# Revolutionizing HIV Treatment: Pioneering Ultra Performance Liquid Chromatography for Emtricitabine, Dolutegravir, and Tenofovir Tablet Validation

A Venkata Suresh Babu<sup>1\*</sup>, HK Sharma<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Nimra College of Pharmacy, Ibrahimpatnam, Vijayawada, Hyderabad, India. <sup>2</sup>Sri Satya Sai University of Technology and Medical Sciences, Sehore, Madhya Pradesh, India.

Received: 04th November, 2023; Revised: 16th December, 2023; Accepted: 12th April, 2024; Available Online: 25th June, 2024

## ABSTRACT

An uncomplicated and precise method has come into existence for the simultaneous quantification of emtricitabine, dolutegravir, and tenofovir in solid dosage forms. The chromatographic analysis utilized a Hibar100 column ( $50 \times 2.1 \text{ mm}$ , 2 µm) with a mobile phase of 0.1% OPA and acetonitrile in a 60:40 v/v ratio at a constant flow rate of 1.0 mL/min, maintaining a temperature of 30°C. The perfected wavelength at 260.0 nm revealed retention times of 1.951, 1.180, and 1.584 minutes for dolutegravir, emtricitabine, and tenofovir, respectively.

Keywords: Emtricitabine, Dolutegravir, Tenofovir, UPLC.

International Journal of Pharmaceutical Quality Assurance (2024); DOI: 10.25258/ijpqa.15.2.37

**How to cite this article:** Babu AVS, Sharma HK. Revolutionizing HIV Treatment: Pioneering Ultra Performance Liquid Chromatography for Emtricitabine, Dolutegravir, and Tenofovir Tablet Validation. International Journal of Pharmaceutical Quality Assurance. 2024;15(2):784-789.

Source of support: Nil.

Conflict of interest: None

# INTRODUCTION

Ultra-performance liquid chromatography (UPLC) revolutionizes analytical separation science by advancing speed, sensitivity, and resolution with fine particles and higher flow rates. This article explores UPLC's potential in pharmaceutical analysis, aiming to accelerate analysis while maintaining quality compared to conventional high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) methods. Emtricitabine, an NRTI, is pivotal in human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) treatment, inhibiting reverse transcriptase and preventing HIV-1 with emtricitabine alafenamide. Tenofovir, an antiviral derived from adenosine monophosphate, is available as tenofovir disoproxil and tenofovir alafenamide since 2008, improving oral bioavailability. Dolutegravir, marketed as Tivicay, treats HIV-1 in mature persons and adolescents  $\geq 12$  years weighing  $\geq$ 40 kg, with 52.6 mg of dolutegravir sodium equivalent to 50 mg of dolutegravir free acid. FDA approved dolutegravir on August 12, 2013.<sup>1-16</sup> The structures of emtricitabine, tenofovir, and dolutegravir are shown in Figures 1, 2, and 3, respectively (Figures 1-3).

# MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### Chemicals

Acetonitrile, HPLC Water, N(CH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>3</sub>), KH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>, and H<sub>3</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> were obtained from Merck India Ltd, Mumbai, India. The APIs

\*Author for Correspondence: suresh158@gmail.com

of emtricitabine, tenofovir, and dolutegravir standards were obtained from Hetero Labs, Hyderabad.

#### **The Instrumentation**

The Waters Acquity System features binary pumps, a TUV detector, and an autosampler seamlessly integrated with Empower 2 Software. <sup>17-20</sup>

#### **Method Optimization**

After thorough experimentation with various mobile phase compositions, 0.1% OPA: Acetonitrile in a 60:40 v/v ratio emerged as the most effective choice for optimal separation and analytical performance. Utilizing a UV spectrum wavelength of 260 nm, the developed UPLC method enabled robust absorbance of both drugs, facilitating their accurate quantification. This optimized method was smoothly applied for the simultaneous evaluation of the combined drugs in vitro, demonstrating its efficacy for precise and efficient analysis.<sup>21</sup>



Figure 1: Structure of emtricitabine



Figure 2: Structure of tenofovir



Figure 3: Structure of dolutegravir

#### Validation Procedure

The analytical method underwent rigorous authentication according to ICH guidelines, ensuring reliability and quality. It covered specifications such as system suitability, precision, accuracy, linearity, robustness, limit of detection (LoD), limit of quantitation (LoQ), forced degradation, and stability, meeting industry standards for pharmaceutical analysis.<sup>22-30</sup>

#### Validation

#### System suitability specifications

System suitability was evaluated by taking the necessary steps with standard solutions of tenofovir, emtricitabine, and dolutegravir. Six consecutive injections were made, and key specifications like peak tailing, resolution, and USP plate count were calculated. The %RSD for the area of these injections was required to be  $\leq 2\%$  to ensure system stability and consistency for accurate quantification of the compounds.

#### Degradation studies

Degradation studies are crucial for assessing pharmaceutical stability and behavior under various conditions. These include forced degradation, thermal, photostability, hydrolysis, oxidation, and pH stability tests. The aim is to identify degradation pathways and ensure drug safety and efficacy. Analytical techniques like HPLC, MS, and spectroscopy monitor chemical changes, detect degradation products, and evaluate stability under stress conditions. These studies inform drug formulation, storage conditions, and regulatory compliance to maintain product quality over time.<sup>31,32</sup>

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### **Optimized Method**

The analysis utilized a mobile phase consisting of 0.1% H<sub>3</sub>PO<sub>3</sub> and CH<sub>3</sub>CN in a 60:40 v/v ratio, with a flux of 1-mL/min. A Hibar 100 x 2.1 mm column with 2 µm particles was employed. Detection occurred at an observation of 260.0 nm, with the column temperature held at 30°C. Each injection volume was 1-mL, and the total run time for the analysis was 4 minutes. The diluent used was a mixture of water and acetonitrile in 50:50 v/v ratio (Figure 4).







Figure 5: Chromatogram for system suitability



Figure 6: Calibration curve of tenofovir



Figure 7: Calibration curve of emtricitabine



Figure 8: Calibration curve of dolutegravir



Figure 9: Linearity 100% chromatogram

UPLC Analysis of Emtricitabine, Dolutegravir, and Tenofovir Tablets

|        | Table 1: System relevancy results |      |         |                |      |         |     |                |      |         |     |  |  |
|--------|-----------------------------------|------|---------|----------------|------|---------|-----|----------------|------|---------|-----|--|--|
| S. No. | Emtricitabine                     |      |         | Tenofovir      |      |         |     | Dolutegravir   |      |         |     |  |  |
| Inj    | Run time (min)                    | TP   | Tailing | Run time (min) | TP   | Tailing | RS  | Run time (min) | TP   | Tailing | RS  |  |  |
| 1      | 1.174                             | 2776 | 1.24    | 1.541          | 5151 | 1.27    | 4.1 | 1.87           | 5991 | 1.32    | 3.5 |  |  |
| 2      | 1.176                             | 2886 | 1.25    | 1.55           | 5185 | 1.28    | 4   | 1.878          | 6099 | 1.32    | 3.4 |  |  |
| 3      | 1.18                              | 2919 | 1.26    | 1.555          | 5058 | 1.28    | 4   | 1.907          | 5975 | 1.34    | 3.6 |  |  |
| 4      | 1.181                             | 2948 | 1.25    | 1.556          | 5102 | 1.28    | 4.1 | 1.908          | 6145 | 1.31    | 3.5 |  |  |
| 5      | 1.186                             | 2854 | 1.25    | 1.564          | 5079 | 1.27    | 4   | 1.924          | 6032 | 1.32    | 3.5 |  |  |
| 6      | 1.199                             | 2851 | 1.25    | 1.584          | 5181 | 1.28    | 4.1 | 1.951          | 6022 | 1.33    | 3.6 |  |  |

|               | Table 2: Linearity results |              |                 |              |                 |              |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---------------|----------------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|               | Tenofovir                  | •            | Emtricita       | bine         | Dolutegravir    |              |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <i>S. No.</i> | Conc<br>(µg/mL)            | Peak<br>area | Conc<br>(µg/mL) | Peak<br>area | Conc<br>(µg/mL) | Peak<br>area |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1             | 6.25                       | 56334        | 25              | 378226       | 3.125           | 152278       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2             | 12.5                       | 115591       | 50              | 755585       | 6.25            | 312586       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3             | 18.75                      | 167812       | 75              | 1164216      | 9.375           | 462895       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4             | 25                         | 228769       | 100             | 1531036      | 12.5            | 607432       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5             | 31.25                      | 284851       | 125             | 1865225      | 15.625          | 748804       |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6             | 37.5                       | 336908       | 150             | 2247311      | 18.75           | 907578       |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| <b>Fable</b> | 3: | System | precision | results |
|--------------|----|--------|-----------|---------|
| able         | э. | System | precision | resuits |

| S. No | Area of tenofovir | Area of<br>emtricitabine | Area of<br>dolutegravir |
|-------|-------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1     | 227299            | 1519830                  | 610546                  |
| 2     | 225249            | 1515637                  | 595582                  |
| 3     | 227736            | 1492055                  | 604272                  |
| 4     | 225123            | 1519364                  | 605553                  |
| 5     | 222602            | 1497910                  | 612308                  |
| 6     | 224164            | 1491701                  | 604130                  |
| Mean  | 225362            | 1506083                  | 605399                  |
| S.D   | 1924.1            | 13616.7                  | 5890.7                  |
| %RSD  | 0.9               | 0.9                      | 1                       |

| Table 4: Repeatability results |                   |                          |                         |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| S. No                          | Area of tenofovir | Area of<br>emtricitabine | Area of<br>dolutegravir |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1                              | 224464            | 1494424                  | 598949                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2                              | 226184            | 1492275                  | 607672                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3                              | 225436            | 1512857                  | 614475                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4                              | 225043            | 1509815                  | 608881                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5                              | 223335            | 1515580                  | 606506                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6                              | 224763            | 1491540                  | 597201                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean                           | 224871            | 1502749                  | 605614                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S.D                            | 960.1             | 11148                    | 6471.8                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| %RSD                           | 0.4               | 0.7                      | 1.1                     |  |  |  |  |  |

|       | Table 5: Intermediate precision results |                          |                         |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| S. No | Area of tenofovir                       | Area of<br>emtricitabine | Area of<br>dolutegravir |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1     | 224995                                  | 1486682                  | 486933                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2     | 224953                                  | 1493336                  | 478806                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3     | 225056                                  | 1498890                  | 490580                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4     | 222620                                  | 1497820                  | 479690                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5     | 225815                                  | 1481720                  | 483068                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6     | 222583                                  | 1503116                  | 503971                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean  | 224337                                  | 1493594                  | 487175                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| S.D   | 1381.2                                  | 8067.3                   | 9345.5                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| %RSD  | 0.6                                     | 0.5                      | 1.9                     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |







Figure 11: Repeatability chromatogram



Figure 12: Intermediate precision chromatogram



Figure 13: Accuracy 100% chromatogram

UPLC Analysis of Emtricitabine, Dolutegravir, and Tenofovir Tablets

|              | Table 6: Accuracy results |                     |  |       |                  |                     |               |                    |                  |                     |            |                    |
|--------------|---------------------------|---------------------|--|-------|------------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------|--------------------|
|              | Tenofovir                 |                     |  |       | Emtricita        | bine                |               |                    | Dolutegra        | wir                 |            |                    |
| Level<br>(%) | Amount<br>Spiked          | Amount<br>recovered | Amount<br>recovered % Mean<br>Recovery %Recovery |       | Amount<br>Spiked | Amount<br>recovered | %<br>Recovery | Mean %<br>Recovery | Amount<br>Spiked | Amount<br>recovered | % Recovery | Mean %<br>Recovery |
|              | (µg/mL)                   | (µg/mL)             | _  |       | (µg/mL)          | (µg/mL)             | _             |                    | (µg/mL)          | (µg/mL)             | -          |                    |
|              | 12.5                      | 25                  | 101.16   |       | 50               | 100                 | 98.42         |                    | 25               | 25                  | 101.16     |                    |
| 50           | 12.5                      | 25                  | 98.45  |       | 50               | 100                 | 98.96         |                    | 25               | 25                  | 98.45      |                    |
|              | 12.5                      | 25                  | 99.59  |       | 50               | 100                 | 99.71         |                    | 25               | 25                  | 99.59      |                    |
|              | 25                        | 25                  | 100.1  |       | 100              | 100                 | 98.51         |                    | 50               | 25                  | 100.1      |                    |
| 100          | 25                        | 25                  | 99.58  | 99.64 | 100              | 100                 | 101.21        | 99.48              | 50               | 25                  | 99.58      | 99.64              |
|              | 25                        | 25                  | 98.85  |       | 100              | 100                 | 100.71        |                    | 50               | 25                  | 98.85      |                    |
|              | 37.5                      | 25                  | 98.98  |       | 150              | 100                 | 98.34         |                    | 75               | 25                  | 98.98      |                    |
| 150          | 37.5                      | 25                  | 99.86  |       | 150              | 100                 | 99.11         |                    | 75               | 25                  | 99.86      |                    |
|              | 37.5                      | 25                  | 100.2  |       | 150              | 100                 | 100.33        |                    | 75               | 25                  | 100.2      |                    |

Table 7: Sensitivity results

| Sample        | LoD (µg/mL) | $LoQ(\mu g/mL)$ |
|---------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Tenofovir     | 0.06        | 0.18            |
| Emtricitabine | 0.47        | 1.44            |
| Dolutegravir  | 0.11        | 0.34            |

| Table 8: Robustness results |                    |                      |                       |                   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| S. No.                      | Condition          | %RSD<br>dolutegravir | %RSD<br>emtricitabine | %RSD<br>tenofovir |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1                           | F.R (-) 0.9 mL/min | 0.4                  | 0.8                   | 0.8               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2                           | F.R (+) 1.1 mL/min | 1.3                  | 0.40                  | 0.6               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3                           | M.P (-) 65 W:35M   | 1.5                  | 0.20                  | 1.4               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4                           | M.P (+) 55 W:45M   | 0.2                  | 1.00                  | 1.1               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5                           | (-) 25°C           | 0.2                  | 0.9                   | 0.5               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6                           | (+) 35°C           | 1                    | 0.7                   | 1.4               |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Figure 14: LoD chromatogram for standard



Figure 15: LoQ chromatogram for standard

Table 9: Assay results

| S. No | Tenofovir |             |        | Emtricitabine |             |        | Dolutegravir |             |        |
|-------|-----------|-------------|--------|---------------|-------------|--------|--------------|-------------|--------|
|       | Stnd Area | Sample area | %Assay | Stnd Area     | Sample area | %Assay | Stnd Area    | Sample area | %Assay |
| 1     | 227299    | 224464      | 99.40  | 1519830       | 1494424     | 99.03  | 1681191      | 1693761     | 100.31 |
| 2     | 225249    | 226184      | 100.16 | 1515637       | 1492275     | 98.89  | 1693923      | 1698036     | 100.56 |
| 3     | 227736    | 225436      | 99.83  | 1492055       | 1512857     | 100.25 | 1699326      | 1709571     | 101.25 |
| 4     | 225123    | 225043      | 99.66  | 1519364       | 1509815     | 100.05 | 1687072      | 1689419     | 100.05 |
| 5     | 222602    | 223335      | 98.90  | 1497910       | 1515580     | 100.43 | 1679077      | 1707150     | 101.10 |
| 6     | 224164    | 224763      | 99.53  | 1491701       | 1491540     | 98.84  | 1680435      | 1675492     | 99.23  |
| Avg   | 225362    | 224871      | 99.58  | 1506083       | 1502749     | 99.58  | 1686837      | 1695572     | 100.42 |
| Stdev | 1924.1    | 960.1       | 0.43   | 13616.7       | 11148.0     | 0.739  | 8238.0       | 12493.5     | 0.740  |
| %RSD  | 0.9       | 0.4         | 0.4    | 0.9           | 0.7         | 0.7    | 0.5          | 0.7         | 0.7    |

|                | Table 10: Degradation results |             |           |               |           |              |           |  |  |  |  |  |
|----------------|-------------------------------|-------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|--------------|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|
| C M            | Degradation                   | Tenofovir   |           | Emtricitabine |           | Dolutegravir |           |  |  |  |  |  |
| <i>S. NO</i> . | condition                     | %Undegraded | %Degraded | %Undegraded   | %Degraded | %Undegraded  | %Degraded |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1              | Acid                          | 95.98       | 4.02      | 96.21         | 3.79      | 96.06        | 3.94      |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2              | Alkali                        | 96.73       | 3.27      | 96.42         | 3.58      | 96.26        | 3.74      |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3              | Oxidation                     | 95.16       | 4.84      | 95.62         | 4.38      | 95.79        | 4.21      |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4              | Thermal                       | 97.64       | 2.36      | 97.87         | 2.13      | 97.81        | 2.19      |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5              | UV                            | 98.40       | 1.60      | 98.65         | 1.35      | 98.27        | 1.73      |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6              | Water                         | 99.34       | 0.66      | 99.59         | 0.41      | 99.39        | 0.61      |  |  |  |  |  |



Figure 16: Chromatogram for working standard solution



Figure 17: Chromatogram for working sample solution

# **Method Validation**

#### System suitability

System suitability specifications were determined and met the required standards, ensuring reliable performance of the chromatographic system (Figure 5, Table 1).

#### Linearity

The calibration curves for tenofovir, emtricitabine, and dolutegravir showed good linearity with high correlation coefficients, indicating accurate quantification over the tested concentration ranges (Figures 6-9, Table 2).

# Precision

The method showed excellent precision with low %RSD values for both repeatability and intermediate precision tests, confirming the method's reliability (Figures 10-12, Tables 3-5).

# Accuracy

Recovery studies demonstrated the method's accuracy, with average % recoveries close to 100% for all three drugs (Table 6, Figure 13).

# Detection and quantification limits

The LoD and LoQ values were low, allowing for the sensitive detection and quantification of the analytes (Figures 14-15, Table 7).

# Robustness

The method proved to be robust, with small changes in chromatographic conditions not significantly affecting the results (Table 8).

# Assay of formulation

The %assay values for tenofovir, emtricitabine, and dolutegravir were close to 100%, demonstrating the method's applicability for routine quality control of tablet formulations (Figures 16 and 17, Table 9).

## Degradation studies

Forced degradation studies indicated the method's capability to detect degradation products, confirming its stability-indicating nature (Table 10).

# CONCLUSION

A precise method has come into existence for the simultaneous estimation of dolutegravir, emtricitabine, and tenofovir in tablet form. Retention times were 1.951, 1.180, and 1.584 minutes, respectively, with %RSD for system precision at 1.0, 0.9, and 0.9%. Method precision %RSD values were 1.1, 0.7, and 0.4%. %Recovery rates were 100.04, 99.48, and 99.58%. LoD/LoQ values (ppm) were emtricitabine: 0.47/1.44, dolutegravir: 0.11/0.34, tenofovir: 0.06/0.18. Regression equations were tenofovir: y = 9033x + 651.7, emtricitabine: y = 14988x + 10437, dolutegravir: y = 33277x + 12509. Reduced retention times indicate a simple and cost-effective method suitable for routine standard control in industries.

# REFERENCES

- Ramyasree A, Umadevi S. An efficient RP-HPLC-PDA Method for Estimating Dolutegravir and Lamivudine in Combined Pharmaceutical Formulations using a Box-Behnken Design Approach. International Journal of Pharmaceutical Quality Assurance. 2023;14(3):507-513. DOI: 10.25258/ijpqa.14.3.11
- Chandrudu J, Gandhimathi R. Development, Optimization, and Validation of a RP-HPLC Method with PDA Detection for the Concurrent Quantification of Emtricitabine, Tenofovir Alafenamide, and Dolutegravir in Both Bulk and Pharmaceutical Dosage Forms. International Journal of Pharmaceutical Quality Assurance. 2023;14(3):487-493. DOI: 10.25258/ijpqa.14.3.09
- Swartz M. E., Ultra Performance Liquid Chromatography (UPLC): An Introduction, Separation Science Re-Defined, LCGC Supplement, p. 8-11(MAY 2005).
- 4. Babu, A.V.S., Sharma, H.K. Stability Indicative and Cost

Effective Analytical Method Development and Validation Of Favipiravir and Oseltamivir in Bulk And Pharmaceutical Dosage Form By Using Rp-Hplc Journal of Drug and Alcohol Research., 2022, 11(9), 236196

- Babu, A.V.S., Sharma, H.K. Method Development And Validation Of Ubrogepant In Bulk And Pharmaceutical Dosage Form By Using Rp-Hplc. (2022). Journal of Pharmaceutical Negative Results, 7690-7696.
- Babu, A.V.S., Sharma, H.K.Method Development AndValidation Of Ritonavir And Nirmatrelvir In Tablet Dosage Form By Using RP-High Performance Liquid Chromatography, Eur. Chem. Bull. 2023, 12(Special Issue 5), 815 – 825.
- 7. Jerkovich A.D., Mellors J.S., and Jorgenson J.W., The use of micrometer-sized particles in ultrahigh pressure liquid chromatography. LCGC. 2003; 21(7): 600-610.
- 8. MacNair J.E., Lewis K.C. And Jorgenson J.W., Ultrahighpressure reversed-phase liquid chromatography in packed capillary columns. Anal. Chem. 1997; 69: 983–989.
- 9. Van Deemter JJ, Zuiderweg EJ, Klinkenberg A. Longitudinal diffusion and resistance to mass transfer as causes of nonideality in chromatography. Chem. Eng. Sci. 1956; 5: 271–289.
- Lars Y. and Honore H.S., On-line turbulent-flow chromatography– high-performance liquid chromatography–mass spectrometry for fast sample preparation and quantitation J. Chromatogr., 2003; A 1020: 59–67.
- McLoughlin D.A., Olah T.V., and Gilbert J.D., A direct technique for the simultaneous determination of 10 drug candidates in plasma by Liquid Chromatography atmospheric pressure chemical ionization mass spectrometry interfaced to a prospect solid-phase extraction system. J. Pharm. Biomed. Anal. 1997; 15: 1893–1901.
- 12. WWW.Waters.Com/Acquitycolumns
- Goodwin L, White SA, Spooner N. Evaluation of ultraperformance liquid chromatography in the bioanalysis of small molecule drug candidates in plasma.J. Chromatogr. Sci. 2007; 45(6): 298–304.
- Swartz M., Ultra Performance Liquid Chromatography. LCGC. 2005; 23(1): 46–53.
- 15. Broske A.D., et al., Agilent Technologies application note 5988-9251EN (2004).
- 16. Michael E. Swartz and Brian J. Murphy. Ultra performance liquid chromatography: tomorrow's HPLC technology today as published in LPI- June 2004.
- Michael E. Swartz, UPLC: An Introduction and Review Waters Corporation, Milford, Massachusetts, USA, Journal of Liquid Chromatography & Related Technologies, 2005; 28: 1253–1263.
- 18. Gui-Ling Yang, Li-Wei Yang2, Yong-Xue Li, Hui Cao, Wen-Liang

Zhou, Zhi-Jian Fang, et al. Applications of Ultra-Performance Liquid Chromatography to Traditional Chinese Medicines. J. Chromatogr Sci., 2008; 48: 18-21.

- Kaushal.C, Srivatsava.B, A Process of Method Development: A Chromatographic Approach. J Chem Pharm Res, Vol.2, Issue 2, 519-545, (2010)
- 20. Green JM. A Practical guide to analytical method validation, Anal Chem (1996) 305A-309A
- ICH, Validation of analytical procedures: Text and Methodology. International Conference on Harmonization, IFPMA, Geneva, (1996)
- 22. IUPAC. Compendium of Chemical Terminology, 2nd edn. (The Gold Book). PAC69, 1137 (1997). Glossary of terms used in computational drug design (IUPAC Recommendations.
- 23. K. D. Tripathi, Essentials of Medical Pharmacology, 6th Edition, Jaypee brother's medical publishers (P) LTD, p-254-255.
- 24. Indian Pharmacopoeia, Indian Pharmacopeial Commission, Controller of Publication, Government of India, Ministry of health and Family Welfare, Ghaziabad, India, 2 (2010) 1657-1658.
- 25. British Pharmacopoeia, The British Pharmacopeial Commission, the stationary office, UK, London, 1408-1409 2 (2011).
- 26. Link to Drugbank Favipiravir
- 27. Link to Drugbank Oseltamivir
- 28. Syeda Shafaq et al.., Method Development and Validation for Simultaneous Estimation of Emtricitabine, Tenofovir Af, Dolutegravir in Its Bulk and Pharmaceutical Dosage Form by Rp-Hplc Method, Wjpis, 2019; 5(11): 179-186.
- 29. A Prabhakar Reddy et al.., Development and Validation of Rp-Hplc-Pda Method for The Simultaneous Estimation of Emtricitabine, Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate and Rilpivirine Hydrochloride in Bulk, Pharmaceutical Dosage Forms And In Dissolution Samples, Iajpr,Vol 4, Issue 11, 2014.
- 30. Somanathan.et al.., Analytical Method Development and Validation of Stability Indicating assay method of analysis for Dolutegravir/Lamivudine/Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate tablets using High Performance Liquid Chromatography, Research J. Pharm. and Tech. 2021; 14(5):2434-2439.
- 31. Ramreddy Godela et al., Concurrent estimation of lamivudine, tenofovir disoproxil fumarate, and efavirenz in blended mixture and triple combination tablet formulation by a new stability indicating RP-HPLC method Ramreddy Godela, Vijayalakshmi Kammari, Sowjanya Gummad, Godela et al. Future Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences (2021) 7:94.
- 32. Yusuff Ismai et al., A New Stability Indicating RP-HPLC Method Development and Validation for the Simultaneous Estimation of Dolutegravir and Rilpivirine in Bulk and its Dosage Forms, Iranian Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences 2019: 15 (4): 53-72.