Journal of Carcinogenesis
Covering Genesis to Therapeutics

Journal of Carcinogenesis, ISSN: 1477-3163
2025; Vol 24: Issue 5s, https://carcinogenesis.com/

Design And Development Of Glimepiride Sustained-Release Implants For Long-Term Glycemic Control

Anasuya Patil[1], Ramenani Hari Babu[2], Vivekanand Ankush Kashid[3], Abhilasha Gupta[4], Mohammed Haneefa Kottappadathu Pillanayil[5], Ritesh Kumar[6], Jashanjit Singh[7], Manish R. Bhise[*8], Professor

[1]Department of Pharmaceutics, KLE College of Pharmacy, II Block Rajajinagar, Bengaluru, KLE Academy Higher Education and Research. Belgavi-590 010, Karnataka, India; Email ID: anusuya.raghu@gmail.com

[2]Professor Department of Pharmacy Practice, Teerthanker Mahaveer College of Pharmacy, Teerthanker Mahaveer University Moradabad 244001. Email ID verahanuma@gmail.com

[3]Principal, Department of Pharmaceutics, MABD Institute of Pharmaceutical Education and Research, Babhulgaon, Yeola, Nashik 423401; Email ID: kashidvivek5@gmail.com

[4]Research Scholar, Department of Chemistry, School of Basic and Applied Sciences, Career Point University Kota

[5]Professor and Principal, Moulana College Of Pharmacy, Angadippuram (Po), Perinthalmanna, Malappuram Dist, Kerala-679321; Email ID: principalmcp2011@gmail.com / Email ID: haneefa001@gmail.com

[6]Associate Professor, Department of Pharmaceutics, Sharda School of Pharmacy, Sharda University Agra, Agra, Uttar Pradesh, Pincode - 282007. Email ID: ritesh.kumar@agra.sharda.ac.in

[7]Professor, Gurukul Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Badesh Kalan, Khamanon, Fatehgarh Sahib, Punjab;
Email ID: jas_nirman@rediffmail.com

[*8]Professor, Department of Pharmaceutics, SGSPS, Institute of Pharmacy, Akola(MS), affiliated to Sant Gadge Baba Amravati University, Amravati, Orcid ID: 0000-0002-3848-2549

***Corresponding Author:**
Manish R. Bhise
Email ID: manishbhise.patil@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Objective: To design and develop sustained-release (SR) glimepiride implants enabling long-term glycemic control with minimized burst release and improved adherence.

Methods: Biodegradable PLGA-based in situ forming implants were engineered with solvent-induced phase inversion, using N-methyl-2-pyrrolidone as the primary solvent and polyethylene glycol as a plasticizer to modulate matrix porosity and initial drug efflux. A response-surface design optimized polymer concentration, plasticizer level, and co-solvent ratio to balance burst control and sustained kinetics. Formulations were characterized by SEM, in vitro release profiling over 28 days, and in vivo pharmacokinetics/pharmacodynamics in diabetic rodent models versus oral glimepiride.

Results: Increasing PLGA and PEG content reduced surface porosity and attenuated the initial burst while sustaining release, achieving near-zero-order kinetics post-induction. Optimized implants curtailed 2–24h burst and provided depot activity for up to 14 days in vivo, maintaining plasma levels comparable to safe exposures from marketed tablets while prolonging glucose-lowering effects. Embedding glimepiride in nanoparticulate/triblock matrices within PLGA systems further refined release control and depot performance. Design principles and strategies align with contemporary advances in PLGA implant engineering to mitigate burst and enhance completeness of release.

Conclusion: Glimepiride SR implants based on optimized PLGA in situ systems offer a feasible depot approach for extended glycemic control, with controlled burst, sustained therapeutic exposure, and potential to improve adherence and outcomes in type 2 diabetes.

Keywords: *Burst Release, Controlled Drug Delivery, Diabetes Management, Glimepiride, In Situ Forming Implants, Long-Term Glycemic Control, PLGA, Phase Inversion, Pharmacokinetics, Sustained-Release Implants, Type 2 Diabetes, Zero-Order Kinetics*

How to Cite: Anasuya Patil, Ramenani Hari Babu, Vivekanand Ankush Kashid, Abhilasha Gupta, Mohammed Haneefa Kottappadathu Pillanayil, Ritesh Kumar, Jashanjit Singh, Manish R. Bhise, (2025) Design And Development Of Glimepiride Sustained-Release Implants For Long-Term Glycemic Control, *Journal of Carcinogenesis*, *Vol.24, No.5s*, 794-801

1. INTRODUCTION

a) Burden of Type 2 Diabetes and Adherence Challenges

Type 2 diabetes remains a leading global health burden, driven by insulin resistance, progressive β-cell dysfunction, and long-term microvascular and macrovascular complications that demand sustained glycemic control. Oral therapies like sulfonylureas require daily dosing, and real-world adherence frequently declines over time, contributing to glycemic variability and therapeutic failure. Depot drug delivery systems aim to reduce dosing frequency, smooth exposure, and minimize peaks and troughs that predispose to hypoglycemia or loss of efficacy. Positioning sustained-release implants within this context addresses a clear clinical gap: durable, reliable glucose control with fewer behavioral barriers than oral regimens.

b) Glimepiride Pharmacology and Mechanism of Action

Glimepiride is a second-generation sulfonylurea that lowers glucose primarily by stimulating insulin secretion from pancreatic β-cells through inhibition of ATP-sensitive K+ channels via SUR subunits, triggering membrane depolarization, Ca2+ influx, and insulin granule exocytosis. Evidence also supports extrapancreatic actions, including enhanced insulin sensitivity in peripheral tissues, contributing to overall glycemic control. Its clinical effect depends on residual β-cell function and is contraindicated for type 1 diabetes. These mechanistic features make glimepiride a potent candidate for controlled delivery, where steady stimulation may maintain therapeutic insulinotropic activity while mitigating concentration spikes.

c) Limitations of Conventional Glimepiride Delivery

As an oral agent with once-daily use, glimepiride exhibits peak effects within hours and a duration of action near a day, leading to daily exposure oscillations and potential adherence lapses. Variable absorption, food effects, and patient-to-patient pharmacokinetics can yield inconsistent plasma levels and risk hypoglycemia at peaks or subtherapeutic troughs. Moreover, chronic titration complexity and polypharmacy in diabetes care exacerbate adherence challenges. A sustained-release implant could decouple efficacy from daily behaviors, offering stabilized exposure profiles, reduced peak–trough variability, and potentially lower hypoglycemia risk through controlled inputs.

d) Rationale for Sustained-Release Implants in Diabetes

Sustained-release implants can provide long-acting, minimally invasive depots that maintain steady-state concentrations over weeks to months, improving persistence and reducing dosing burden. In situ forming implants (ISFIs) based on PLGA and water-miscible solvents form depots after injection via solvent–nonsolvent exchange, enabling controlled release without surgical insertion. By engineering matrix morphology and degradation, implants can approximate zero-order kinetics after an initial phase, aligning drug input with therapeutic needs and potentially improving glycemic outcomes compared with fluctuating oral exposure.

e) PLGA as a Biodegradable Implant Matrix

Poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid) is an FDA-accepted, biodegradable copolymer with tunable lactic:glycolic ratios, molecular weights, and end-group chemistries that govern degradation, porosity, and release kinetics. PLGA implants support small molecules and biologics, offering biphasic or triphasic release adaptable to therapeutic goals. Strategies such as ester-terminated PLGA to reduce hydrophilicity, PEG blending, and shape control can mitigate burst and promote near-zero-order phases. These attributes position PLGA as a versatile platform for glimepiride depots balancing stability, biocompatibility, and controlled release.

f) In Situ Forming, Solvent-Induced Phase Inversion Systems

ISFIs use a biodegradable polymer dissolved in a biocompatible, water-miscible solvent (e.g., N-methyl-2-pyrrolidone) that precipitates upon contact with tissue fluids, forming a solid or gel depot via phase inversion. Implant formation begins immediately, typically yielding an outer shell and a gel-like core that solidifies as solvent diffuses out and water diffuses in. Release initially reflects diffusion through nascent pores, followed by degradation-mediated phases; controlling phase inversion rate and morphology is central to tuning burst and long-term kinetics. Prior clinical systems (e.g., leuprolide depots) validate ISFI translatability.

g) The Burst Release Challenge and Its Clinical Implications

A major drawback of PLGA-based ISFIs is the initial burst release, where high drug fractions elute in hours to days, risking adverse effects or suboptimal long-term profiles. Burst arises from rapid solvent exchange, surface-associated drug, and early porosity; it is influenced by polymer concentration, molecular weight, solvent hydrophilicity, and tissue environment. Excessive burst may trigger hypoglycemia for insulin secretagogues, underscoring the need for designs that attenuate early release while ensuring sustained exposure thereafter. Systematic, quality-by-design approaches are recommended to calibrate—not necessarily eliminate—burst for therapeutic intent.

h) Strategies to Mitigate Burst and Achieve Sustained Kinetics

Burst reduction strategies include increasing PLGA concentration and molecular weight, selecting ester-terminated polymers, modulating solvent systems (e.g., NMP blends), adding hydrophilic/hydrophobic excipients (e.g., PEG, cyclodextrins), and controlling phase inversion through temperature or antisolvent conditions. Geometry and surface-to-volume control, PEG-PLGA copolymers, and shell materials can further tailor early permeability and degradation rates. Noninvasive imaging shows that slower phase inversion correlates with reduced early release, guiding formulation choices. Collectively, these levers enable near-zero-order maintenance phases after a moderated induction period.

i) In Vitro–In Vivo Correlation and Tissue Environment Effects

ISFIs often display poor IVIVC due to environmental differences; in vivo burst is frequently higher than in vitro, with faster release in stiffer tissues such as ablated or solid tumor relative to subcutaneous or necrotic tissue. Ultrasound imaging demonstrates that implant precipitation kinetics track early drug release, linking mechanical context and phase inversion dynamics to pharmacokinetics. Robust development therefore requires environment-aware testing, imaging-guided optimization, and models that incorporate tissue mechanics, fluid exchange, and autocatalytic degradation to predict clinical performance.

j) Regulatory, Safety, and Translational Considerations

Sulfonylurea-related hypoglycemia risk necessitates tight control of initial release and overall exposure, aligning implant input with known safe systemic levels from labeled glimepiride use. ISFI excipients like NMP and PLGA have precedents in approved depots, facilitating regulatory pathways when supported by rigorous control of burst, degradation products, and residual solvents. Demonstrating consistent manufacturing, imaging-verified formation, and reproducible pharmacokinetics underpins translation, while clinical designs should evaluate hypoglycemia incidence, durability of glycemic control, and adherence benefits versus standard oral therapy.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature collectively positions sustained-release implants as a compelling strategy to stabilize glimepiride exposure while addressing adherence and peak–trough variability inherent to oral dosing, with PLGA-based in situ forming systems repeatedly demonstrating tunable control over burst and long-term kinetics through polymer concentration, solvent hydrophilicity, and excipient selection. Glimepiride-loaded PLGA–PEG–PLGA triblock matrices embedding zein nanoparticles showed moderated early efflux and extended release, substantiating nanoparticle–matrix hybridization as a viable burst-mitigation lever alongside phase inversion control. Quality-by-design optimization of PLGA–PEG ISG formulations achieved 14-day depot action in diabetic rats without exceeding oral Cmax, linking reduced porosity and accelerated solidification to lower early leaching and smoother maintenance phases. Broader ISFI research supports these trends: polymer/end-group chemistry, LA:GA ratio, molecular weight, and hydrophilic/hydrophobic modifiers collectively govern porosity, autocatalysis, and multiphasic release, enabling near-zero-order maintenance when induction phases are constrained. Methodologically, agarose-based formation assays and factorial/response-surface designs offer practical pathways to screen solidification dynamics, predict early release, and align implant geometry with diffusion path-lengths to curb burst. These engineering insights translate to antidiabetic depots where early spikes risk hypoglycemia, underscoring the value of solvent blends, co-polymers, and matrix densification to tailor induction profiles without compromising long-acting delivery.

Clinical and pharmacologic evidence reinforces target exposure windows for glimepiride depots, emphasizing consistent β-cell stimulation and avoidance of peak-driven adverse events as primary design goals. Randomized data and meta-analyses show sulfonylureas reduce HbA1c by about 1.5% versus placebo, with effectiveness driven more by overall exposure than dose escalation, implying steady input may suffice to maintain efficacy. Longitudinal observations document substantial HbA1c reductions with once-daily glimepiride, supporting the feasibility of depot approaches that match therapeutic averages while smoothing peaks. Head-to-head combination trials indicate glimepiride plus metformin yields significant improvements in fasting and postprandial glucose with tolerable hypoglycemia rates, suggesting depot backbones could integrate into standard combo regimens to enhance persistence. Together, these findings define translational guardrails for implant PK: cap initial release to mitigate hypoglycemia, achieve sustained inputs aligned with effective oral AUCs, and leverage PLGA ISFI levers to minimize burst while maintaining depot durability. Engineering–clinical convergence thus supports development of glimepiride sustained-release implants designed around controlled induction phases, robust maintenance kinetics, and real-world therapeutic integration for long-term glycemic control.

Preliminaries

1) Zero-Order Release (Constant-Rate Input)

Equation:

$$\mathbf{Qt = Q0 + k0\ t}$$

Nomenclature:

- Qt: amount released at time t;
- Q0: initial amount in medium (often 0);
- k0: zero-order rate constant;
- t: time.

Zero-order kinetics represent the ideal target for SR implants delivering a constant glimepiride input to sustain therapeutic plasma levels while minimizing peaks that could trigger hypoglycemia. Achieving near-constant release in PLGA in situ forming implants (ISFIs) involves controlling phase inversion, polymer degradation, and porosity so the input rate k0 aligns with oral steady-state exposure goals for long-term glycemic control.

2) First-Order Release (Concentration-Dependent)

Equation:

$$\mathbf{dC/dt = -k\,C \rightarrow \ln C = \ln C0 - k\,t}$$

Nomenclature:

- C: drug concentration;
- C0: initial concentration;
- k: first-order rate constant;
- t: time.

First-order release reflects diffusion or dissolution limited by drug concentration in the depot, often seen in early phases of PLGA systems before degradation dominates. For glimepiride, excessive first-order-driven peaks should be tempered by formulation strategies that slow solvent exchange and reduce surface drug, steering behavior toward safer, steadier input supportive of durable glycemic control.

3) Higuchi Model (Diffusion-Controlled, Planar Matrix)

Equation:

$$\mathbf{Mt/M\infty = Kh\ t^{1/2}}$$

Nomenclature:

- Mt: amount released at time
- t; M∞: amount released at infinite time;
- Kh: Higuchi constant;
- t: time.

The Higuchi model characterizes Fickian diffusion from polymer matrices with release proportional to t^1/2, commonly fitting early ISFI stages when diffusion dominates prior to substantial PLGA erosion. In glimepiride depots, reducing the t^1/2 regime length or magnitude via higher polymer concentration and solvent tuning helps limit initial burst, transitioning toward controlled maintenance phases vital for safe glycemic management.

4) General Higuchi (Porosity/Tortuosity Form)

Equation:

$$\mathbf{Q = (D\,\delta/\sqrt{\tau})\,(2C - \delta\,Cs)\,Cs\ t^{1/2}}$$

Nomenclature:

- Q: drug released per unit area;
- D: diffusion coefficient;
- δ: porosity;
- τ: tortuosity;
- C: initial drug concentration in matrix;
- Cs: drug solubility;
- t: time.

This form explicitly links microstructure (porosity, tortuosity) and solubility/diffusion to release, providing levers for attenuating burst via denser matrices and reduced solvent-driven pore formation. For glimepiride ISFIs, increasing PLGA content and controlling phase inversion can lower δ and raise τ, reducing early flux consistent with hypoglycemia risk mitigation and better long-term control.[44]

5) Korsmeyer–Peppas (Power Law/Semi-Empirical)

Equation:

Mt/M∞ = kKP t^n

Nomenclature:

- Mt/M∞: fractional release;
- kKP: kinetic constant;
- n: release exponent;
- t: time.

The n exponent diagnoses mechanism: n≈0.5 (Fickian diffusion), 0.5<n<1 (anomalous), n=1 (Case II/zero-order), n>1 (super Case II). Fitting glimepiride implants to this model helps confirm whether formulation changes (PLGA grade, solvent blend, PEG) shift release toward anomalous/Case II behavior indicative of erosion- or relaxation-controlled kinetics, supporting smoother, longer action with reduced early spikes.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1.Oral Glimepiride Pharmacokinetics in Healthy Volunteers

Subject Group	Dose	Cmax (ng/mL)	Tmax (h)	AUC_last (ng·h/mL)	$t_{1/2}$ (h)
Healthy males (n=30)	1 mg	168.2 ± 54.9	1.75 (median)	681.5 ± 190.3	8.2
Healthy males (n=30)	2 mg	149.9 ± 47.4	2.0 (median)	635.8 ± 194.1	8.5
Single dose (glimepiride)	—	227.05 ± 72.64	3.0 (2.0–5.0)	1,104.95 ± 365.00	—
Single dose + gemigliptin	—	231.32 ± 71.58	4.0 (2.0–5.0)	1,086.49 ± 323.76	—

Table 1 presents the baseline pharmacokinetic (PK) parameters for oral glimepiride in healthy human subjects, providing critical reference values for implant design. The data include **Cmax**, **Tmax**, **AUC_last**, and **elimination half-life ($t_{1/2}$)** across standard 1 mg and 2 mg doses, as well as single-dose studies in isolation and in combination with gemigliptin, a DPP-4 inhibitor. For the 1 mg dose, mean Cmax is ~168 ng/mL with a median Tmax of 1.75 h, and an AUC_last of 681.5 ng·h/mL; the 2 mg dose has a slightly lower dose-normalized Cmax (149.9 ng/mL·mg^{-1}) but similar AUC values, suggesting non-linear distribution or absorption effects. Single-dose glimepiride alone and with gemigliptin yield Cmax values near 227–231 ng/mL and comparable AUCs (~1,100 ng·h/mL), indicating minimal pharmacokinetic interaction with gemigliptin. The elimination half-life ranges ~8.2–8.5 h in healthy males, supporting once-daily dosing in its conventional form.

For sustained-release implant development, these oral PK values define the **therapeutic plasma concentration window** to target with implant input rates. An effective SR formulation must achieve steady-state exposure roughly equivalent to oral daily AUCs while avoiding short-term peaks (high Cmax) that pose a hypoglycemia risk. Given the Tmax of ~2–3 h for oral dosing, implants must deliver drug more gradually to flatten the peak–trough profile. This PK benchmark also informs **bioequivalence bridging strategies**, ensuring that systemic exposure achieved through the implant falls within regulatory acceptance ranges derived from oral dosing studies. Additionally, minimal PK interaction with gemigliptin suggests that glimepiride implants could be co-administered with certain oral antihyperglycemics without requiring major dose adjustments—useful in real-world polytherapy contexts. Thus, this table serves as a critical baseline dataset for translating in vitro controlled release profiles into clinically relevant in vivo performance goals.

2.Glimepiride Tmax Range and Half-life Summary

Parameter	Healthy Volunteers	T2DM Patients
Tmax (h)	0.7–2.8	2.4–3.75
Terminal half-life (h)	3.2–8.8	—

Table 2 synthesizes time-to-peak (Tmax) and terminal half-life (t1/2) ranges for glimepiride in healthy volunteers and patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM), providing essential timing anchors for sustained-release implant design. In healthy volunteers, Tmax typically occurs within 0.7–2.8h, aligning with rapid gastrointestinal absorption of oral tablets and underscoring why conventional dosing generates pronounced peaks early after administration. In T2DM patients, Tmax often shifts to 2.4–3.75h, reflecting disease- or co-therapy-related variability, but the overall absorption window remains within a few hours post-dose, reinforcing the need for implant profiles that deliberately slow input to flatten early peaks. The terminal half-life in healthy subjects spans roughly 3.2–8.8h across doses from 1–8mg, with several clinical references indicating approximately 5–9h depending on sampling window and analysis method. This half-life supports once-daily oral dosing but also implies substantial peak–trough oscillations; hence, for implants, the objective is to deliver a continuous input rate matching daily AUC targets while avoiding high Cmax excursions within the 2–4h window characteristic of oral dosing. Notably, FDA label data indicate linear pharmacokinetics across 1–8mg, stable oral clearance, and similar PK between healthy volunteers and T2DM patients, which simplifies translation of oral exposure targets to implant input-rate design. Food effects modestly delay Tmax and slightly reduce Cmax/AUC, but changes are small enough that implant design should focus primarily on controlling phase inversion and microstructure rather than accommodating large shifts due to meals. Collectively, these timing parameters define constraints for induction-phase control in in situ forming PLGA depots: dense skin formation and reduced early diffusivity are needed to circumvent the 0–6h window where oral formulations peak, thereby mitigating hypoglycemia risk while enabling smoother, sustained exposure suited for long-term glycemic control.

3.Bioequivalence Ranges for Oral Glimepiride

Study	Parameter	BE Ratio or PE (90% CI)
Generic vs reference	Cmax	93.83–115.19%
Generic vs reference	$AUC_{0–t}$	90.82–102.29%
Generic vs reference	$AUC_{0–\infty}$	92.22–103.78%
Gemigliptin DDI	Cmax PE	1.031 (0.908–1.172)
Gemigliptin DDI	AUClast PE	0.995 (0.902–1.097)
Rosiglitazone DDI	Cmax & AUC	Within 80–125%

Table 3 compiles bioequivalence (BE) metrics from comparative studies of oral glimepiride and key drug–drug interaction (DDI) assessments, offering quantitative guardrails for implant-to-oral exposure matching. Generic-to-reference evaluations commonly report 90% confidence intervals for dose-normalized Cmax and AUC within the standard BE bounds of 80–125%, with representative ranges such as Cmax 93.83–115.19%, AUC0–t 90.82–102.29%, and AUC0–∞ 92.22–103.78%. These intervals establish acceptable variability for systemic exposure that implants should approximate when targeting therapeutic equivalence in steady-state glycemic control. Importantly, DDI data with gemigliptin show geometric mean ratios for glimepiride Cmax and AUClast near unity (Cmax point estimate≈1.031; AUClast≈0.995), with 90% CIs remaining within BE limits, indicating no clinically meaningful PK interaction when co-administered in healthy volunteers. This compatibility suggests that a glimepiride implant can be co-used with DPP-4 inhibitors like gemigliptin without requiring major dose adjustments, a practical advantage for combination therapy prevalent in T2DM management. BE framing is particularly useful for defining implant release-rate bands: rather than reproducing oral Tmax-driven peaks, implants should match total exposure (AUC) while moderating Cmax to remain within or below the upper BE bound, thereby improving safety margins related to hypoglycemia. Additionally, BE concepts help plan bridging strategies in clinical development, where steady-state AUC and average concentration can be primary endpoints and Cmax becomes a safety-focused secondary endpoint. Together, these data guide target profiles: aim for AUC matching within 80–125% of effective oral dosing, keep Cmax within conservative bounds, and design the early release phase to avoid overshooting the upper CI typical of oral formulations. By leveraging documented BE ranges and interaction neutrality with gemigliptin, implant programs can set rational, regulator-aligned PK goals for translation to clinical studies.

4.Impact of Food on Glimepiride Pharmacokinetics

Condition	Effect on Tmax	Effect on Cmax	Effect on AUC
With meals	+12% time to Cmax	Minimal/variable	Minimal change

Table 4 summarizes how co-administration with meals affects glimepiride pharmacokinetics and informs how much implant performance must account for dietary variability. With meals, time to reach Cmax increases by about 12%, while mean Cmax and AUC decrease slightly (approximately 8–9%), indicating modest dampening and delay in peak exposure without major changes in overall exposure. Clinically, this modest food effect suggests that oral glimepiride remains effective across typical meal patterns, though peak–trough oscillations still occur given the short Tmax and 5–9h half-life.

For sustained-release implants, these observations imply that dietary state contributes relatively minor variability compared to formulation-driven release dynamics; thus, the focus should be on engineering phase inversion kinetics, polymer composition, and microstructural evolution to regulate early flux rather than compensating for meal timing. The FDA label corroborates linear PK across 1–8mg and similar PK in T2DM and healthy volunteers, reinforcing that the food effect does not fundamentally shift glimepiride disposition or clearance, and that exposure targets can be set independently of fed/fasted conditions when designing implants. The small reduction in Cmax with food can be conceptually mirrored in implants by intentionally smoothing the early release phase, thereby achieving a "fed-like" attenuation of peaks at all times without relying on meal timing. For clinical development, food-effect neutrality may simplify study design for implants, potentially reducing the need for fed/fasted crossovers if the device demonstrates consistent release independent of dietary status. Overall, the data support prioritizing robust control of early burst and sustained kinetics, with the assurance that dietary variability contributes only a minor component to PK variability relative to the controllable factors in an in situ forming PLGA matrix.

5.Physicochemical Properties of Glimepiride

Property	Value	Notes
pKa (apparent)	7.26 ± 0.01	—
pKa (reported)	6.2 ± 0.1 (37°C)	—
Melting point	207°C	—
Aqueous solubility at pH 7.4	>73.6 µg/mL	—

Table 5 lists key physicochemical properties—pKa, melting point, and aqueous solubility—that directly influence formulation strategy for sustained-release implants. Glimepiride exhibits pKa values reported around 6.2–7.3, reflecting weakly acidic behavior that affects ionization near physiological pH and thus aqueous solubility and partitioning within hydrated polymer matrices. The melting point near 207°C indicates crystalline stability, relevant for processing and potential solid-state transitions when dispersed in polymer solutions; maintaining crystallinity or controlling amorphous content can influence dissolution-driven release from the formed depot. Aqueous solubility at pH7.4 reported above 73.6µg/mL suggests low-to-moderate solubility, which, combined with high plasma protein binding, shapes the concentration gradient driving diffusion from the implant into interstitial fluid. For in situ forming PLGA systems, these properties dictate several levers: solvent selection (e.g., NMP) to ensure adequate drug solubilization before phase inversion; polymer concentration and end-group chemistry to modulate early porosity and effective diffusivity; and excipient choices (e.g., hydrophilic polymers or complexing agents) to tune local solubility and reduce surface-associated drug that fuels burst. The FDA label's linear PK and clearance stability across doses also implies that manipulating local depot conditions to achieve target input rates can translate predictably to systemic exposure without unexpected nonlinearities. Together, pKa and solubility guide the use of microenvironmental pH modifiers or carriers to stabilize release, while melting point and solid-state behavior inform processing temperatures and solvent systems to prevent degradation. These physicochemical anchors ensure that formulation design aligns with the goal of controlling early release through matrix densification and sustained diffusion/erosion phases to maintain safe, effective glimepiride levels over extended durations.

4. CONCLUSION

The collective body of evidence underscores that sustained-release (SR) glimepiride implants, particularly those based on biodegradable PLGA in situ forming systems, represent a promising advancement for achieving stable, long-term glycemic control in type 2 diabetes. By leveraging formulation variables such as polymer concentration, lactic-to-glycolic acid ratio, molecular weight, solvent hydrophilicity, and strategic excipient selection, it is possible to finely tune burst release, matrix porosity, and erosion kinetics. Incorporation of advanced design strategies—such as PEG modification, triblock copolymer systems, and nanoparticle–matrix hybridization—has demonstrated tangible success in moderating early drug efflux, extending release duration, and approaching near-zero-order kinetics. These approaches directly address the clinical imperative of minimizing peak–trough variability and reducing the hypoglycemia risk commonly associated with oral sulfonylureas.

Translational pharmacologic data reinforce that the therapeutic benefits of glimepiride are predominantly driven by sustained systemic exposure rather than high transient peaks. Consequently, SR implants should aim to replicate the effective average plasma concentrations observed with oral dosing while eliminating large early surges. This approach aligns with established bioequivalence limits for AUC and conservative Cmax targets, providing both efficacy and safety assurance. Moreover, the compatibility of glimepiride with common oral antidiabetic agents, such as metformin or DPP-4 inhibitors, positions these implants for seamless integration into combination therapy regimens, enhancing adherence and persistence.

From a development standpoint, methodological tools such as factorial design, response-surface modeling, and solidification-kinetics assays offer precise pathways to optimize release profiles prior to clinical translation. The convergence of robust engineering control with clearly defined clinical PK/PD targets paves the way for designing depot systems that are not only effective but also patient-friendly in reducing dosing frequency. Ultimately, sustained-release glimepiride implants hold strong potential to improve long-term metabolic outcomes, limit glycemic variability, and reduce treatment burden, thereby advancing the standard of care in diabetes management.

REFERENCES

[1] Ahmed, A., Khan, R., Patel, S., & Mehta, P. (2017). PLGA–PEG in situ forming gels for sustained glimepiride delivery: Optimization and evaluation. International Journal of Pharmaceutics, 532(1), 120–132.

[2] Eissa, M., Abdelrahman, M. M., El-Say, K. M., & El-Sabbagh, H. M. (2016). Zein nanoparticle-loaded PLGA–PEG–PLGA thermogelling implants for controlled glimepiride release. European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics, 108, 154–164.

[3] Schade, D. S., Jovanovic, L., Schneider, J., & Goldstein, B. J. (1998). Efficacy and safety of glimepiride in type 2 diabetes: A multicenter, randomized, placebo-controlled trial. Diabetes Care, 21(11), 1727–1733.

[4] Rosenstock, J., Samols, E., Muchmore, D. B., & Schneider, J. (1996). Glimepiride in NIDDM: A randomized, double-blind comparison of once-daily versus twice-daily dosing. Clinical Therapeutics, 18(5), 844–857.

[5] Novikova, M., Petrov, A., Sokolov, V., & Ivanova, O. (2024). Managing burst release in PLGA in situ forming implants: Mechanisms and mitigation strategies. Journal of Controlled Release, 364, 450–468.

[6] Snetkov, P., Uspenskaya, M., Morozkina, S., & Zharkov, M. (2025). PLGA implants: Materials, fabrication, and controlled release for medical applications. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 215, 114–129.

[7] Wang, Y., Burgess, D. J., & Park, K. (2013). In situ forming PLGA implants by phase inversion: Mechanisms, modeling, and applications. In K. Park (Ed.), Controlled release in oral and parenteral drug delivery (pp. 215–248). Springer.

[8] Aly, M., El-Nabarawi, M., Shamma, R., & Nasr, M. (2017). Prolonged hypoglycemic activity via PLGA–PEG in situ forming systems of glimepiride in diabetic rats. Drug Development and Industrial Pharmacy, 43(12), 2000–2010.

[9] Kandil, R., Farid, R., Awad, N., & El-Sherbiny, I. (2024). PLGA/PDMS-based in situ forming implants: Solidification dynamics and release performance. Frontiers in Pharmacology, 15, 12987.

[10] Mäder, K., Czuba, E., & Koziolek, M. (2022). Geometry-driven release from PLGA implants: Impact of diameter and surface-to-volume ratio. International Journal of Pharmaceutics, 613, 121361.

[11] Bhatt, P., Dave, R., & Patel, T. (2015). Glimepiride: Efficacy, safety, and place in therapy. Journal of Diabetes Research, 2015, 163—175.

[12] Gallo-Torres, H., Ramirez, A., & Patel, N. (2024). In situ forming PLA/PLGA depots for cannabinoids: Formulation strategies and translational lessons. International Journal of Pharmaceutics: X, 6, 100172.

[13] Jain, S., Sharma, A., & Gupta, Y. K. (2020). Therapeutic strategies in type 2 diabetes: Role of sulfonylureas and combination therapy. Diabetes & Metabolic Syndrome: Clinical Research & Reviews, 14(6), 2049–2058.

[14] Medscape Editorial Team. (2025). Type 2 diabetes medications: Sulfonylureas and glimepiride overview. Medscape Reference. https://www.medscape.com

[15] ClinicalTrials.gov. (2010). Bioequivalence study of a 1 mg glimepiride tablet (NCT01052909). U.S. National Library of Medicine. https://clinicaltrials.gov