7 | 3.0 | 8.9 | 8.7 | 10.5 | [ 10.3 | 4.4 | 42.4 | Pass |  |
| 7.8 | 8.3 | 6.8 | 7.7 | 6.8 | 9.5 | 9.4 | 1.8 | 19.4 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33.7 | 31.6 | 34.5 | 34.8 | 35.5 | 39.3 | 24.0 | 11.5 | 47.9 | Fail | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25.0 | 25.8 | 22.1 | 26.5 | 27.9 | 32.4 | 25.5 | 2.8 | 11.1 | Fail | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7.0 | 6.5 | 8.8 | 4.3 | 6.9 | 8.4 | 9.8 | 3.6 | 36.4 | Pass |  |
| 3.8 | 6.8 | 3.9 | 5.1 | 3.6 | 4.6 | 9.2 | 5.3 | 58.0 | Pass |  |
| 8.8 | 10.7 | 9.1 | 10.0 | 8.2 | 12.8 | 7.3 | 4.0 | 55.2 | Pass |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12.0 | 16.3 | 11.1 | 12.1 | 14.2 | 11.2 | 14.4 | 4.1 | 28.8 | Fail | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4.4 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 5.7 | 18.3 | 6.8 | 10.4 | 5.4 | 52.6 | Pass |  |
| 1.3 | 5.6 | 6.8 | 4.1 | 4.5 | 3.8 | 8.4 | 4.8 | 57.0 | Pass |  |
| 3.7 | 4.3 | 6.6 | 3.8 | 3.3 | 5.1 | 10.5 | 7.5 | 71.0 | Fail | Pass |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15.6 | 11.1 | 11.7 | 13.1 | 11.7 | 12.7 | 14.4 | 5.1 | 35.2 | Fail | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11.6 | 3.0 | 13.5 | 12.7 | 11.0 | 12.3 | 12.6 | 4.2 | 33.0 | Fail | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8.0 | 7.5 | 6.8 | 6.7 | 6.4 | 7.8 | 4.4 | 3.0 | 67.2 | Pass |  |


| $\%$ of Quantity Capsule 1 | \% of Quantity Capsule 2 | \% of Quantity Capsule 3 | $\%$ of Quantity Capsule 4 | \% of Quantity Capsule 5 | \% of Quantity Capsule 6 | Mean \% of Quantity | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of } \\ \text { Quantity } \\ \text { SD } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \% \text { of } \\ & \text { Quantity } \end{aligned}$ $\% C V$ | Initial Judge | Disso <br> Initial Final Judge | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ew Judge } \\ & \mathrm{Q}=52 \end{aligned}$ | Disso New Final Judge |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 63.5 | 71.2 | 102.5 | 64.7 | 76.4 | 46.9 | 70.4 | 14.3 | 20.3 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 71.2 | 64.9 | 74.5 | 64.9 | 73.3 | 61.8 | 60.5 | 9.4 | 15.5 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 37.1 | 49.6 | 41.5 | 37.8 | 49.6 | 40.3 | 63.2 | 21.9 | 34.6 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35.2 | 34.1 | 32.5 | 34.1 | 35.7 | 37.1 | 46.3 | 12.6 | 27.2 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 63.3 | 52.7 | 60.6 | 51.7 | 42.5 | 50.0 | 63.0 | 11.4 | 18.2 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 65.6 | 54.7 | 62.1 | 63.1 | 63.3 | 64.9 | 61.3 | 8.8 | 14.3 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 74.9 | 64.9 | 61.2 | 65.5 | 62.3 | 75.3 | 69.6 | 5.9 | 8.5 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34.0 | 27.7 | 31.1 | 32.4 | 28.6 | 26.2 | 46.6 | 20.7 | 44.3 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 58.8 | 81.4 | 72.6 | 67.6 | 73.9 | 64.5 | 64.9 | 10.2 | 15.7 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 80.5 | 74.6 | 75.1 | 60.4 | 64.0 | 67.9 | 69.4 | 7.5 | 10.8 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 67.2 | 52.1 | 62.3 | 79.2 | 65.7 | 76.5 | 68.8 | 8.2 | 12.0 | Pass | Fail |  | Pass |
| 38.4 | 71.2 | 56.3 | 41.9 | 38.2 | 69.0 | 62.9 | 15.2 | 24.1 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 60.6 | 41.1 | 48.6 | 52.5 | 64.5 | 50.4 | 61.9 | 11.1 | 18.0 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 69.8 | 61.6 | 66.0 | 53.7 | 60.9 | 68.5 | 65.1 | 8.3 | 12.7 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 39.2 | 67.8 | 56.7 | 43.5 | 41.6 | 69.6 | 61.6 | 12.9 | 20.9 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 53.0 | 69.8 | 66.7 | 60.4 | 61.1 | 66.8 | 66.5 | 5.9 | 8.9 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 61.7 | 78.7 | 77.4 | 71.1 | 81.4 | 81.0 | 74.8 | 6.9 | 9.2 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24.3 | 18.1 | 29.6 | 19.4 | 22.9 | 18.6 | 47.7 | 30.0 | 62.9 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 61.8 | 90.6 | 60.5 | 64.9 | 57.5 | 53.4 | 60.2 | 10.7 | 17.7 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65.6 | 72.1 | 81.4 | 78.6 | 78.2 | 80.4 | 75.7 | 8.0 | 10.5 | Pass | Pass |  |  |


| \% of Quantity Capsule 1 | \% of Quantity Capsule 2 | \% of <br> Quantity <br> Capsule 3 | \% of <br> Quantity <br> Capsule 4 | \% of <br> Quantity Capsule 5 | \% of <br> Quantity <br> Capsule 6 | \% of Quantity Capsule 7 | \% of Quantity Capsule 8 | \% of Quantity Capsule 9 | \% of <br> Quantity Capsule 10 | Mean \% of Quantity | \% of Quantity SD | \% of <br> Quantity YCV | $\begin{gathered} \text { AV } \\ \text { (Acceptanc } \\ \text { e Value) } \end{gathered}$ | Judge | New Judge $A V=18$ | Mean \% of Quantity | Judge | New Judge <br> BP <br> $76.0 \leqq$ mea <br> $n \leqq 126$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 98.4 | 103.4 | 96.8 | 103.9 | 100.1 | 99.0 | 94.2 | 99.7 | 98.1 | 95.7 | 98.9 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 7.4 | Pass |  | 98.9 | Pass |  |
| 90.5 | 91.9 | 91.6 | 95.1 | 95.2 | 96.6 | 91.0 | 90.8 | 91.1 | 96.5 | 93.0 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 11.5 | Pass |  | 93.0 | Fail | Pass |
| 88.2 | 87.8 | 86.7 | 97.1 | 83.7 | 84.2 | 88.3 | 93.3 | 85.2 | 105.7 | 90.0 | 6.9 | 7.6 | 25.0 | Fail | Fail | 90.0 | Fail | Pass |
| 99.9 | 103.1 | 98.4 | 102.9 | 105.9 | 94.3 | 102.8 | 101.5 | 98.1 | 103.8 | 101.1 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 8.2 | Pass |  | 101.1 | Pass |  |
| 97.5 | 95.4 | 81.2 | 90.8 | 100.2 | 98.4 | 100.1 | 94.5 | 93.9 | 101.2 | 95.3 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 17.5 | Fail | Pass | 95.3 | Pass |  |
| 99.1 | 108.0 | 100.1 | 99.8 | 99.6 | 106.5 | 103.0 | 100.4 | 104.1 | 107.9 | 102.9 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 7.2 | Pass |  | 102.9 | Pass |  |
| 102.7 | 102.6 | 105.7 | 101.5 | 96.8 | 106.0 | 106.1 | 105.5 | 101.0 | 106.7 | 103.5 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 5.6 | Pass |  | 103.5 | Pass |  |
| 95.9 | 94.0 | 97.5 | 91.8 | 91.4 | 90.8 | 99.0 | 100.9 | 96.1 | 104.8 | 96.2 | 4.5 | 4.7 | 13.0 | Pass |  | 96.2 | Pass |  |
| 97.1 | 94.1 | 95.2 | 100.0 | 99.5 | 100.9 | 92.6 | 105.0 | 97.8 | 102.7 | 98.5 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 9.4 | Pass |  | 98.5 | Pass |  |
| 107.7 | 105.9 | 104.9 | 101.8 | 99.9 | 104.6 | 103.2 | 104.3 | 107.8 | 105.1 | 104.5 | 2.4 | 2.3 | 2.8 | Pass |  | 104.5 | Pass |  |
| 101.6 | 106.5 | 107.0 | 106.7 | 106.5 | 105.2 | 106.5 | 104.5 | 109.7 | 109.8 | 106.4 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 0.8 | Pass |  | 106.4 | Fail | Pass |
| 101.4 | 106.5 | 106.8 | 106.7 | 106.5 | 105.1 | 107.9 | 107.4 | 109.2 | 109.7 | 106.7 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 0.3 | Pass |  | 106.7 | Fail | Pass |
| 99.5 | 107.6 | 104.4 | 106.9 | 104.4 | 109.8 | 107.9 | 109.4 | 108.3 | 105.4 | 106.4 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.5 | Pass |  | 106.4 | Fail | Pass |
| 99.6 | 108.0 | 99.8 | 98.9 | 106.3 | 105.3 | 104.0 | 99.5 | 100.2 | 102.9 | 102.4 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 7.0 | Pass |  | 102.4 | Pass |  |
| 99.8 | 107.9 | 104.5 | 107.2 | 104.5 | 109.8 | 107.8 | 109.6 | 108.4 | 105.8 | 106.5 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 2.2 | Pass |  | 106.5 | Fail | Pass |
| 91.1 | 91.6 | 92.7 | 97.9 | 99.0 | 97.1 | 94.9 | 96.7 | 93.7 | 93.8 | 94.9 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 10.2 | Pass |  | 94.9 | Pass |  |
| 89.8 | 92.1 | 89.0 | 88.8 | 90.8 | 93.0 | 92.2 | 93.5 | 90.0 | 84.7 | 90.4 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 14.3 | Pass |  | 90.4 | Fail | Pass |
| 89.8 | 92.1 | 89.1 | 88.9 | 91.0 | 93.0 | 92.3 | 93.5 | 89.9 | 84.8 | 90.4 | 2.6 | 2.9 | 14.2 | Pass |  | 90.4 | Fail | Pass |
| 87.9 | 89.2 | 89.3 | 87.9 | 90.6 | 87.9 | 88.6 | 85.5 | 91.0 | 93.8 | 89.2 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 5.4 | Pass |  | 89.2 | Fail | Pass |
| 92.1 | 96.0 | 90.3 | 91.2 | 92.0 | 95.0 | 94.2 | 93.6 | 95.9 | 96.5 | 93.7 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 10.1 | Pass |  | 93.7 | Fail | Pass |
| 96.4 | 94.7 | 95.8 | 91.6 | 97.6 | 92.5 | 97.6 | 96.6 | 98.5 | 98.0 | 95.9 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 8.2 | Pass |  | 95.9 | Pass |  |
| 102.0 | 95.8 | 110.0 | 107.2 | 107.8 | 108.5 | 106.7 | 98.2 | 105.6 | 105.3 | 104.7 | 4.6 | 4.4 | 7.9 | Pass |  | 104.7 | Pass |  |
| 90.7 | 95.5 | 93.6 | 91.0 | 99.3 | 90.8 | 96.0 | 91.3 | 98.0 | 91.7 | 93.8 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 12.4 | Pass |  | 93.8 | Fail | Pass |
| 96.2 | 97.8 | 99.7 | 95.8 | 98.9 | 94.6 | 93.0 | 93.6 | 98.6 | 90.6 | 95.9 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 9.7 | Pass |  | 95.9 | Pass |  |
| 93.5 | 94.2 | 102.0 | 93.3 | 96.1 | 93.1 | 98.5 | 100.9 | 92.9 | 93.8 | 95.8 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 10.9 | Pass |  | 95.8 | Pass |  |
| 98.9 | 93.0 | 95.9 | 96.4 | 100.3 | 99.5 | 92.0 | 96.3 | 100.5 | 103.6 | 97.6 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 9.5 | Pass |  | 97.6 | Pass |  |
| 96.3 | 101.6 | 92.5 | 98.5 | 99.4 | 96.6 | 97.9 | 96.6 | 100.0 | 98.2 | 97.8 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 6.7 | Pass |  | 97.8 | Pass |  |
| 101.2 | 94.0 | 105.6 | 98.6 | 101.9 | 98.5 | 95.0 | 95.6 | 102.6 | 102.7 | 99.6 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 8.2 | Pass |  | 99.6 | Pass |  |
| 90.0 | 90.9 | 92.3 | 92.2 | 95.9 | 95.4 | 92.5 | 94.4 | 93.4 | 92.2 | 92.9 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 10.1 | Pass |  | 92.9 | Fail | Pass |
| 93.2 | 98.1 | 96.6 | 99.7 | 95.5 | 94.3 | 97.0 | 97.2 | 96.9 | 101.7 | 97.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 7.4 | Pass |  | 97.0 | Pass |  |
| 90.1 | 95.5 | 92.5 | 95.0 | 96.7 | 103.7 | 98.3 | 90.8 | 95.4 | 97.0 | 95.5 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 12.4 | Pass |  | 95.5 | Pass |  |
| 92.1 | 102.4 | 99.3 | 96.7 | 92.8 | 98.1 | 95.1 | 100.4 | 98.0 | 98.5 | 97.3 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 9.0 | Pass |  | 97.3 | Pass |  |
| 92.3 | 94.7 | 98.9 | 100.1 | 99.6 | 95.7 | 93.9 | 95.3 | 92.7 | 97.2 | 96.0 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 9.1 | Pass |  | 96.0 | Pass |  |
| 95.2 | 90.3 | 96.8 | 103.7 | 95.0 | 92.6 | 98.2 | 90.7 | 95.9 | 97.1 | 95.5 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 12.4 | Pass |  | 95.5 | Pass |  |
| 92.5 | 92.6 | 96.1 | 92.2 | 92.3 | 90.0 | 91.1 | 93.6 | 94.5 | 95.4 | 93.0 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 10.0 | Pass |  | 93.0 | Fail | Pass |
| 94.8 | 92.6 | 97.8 | 98.2 | 97.0 | 92.0 | 98.3 | 96.7 | 99.3 | 96.0 | 96.3 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 8.2 | Pass |  | 96.3 | Pass |  |
| 97.1 | 93.7 | 96.7 | 97.7 | 94.0 | 93.4 | 94.0 | 96.9 | 91.6 | 93.9 | 94.9 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 8.5 | Pass |  | 94.9 | Pass |  |
| 56.5 | 47.1 | 95.7 | 99.2 | 77.9 | 47.6 | 83.0 | 72.5 | 85.2 | 99.6 | 76.4 | 20.1 | 26.4 | 70.4 | Fail | Fail | 76.4 | Fail | Pass |
| 89.0 | 91.5 | 96.7 | 95.8 | 98.8 | 100.1 | 88.1 | 90.3 | 93.3 | 92.7 | 93.6 | 4.1 | 4.4 | 14.7 | Pass |  | 93.6 | Fail | Pass |
| 92.4 | 93.0 | 94.0 | 99.5 | 100.6 | 98.6 | 96.3 | 98.2 | 94.8 | 95.2 | 96.3 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 9.1 | Pass |  | 96.3 | Pass |  |
| 75.6 | 84.7 | 81.9 | 86.5 | 101.0 | 80.1 | 99.1 | 100.1 | 95.9 | 91.3 | 89.6 | 9.1 | 10.2 | 30.8 | Fail | Fail | 89.6 | Fail | Pass |
| 93.0 | 78.3 | 77.4 | 76.2 | 89.1 | 94.1 | 91.4 | 97.8 | 82.9 | 87.6 | 86.8 | 7.7 | 8.8 | 30.1 | Fail | Fail | 86.8 | Fail | Pass |
| 109.2 | 107.2 | 107.9 | 106.3 | 102.1 | 105.1 | 104.5 | 105.3 | 106.4 | 100.3 | 105.4 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.4 | Pass |  | 105.4 | Pass |  |
| 86.1 | 91.8 | 87.7 | 83.8 | 90.4 | 86.5 | 88.2 | 89.4 | 84.2 | 90.7 | 87.9 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 17.2 | Fail | Pass | 87.9 | Fail | Pass |
| 101.2 | 101.4 | 98.2 | 99.3 | 96.9 | 96.9 | 98.6 | 96.0 | 99.1 | 101.5 | 98.9 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 4.7 | Pass |  | 98.9 | Pass |  |
| 90.9 | 81.7 | 99.9 | 92.7 | 93.5 | 85.0 | 85.6 | 87.3 | 85.5 | 86.5 | 88.8 | 5.4 | 6.0 | 22.5 | Fail | Fail | 88.8 | Fail | Pass |
| 99.8 | 94.0 | 62.2 | 62.5 | 76.6 | 45.5 | 73.8 | 90.3 | 76.0 | 78.7 | 75.9 | 16.4 | 21.5 | 61.8 | Fail | Fail | 75.9 | Fail | Fail |
| 100.0 | 93.9 | 99.7 | 95.4 | 96.7 | 97.9 | 98.4 | 98.9 | 104.0 | 103.3 | 98.8 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 7.6 | Pass |  | 98.8 | Pass |  |
| 93.3 | 94.5 | 96.5 | 91.2 | 96.4 | 95.7 | 93.8 | 92.6 | 98.3 | 98.7 | 95.1 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 9.3 | Pass |  | 95.1 | Pass |  |
| 98.3 | 90.0 | 97.8 | 90.3 | 99.0 | 101.3 | 101.6 | 104.2 | 103.4 | 103.3 | 98.9 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 12.2 | Pass |  | 98.9 | Pass |  |
| 94.1 | 103.4 | 99.3 | 101.9 | 96.4 | 104.2 | 97.3 | 103.5 | 98.6 | 104.0 | 100.3 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 8.7 | Pass |  | 100.3 | Pass |  |
| 80.6 | 69.2 | 77.8 | 80.0 | 89.5 | 78.4 | 85.0 | 85.6 | 82.6 | 83.4 | 81.2 | 5.5 | 6.8 | 30.5 | Fail | Fail | 81.2 | Fail | Pass |
| 98.6 | 113.1 | 90.3 | 98.3 | 116.2 | 96.6 | 100.7 | 108.9 | 113.3 | 113.5 | 104.9 | 9.1 | 8.6 | 18.3 | Fail | Fail | 104.9 | Pass |  |
| 88.1 | 99.5 | 100.1 | 94.7 | 95.0 | 89.9 | 98.0 | 87.3 | 90.8 | 91.6 | 93.5 | 4.7 | 5.0 | 16.2 | Fail | Pass | 93.5 | Fail | Pass |


| AV <br> (Acceptanc e Value) | Judge | New Judge $A V=18$ | Kanazawa Univ. Quantity test (10 caps) | Judge | New Judge | DS Final Judge | DS New Final Judge | All test pass or any fail | New All test pass or any fail |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7.4 | Pass |  | 98.9 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 11.5 | Pass |  | 93.0 | Fail | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail | Fail |
| 19.9 | Fail | Fail | 90.0 | Fail | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Fail |
| 8.2 | Pass |  | 101.1 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 17.5 | Pass |  | 95.3 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 7.2 | Pass |  | 102.9 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 5.6 | Pass |  | 103.5 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 13.0 | Pass |  | 96.2 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 9.4 | Pass |  | 98.5 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 2.8 | Pass |  | 104.5 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 0.8 | Pass |  | 106.4 | Fail | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Pass |
| 0.3 | Pass |  | 106.7 | Fail | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Pass |
| 2.5 | Pass |  | 106.4 | Fail | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Pass |
| 7.0 | Pass |  | 102.4 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 2.2 | Pass |  | 106.5 | Fail | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Pass |
| 10.2 | Pass |  | 94.9 | Pass |  | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 14.3 | Pass |  | 90.4 | Fail | Pass | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 14.2 | Pass |  | 90.4 | Fail | Pass | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 5.4 | Pass |  | 89.2 | Fail | Pass | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 10.1 | Pass |  | 93.7 | Fail | Pass | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 8.2 | Pass |  | 95.9 | Pass |  | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 7.9 | Pass |  | 104.7 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 12.4 | Pass |  | 93.8 | Fail | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Pass |
| 9.7 | Pass |  | 95.9 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 10.9 | Pass |  | 95.8 | Pass |  | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 9.5 | Pass |  | 97.6 | Pass |  | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 6.7 | Pass |  | 97.8 | Pass |  | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 8.2 | Pass |  | 99.6 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 10.1 | Pass |  | 92.9 | Fail | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Pass |
| 7.4 | Pass |  | 97.0 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 12.4 | Pass |  | 95.5 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 9.0 | Pass |  | 97.3 | Pass |  | Fail | Pass | Fail | Pass |
| 9.1 | Pass |  | 96.0 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 12.4 | Pass |  | 95.5 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 10.0 | Pass |  | 93.0 | Fail | Pass | Fail | Pass | Fail | Pass |
| 8.2 | Pass |  | 96.3 | Pass |  | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 8.5 | Pass |  | 94.9 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 70.4 | Fail | Fail | 76.4 | Fail | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Pass |
| 14.7 | Pass |  | 93.6 | Fail | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Pass |
| 9.1 | Pass |  | 96.3 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 20.8 | Fail | Fail | 89.6 | Fail | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Fail |
| 21.6 | Fail | Fail | 86.8 | Fail | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Fail |
| 2.4 | Pass |  | 105.4 | Pass |  | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 13.8 | Pass |  | 87.9 | Fail | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Pass |
| 4.7 | Pass |  | 98.9 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 16.7 | Fail | Pass | 88.8 | Fail | Pass | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 61.8 | Fail | Fail | 75.9 | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 7.6 | Pass |  | 98.8 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 9.3 | Pass |  | 95.1 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 12.2 | Pass |  | 98.9 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 8.7 | Pass |  | 100.3 | Pass |  | Pass |  | Pass |  |
| 30.5 | Fail | Fail | 81.2 | Fail | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Fail |
| 10.4 | Pass |  | 104.9 | Pass |  | Fail | Fail | Fail | Fail |
| 13.6 | Pass |  | 93.5 | Fail | Pass | Pass |  | Fail | Pass |

## Omeprazole USP

| Kanazawa Univ. Dissolution test USP: Buffer Stage- No unit is less than Q+5\% ( $Q=75 \%$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | considered $Q=65 \%$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 89.4 | 87.9 | 90.5 | 92.6 | 92.2 | 89.5 | 90.3 | 1.8 | 2.0 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 90.7 | 85.0 | 90.3 | 89.7 | 90.1 | 91.9 | 89.6 | 2.4 | 2.7 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 86.1 | 95.4 | 95.7 | 96.3 | 88.0 | 93.2 | 92.4 | 4.3 | 4.7 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 92.8 | 97.9 | 93.9 | 90.9 | 92.7 | 97.6 | 94.3 | 2.9 | 3.0 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 77.1 | 81.7 | 80.0 | 78.6 | 81.4 | 77.7 | 79.4 | 1.9 | 2.4 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Pass |
| 83.4 | 89.1 | 86.9 | 88.0 | 85.5 | 88.4 | 86.9 | 2.1 | 2.5 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 88.4 | 89.2 | 86.4 | 87.5 | 93.3 | 87.8 | 88.8 | 2.4 | 2.7 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 85.6 | 89.2 | 86.5 | 87.5 | 90.0 | 87.6 | 87.7 | 1.6 | 1.9 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 89.4 | 90.4 | 99.5 | 91.6 | 92.2 | 96.4 | 93.2 | 3.9 | 4.2 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 88.8 | 89.9 | 98.9 | 91.0 | 91.7 | 95.9 | 92.7 | 3.9 | 4.2 | Pass | Pass |  |  |
| 81.2 | 77.6 | 80.0 | 78.6 | 77.3 | 75.9 | 78.4 | 1.9 | 2.5 | Fail | Fail | Pass | Fail |


| Kanezana Univ. Cortent unifomity test (19st stage) |  |  |  |  |  | toleaca: $A \leq \leq 15.0$ |  |  | 10,0 | 103.4 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 8.1 | Pass |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 106.7 | 105.7 | 103.3 | 107.9 | 105.9 | 97.6 | 10.6 | 94.6 | 103.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 103.4 | Pass |  |  |
| 105.1 | 10.8 | 1067 | 10.0 | 1085 | 103.9 | 108.2 | 1077 | 10.3 | 105.7 | 10.0 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 9.3 | Pass |  | 10.0 | Pass |  |  |
| 93.7 | 98.7 | 97,3 | 93.1 | 10.3 | 10.1 | 92.4 | 93.3 | 90.7 | 1077 | 97,0 | 5.4 | 5.6 | 14.4 | Pass |  | 97.0 | Pass |  |  |
| 10.2 | 96.2 | 110.0 | 107.4 | 107.9 | 108.5 | 1068 | 98.5 | 103.9 | 105.3 | 10.7 | 4.5 | 4.3 | 7.1 | Pass |  | 10.7 | Pass |  |  |
| 88.9 | 63.0 | 70.3 | 62.4 | 86.7 | 84.7 | 70.0 | 70.9 | 95.3 | 91.9 | 78.4 | 12.3 | 1.5 .7 | 49.7 | Fail | Fail | 78.4 | Fail | Pass |  |
| 109.7 | 108.2 | 1093 | 100.4 | 108.1 | 19.8 | 1066 | 102.4 | 107.7 | 107.6 | 107, | 3.2 | 2.9 | 2.1 | Pass |  | 107, | Pass |  |  |
| 98.0 | 92.7 | 99.3 | 100.4 | 10.5 | 90.2 | 96.2 | 10.12 | 10.2 | 93.3 | 97.8 | 4.7 | 4.8 | 11.9 | Pass |  | 97.8 | Pass |  |  |
| 97.1 | 93.1 | 10.6 | 1066 | 99.6 | 98.8 | 93.2 | 98.1 | 10.6 | 93.3 | 98.5 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 11.2 | Pass |  | 98.5 | Pass |  |  |
| 90.1 | 19.8 | 10.3 | 10.7 | 97, 1 | 108.1 | 1005 | 10.6 | 99.5 | 103.5 | 100.9 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 11.6 | Pass |  | 100.9 | Pass |  |  |
| 100.0 | 94.7 | 10.4 | 10.5 | 107.7 | 92.1 | 98.3 | 103.3 | 103.3 | 95.2 | 99.9 | 4.8 | 4.8 | 11.5 | Pass |  | 99.9 | Pass |  |  |
| 93.4 | 106.4 | 88.1 | 93.7 | 10.5 | 94.4 | 91.0 | 95.3 | 94.7 | 105.6 | 97.6 | 5.5 | 5.1 | 14.2 | Pass |  | 97.6 | Pass |  |  |

## Ceftriaxone



| AV <br> (Acceptanc e Value) | CU Judge | CU Judge | AV <br> (Acceptanc e Value.) | CU Judge | New CU Judge | Kanazawa Univ. Quantity test | Judge | New Judge | New All Fail Judge |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27.63 | Fail | Fail | 27.63 | Fail | Fail | 117.66 | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 4.49 | Pass |  | 4.49 | Pass |  | 103.29 | Pass |  |  |
| 9.62 | Pass |  | 9.62 | Pass |  | 107.97 | Pass |  |  |
| 15.00 | Pass |  | 15.00 | Pass |  | 112.08 | Pass |  |  |
| 10.10 | Pass |  | 10.10 | Pass |  | 107.27 | Pass |  |  |
| 11.61 | Pass |  | 11.61 | Pass |  | 108.50 | Pass |  |  |
| 9.31 | Pass |  | 9.31 | Pass |  | 108.70 | Pass |  |  |
| 8.87 | Pass |  | 8.87 | Pass |  | 108.40 | Pass |  |  |
| 10.34 | Pass |  | 10.34 | Pass |  | 106.81 | Pass |  |  |
| 10.19 | Pass |  | 10.19 | Pass |  | 106.20 | Pass |  |  |
| 9.62 | Pass |  | 9.62 | Pass |  | 107.99 | Pass |  |  |
| 8.75 | Pass |  | 8.75 | Pass |  | 108.54 | Pass |  |  |
| 50.36 | Fail | Fail | 50.36 | Fail | Fail | 118.61 | Fail | Pass | Fail |
| 14.72 | Pass |  | 14.72 | Pass |  | 110.69 | Pass |  |  |
| 10.46 | Pass |  | 10.46 | Pass |  | 107.63 | Pass |  |  |
| 15.00 | Pass |  | 15.00 | Pass |  | 107.21 | Pass |  |  |
| 15.00 | Pass |  | 15.00 | Pass |  | 111.59 | Pass |  |  |
| 12.23 | Pass |  | 12.23 | Pass |  | 105.57 | Pass |  |  |
| 14.95 | Pass |  | 14.95 | Pass |  | 114.15 | Pass |  |  |
| 9.64 | Pass |  | 9.64 | Pass |  | 106.14 | Pass |  |  |
| 11.10 | Pass |  | 11.10 | Pass |  | 105.47 | Pass |  |  |
| 12.53 | Pass |  | 12.53 | Pass |  | 106.78 | Pass |  |  |
| 7.41 | Pass |  | 7.41 | Pass |  | 102.50 | Pass |  |  |
| 9.82 | Pass |  | 9.82 | Pass |  | 105.82 | Pass |  |  |
| 10.02 | Pass |  | 10.02 | Pass |  | 108.48 | Pass |  |  |
| 9.34 | Pass |  | 9.34 | Pass |  | 105.05 | Pass |  |  |
| 11.06 | Pass |  | 11.06 | Pass |  | 106.95 | Pass |  |  |
| 6.16 | Pass |  | 6.16 | Pass |  | 100.97 | Pass |  |  |
| 14.23 | Pass |  | 14.23 | Pass |  | 111.74 | Pass |  |  |
| 11.92 | Pass |  | 11.92 | Pass |  | 110.27 | Pass |  |  |
| 11.96 | Pass |  | 11.96 | Pass |  | 109.52 | Pass |  |  |
| 10.78 | Pass |  | 10.78 | Pass |  | 106.35 | Pass |  |  |
| 12.41 | Pass |  | 12.41 | Pass |  | 107.52 | Pass |  |  |
| 10.34 | Pass |  | 10.34 | Pass |  | 107.05 | Pass |  |  |
| 14.04 | Pass |  | 14.04 | Pass |  | 111.13 | Pass |  |  |
| 8.85 | Pass |  | 8.85 | Pass |  | 97.98 | Pass |  |  |
| 10.90 | Pass |  | 10.90 | Pass |  | 103.87 | Pass |  |  |
| 9.53 | Pass |  | 9.53 | Pass |  | 107.01 | Pass |  |  |
| 10.37 | Pass |  | 10.37 | Pass |  | 107.31 | Pass |  |  |
| 6.52 | Pass |  | 6.52 | Pass |  | 101.98 | Pass |  |  |
| 11.14 | Pass |  | 11.14 | Pass |  | 108.15 | Pass |  |  |
| 14.55 | Pass |  | 14.55 | Pass |  | 108.61 | Pass |  |  |
| 7.76 | Pass |  | 7.76 | Pass |  | 106.26 | Pass |  |  |
| 10.25 | Pass |  | 10.25 | Pass |  | 107.14 | Pass |  |  |
| 5.44 | Pass |  | 5.44 | Pass |  | 99.75 | Pass |  |  |
| 9.35 | Pass |  | 9.35 | Pass |  | 106.52 | Pass |  |  |
| 6.50 | Pass |  | 6.50 | Pass |  | 101.01 | Pass |  |  |
| 77.79 | Fail | Fail | 77.79 | Fail | Fail | 98.91 | Pass |  | Fail |
| 6.80 | Pass |  | 6.80 | Pass |  | 100.81 | Pass |  |  |
| 11.8 | Pass |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Annex 2.1 Map of Cambodia



[^0]:    * Sample size was insufficient for testing in some cases.

