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#### Abstract

For the simultaneous quantification of paracetamol, ambroxol hydrochloride, levocetirizine dihydrochloride, and pseudoephedrine hydrochloride in tablet dosage forms, a simple, specific, accurate, exact, and cost-effective UV-method was devised. The analysis was carried out using Cramer's rule and Gauss-Jorden elimination using UV-spectroscopy of paracetamol, ambroxol hydrochloride, levocetirizine dihydrochloride, and pseudoephedrine hydrochloride as the solvent. The absorbtion maximums for the four drugs of 243, 220 , 264, and 257 nm were selected wavelenth. With a regression coefficient of 0.999 , a linear response between ( $12 \mathrm{ug}-72 \mathrm{ug} / \mathrm{ml}$ ) was seen, and the percentage R.S.D. values of $0.7073,0.6484,1.6358$, and 0.7308 fall within acceptable bounds. Method was approved in accordance with ICH recommendations.
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## I. INTRODUCTION

Paracetamol (PARA), Ambroxol Hydrochloride(AMB) ,Levocetirizine Dihydrochloride(LVD), Pseudoephedrine Hydrochloride(PEH) is a cold,allergic,rihinitis agents, chemicallyit is $N$-(4-hydroxyphenyl) ethanamide, Trans-4-[2-[4-[(4-chlorophenyl) phenyl] methyl]-cyclohexanol, ( $R$ )-2-[2-[4-[(2-Amino-3,5-dibrombenzylamino)] piperazin-1yllethoxy] dihydrochloride of acetic acid, (1s, 2s) - 2methylamine phenylpropane-1-ol hydrochloride is one. combination method is for have been reported for its estimation.of uv-method for new approchemently.

Numerous approaches are documented for individual medications and combinations with other pharmaceuticals, according to a thorough literature review, but there isn't a single way so far published for the simultaneous estimation of PARA, AMB,LVD,PHE as a combination dosage. Therefore, efforts have been undertaken to establish three spectrophotometeric procedures that are straightforward,
accurate, specific, and reproducible for the simultaneous estimation of equation is derived for using Cramer's rule and Gauss jorden elimination -rule PARA, AMB, LVD, PHE in combined dosage form, using simultaneous equation method.

## II. METHOD AND MATERIALS

$>$ Reagent:
MEDOPHARM Pharmaceuticals Chennai provided standard bulk medication samples of PARA, AMB, LVD, and PHE. A combination dosage form tablet (LV-PLUS) was purchased from a nearby market.

The rest of the reagents were all of analytical grade. The UV/visible spectrophotometer was a Shimadzu model 1700 with matching quartz cells measuring 1 cm . The following software specifications were used to record the spectra: spectral bandwidth of 3 nm , wavelength accuracy of $+/-0.5 \mathrm{~nm}$, and wavelength readability in steps of 0.1 nm .

## > Experiment

- Method 1: Employing Simultaneous Equations

Pure drug sample of PARA,AMB,LVD,PHE were dissolved separately in methanol and 0.1 N Hydrochloric acid so as to give several dilutions of standard in the concentration range $10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ of PARA,AMB,LVD,PHE.All dilutions were scanned between 400 and 200 nm in wavelength. The overlapping spectra of four medicines are shown in Fig. 1.

In order to create simultaneous equations, four wavelengths were chosen: $243,220,264$, and 257 nm (maximum of four medicines, respectively). $\mathrm{E}(1 \%, 1 \mathrm{~cm})$ values for PARA at 243 , AMB at 220, LVD at 264, and PHE at 257 nm were determined to be 447.34, 195.34, 309.12, and 583.32, respectively.These numbers represent the average of six different measurements.

The concurrent equations that were created were,
At 243 nm

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{1}=a x_{1} c_{P}+a y_{1} c_{A}+a z_{1} c_{L}+a w_{1} c_{P S} . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

At 220 nm

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{2}=a x_{2} c_{P}+a y_{2} c_{A}+a z_{2} c_{L}+a w_{2} c_{P S} . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

At 264 nm
$A_{3}=a x_{j} c_{P}+a y_{3} c_{A}+a z_{3} c_{L}+a w_{3} c_{P S}$

## At 257 nm

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{4}=a x_{4} c_{P}+a y_{4} c_{A}+a z_{4} c_{L}+a w_{4} c_{P S}- \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where $\mathrm{A}_{1}, \mathrm{~A} 2, \mathrm{~A} 3, \mathrm{~A} 4$ are the absorbances of sample solution at $243,220,264,257 \mathrm{~nm}$ respectively. Cx to $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{z}}$ arethe concentration of PARA, AMB, LVD, PHE respectively $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml})$ in sample solution.

Let, ${ }^{\text {L- lambdamax }}$

- the absorptivities of Paracetamol at $L_{1}, L_{2}, L_{3}$ and $L_{4}$ be $a x_{1}, a x_{2}$, $a x_{j}$ and $a x_{4}$, respectively.
- the absorptivities of Ambroxol Hydrochloride at $\mathrm{L}_{4}, \mathrm{~L}_{2}, \mathrm{~L}_{3}$ andL $L_{4}$ be ay $y_{1}, y_{2}$, $a y_{3}$ and $a y_{4}$, respectively.
- the absorptivities of Levocetirizine Dihydrochloride at $L_{1}, L_{2} L_{3}$ and $L_{4}$ be $a z_{1}, a z_{2} a z_{3}$ and $a z_{4}$, respectively.
- the absorptivities of Pseudoephiedrine Hydrochloride at $\mathrm{L}_{1}, \mathrm{~L}_{2} \mathrm{~L}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{L}_{4}$ be
$a w_{1}, a w_{2}, a w_{3}$ and $a w_{4}$, respectively


## > Method-1

- Cramer's Rule:

Consider the following matrix-multiplication representation of a system of $n$ linear equations for $n$ unknownsto apply Cramer's Rule.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Ax}=\mathrm{b} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

the $n$ by $n$ matrix A has a nonzero determinant, and the vector $\mathrm{X}=$
$\left(\mathrm{X}_{1}, \ldots \quad \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{n}}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}$ is the column vector of the variables.

Then the theorem states that in this case the system has a unique solution,
whose individual values for the unknowns are given by:

$$
\mathrm{xl}=\frac{\operatorname{det}(\mathrm{Ai})}{\operatorname{det}(\mathrm{A})} \mathrm{i}=1, \ldots, \mathrm{n}
$$

Where,

$$
\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{i}} \text { is the matrix formed by replacing the } i \text { th column of } \mathrm{A} \text { by the column }
$$

## vectorb.

$a_{n 2} \quad$ Cramer's Rule $4 \times 4$

Solution of $4 x 4$ matrix can be find as same as we find for $2 \times 2$ and $3 \times 3$ matrices. Find thevalues of $x, y, z$ and W using Cramer's rule.

$$
\begin{gathered}
2 x-y+4 z+t=-23 x+2 y-t=-3 \\
3 x+2 y+2 t=10 \\
x+y+2 z=2
\end{gathered}
$$

- Gauss-Jordan Elimination Method and the Aug Mented Matrix
The Gauss-Jordan Elimination method works with the augmented matrix in order to solve the system of equations.
$\checkmark$ Gauss-Jordan Elimination method is to convert the matrix into this form.

| $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |  |  |
| $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |  |  |
| $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{1}$ |  |  |

Where,
r1,r2,r3,r4 represent the results of each equation (constant terms)

## - Choosing a Solvent

According to I.P specifications, the solubility of medicines was assessed in a range of polar and non-polar solvents. For the analysis, Methanol and 0.1 N Hydrochloric Acid were discovered to be the most common solvents. For the suggested processes, Paracetamol, Ambroxol Hydrochloride, Levocetirizine Dihydrochloride, and Pseudoephedrine Hydrochloride were also found to be common solvents.

- Preparation of Standard Stock Solution:

Standard stock solution Paracetamol, Ambroxol Hydrochloride, Levocetirizine Dihydrochloride and Pseudoephdrine Hydrochloride were prepared by dissolving, 15 mg Paracetamol, Ambroxol Hydrochloride, and Pseudoephedrine Hydrochloride in 10 ml of Methanol, separately to get a concentration of $1500 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml} .4 \mathrm{ml}$, of the above solution, were transferred into 10 ml standard flask and made up to the mark with 0.1 N Hydrochloride acid to get $240 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ of each drug.

## - Check for Stability

Stability was studied by measuring the absorbance of each $10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ solutions of four drugs at different time intervals. It was observed that Paracetamol, Ambroxol Hydrochloride, Levocetirizine Dihydrochloride and Pseudoephedrine Hydrochloride in 0.1N Hydrochloric acid were stable for approximately 5 hours at all selected wavelengths.

- Standard Stock Solution Preparation:

Standard stock solution The following compounds were created by independently dissolving 15 mg each of

Paracetamol, Ambroxol Hydrochloride, Levocetirizine Dihydrochloride, and Pseudoephedrine Hydrochloride in 10 ml of Methanol to achieve a concentration of $1500 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$. To obtain $240 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ of each medication, 4 ml of the aforementioned solution were put into a 10 ml standard flask and brought up to the appropriate volume with 0.1 N hydrochloride acid.

## - Linearity and Calibration

To obtain a concentration range of each 12 to $72 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ of paracetamol, ambroxol hydrochloride, levocetirizine dihydrochloride, and pseudoephedrine hydrochloride, aliquots of standard stock solutions ( $240 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ ) of these drugs were transferred into a series of 10 ml volumetric flasks and made up to the volume with 0.1 N hydrochloric acid.At these chosen wavelengths, the absorbances of various concentration solutions were measured, and the calibration curves were shown as concentration against absorbance. Levocetirizine Dihydrochloride, Pseudoephedrine Hydrochloride, Ambroxol Hydrochloride, and Paracetamol all demonstrated linearity with concentration ranges between 12 and $72 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$, respectively.

## III. ANALYSIS OF TABLET FORMULATION

Twenty tablets were precisely weighed; the average weight was found, and the tablets were then finely pulverized. The average weight of 20 tablets of the formulation (LV-PLUS comprising Paracetamol 500 mg , Ambroxol Hydrochloride 60 mg , Levocetirizine Dihydrochloride 5 mg , and Pseudoephedrine Hydrochloride 30 mg ) ( $100: 30: 1: 15$ ) was determined and the pills were then crushed into a fine powder. An amount weighing precisely 15 mg of Paracetamol was extracted from the triturate of 20 tablets and put to a 10 ml volumetric flask.

This raw ingredient was carefully weighed and then added along with 13.2 mg of ambroxol hydrochloride, 14.85 mg of levocetirizine dihydrochloride, and 14.1 mg of pseudoephedrine hydrochloride. It was then dissolved in methanol before being added to more methanol to make up the volume. After being sonicated for around 15 minutes, the solution was filtered using whatmann filter paper no. 41. A theoretical concentration of $24 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ of paracetamol, ambroxol hydrochloride, levocetirizine dihydrochloride, and pseudoephedrine hydrochloride was obtained by diluting the filtrate. The absorbances were measured at wavelengths of 243, 220, 264, and 257 nm . This was done six times to ensure the accuracy and repeatability of the method. Levocetirizine Dihydrochloride, Pseudoephedrine Hydrochloride, Ambroxol Hydrochloride, and Paracetamol's absorptivity values were used to solve the equations using Cramer's Rule and Gauss- Jorden Elimination Methods.

## $>$ Recovery Studies

Recovery studies using the conventional addition method were conducted to examine the suggested methods' accuracy, repeatability, and precision. Recovery study findings were deemed good and provided in The accuracy of the approach was assessed by comparing the findings from

Intra Day $(\mathrm{n}=3)$ and $\operatorname{Inter} \operatorname{Day}(\mathrm{n}=3)$ tests.

## IV. CONCLUSION AND RESULTS

For the estimate of, straight forward simultaneous estimation techniques were successfullydevised. PARA, AMB, LVD, PHE- in raw material and combined dosage form.

## > Linearity:

Table1 provides a summary of the calibration curves that were created for both medications at the chosen analytical wavelengths.This demonstrates that in the concentration range of $12-72 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$, PARA, AMB, LVD and PHE obey Beer's law.

## $>$ Accuracy:

The accuracy of the approach was assessed by looking at the recovery of PARA, AMB, LVD and PHE at three different levels, ranging from 80, 100, and $140 \%$ of the nominal concentration. Excellent recoveries are shown by the data as displayed in Table 3.

## > Precision \& Repeatability:

The proposed method was repeated three times in a single day in order to study the method's accuracy and repeatability. The results' average percentage and RSD values were tabulated, and when the experiment was repeated on three different days, the average percentage RSD values for determination were tabulated in Table4. The outcomes support the method's intraday and interday accuracy.

## > Conclusion

Cramer's rule and Gauss jorden elimination -rule method is a suitable for the reliable analysis for commercial formulations containing combinations of PARA,AMB,LVD,PHE. The techniques are straightforward, exact, quick, and accurate. High percentage recovery demonstrates that formulation-related excipient interference is not present in the procedure.
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Table 1 Optical Characteristics Paracetamol By Simultaneous Equation Method

| PARAMETERS | AT 243 nm | AT 220 nm | AT 264 nm | AT 257 nm |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beers law limit $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml})^{12-72}$ | $12-72$ | $12-72$ | $12-72$ |  |
| Molar absorptivity $\left(\mathrm{L} \mathrm{mol}^{-1} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right)$ | 8067.3760 | $1844-4539$ | 3618.0829 | 5634.5738 |
| Sandell's sensitivity $\left(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{2} / 0.001 \mathrm{A.U}\right)$ | 0.0191 | 0.0856 | 0.0420 | 0.0270 |
| Correlation coefficient $(\mathrm{r})$ | 0.9999 | 0.9999 | 0.9999 | 0.9999 |
| Regression equation $(\mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{mx}+\mathrm{c})$ | $0.0523 \mathrm{x}+0.0106$ | $\mathrm{y}=0.0116+$ | $=0.0238 \mathrm{x}+0.0012$ | $=0.0369 \mathrm{x}+0.0034$ |
|  |  | 0.0052 |  | 0.0369 |
| Slope $(\mathrm{m})$ | 0.0523 | 0.0116 | 0.0238 | 0.0369 |
| Intercept $(\mathrm{c})$ | 0.0106 | 0.0052 | 0.0012 | 0.0034 |
| LOD $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml})$ | 0.0353 | 0.0081 | 0.0076 | 0.0111 |
| LOQ $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml})$ | 0.1069 | 0.0245 | 0.0232 | 0.0339 |
| Standard error | 0.0149 | 0.0046 | 0.0070 | 0.0133 |

Table 2 Optical Characteristics of Ambroxol Hydrochloride by Simultaneous Equation Method

| PARAMETERS | AT 243 nm | AT 220 nm | AT 264 nm | AT 257 nm |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beers law limit $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml})$ | $12-72$ | $12-72$ | $12-72$ | $12-72$ |
| Molar absorptivity $\left(\mathrm{L} \mathrm{mol}^{-1} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1)}\right.$ | 5328.2842 | 11217.3717 | 932.6916 | 2462.0060 |
| Sandell's sensitivity $\left(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{2} / 0.001 \mathrm{A.U}\right)$ | 0.0712 | 0.0327 | 0.3963 | 0.1496 |
| Correlation coefficient $(\mathrm{r})$ | 0.9999 | 0.9999 | 0.9999 | 0.9999 |
| Regression equation $(\mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{mx}+\mathrm{c})$ | $\mathrm{y}=0.0140 \mathrm{x}$ <br> +0.0005 | $\mathrm{y}=0.0305 \mathrm{x}+(-0.0084)$ | $\mathrm{y}=0.0025 \mathrm{x}+(-0.0005)$ | $\mathrm{y}=$ <br>  <br> Slope $(\mathrm{m})$ |
| Intercept $(\mathrm{c})$ | 0.0140 | 0.0305 | $0.0066 \mathrm{x}+(-0.0026)$ |  |
| LOD $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml})$ | 0.0005 | -0.0084 | -0.0005 | 0.0066 |
| LOQ $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml})$ | 0.0251 | 0.0931 | 0.0719 | -0.0026 |
| Standard error | 0.0761 | 0.2822 | 0.2179 | 0.0631 |
|  | 0.0039 | 0.0114 | 0.0005 | 0.1912 |

## > Mean of Six Observations

Table 3 Optical Characteristics of Levocetirizine Dihydrochloride by Simultaneous Equation Method

| PARAMETERS | AT 243 nm | AT 220 nm | AT 264 nm | AT 257 nm |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beers law limit $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml})^{12-72}$ | $12-72$ | $12-72$ | $12-72$ |  |
| Molar absorptivity $\left(\mathrm{L} \mathrm{mol}^{-1} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1)}\right.$ | 6131.0547 | 14257.1678 | 2959.6707 | 1937.1685 |
| Sandell's sensitivity $\left(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{2} / 0.001 \mathrm{A.U}\right)$ | 0.0722 | 0.0341 | 0.1541 | 0.2376 |
| Correlation coefficient $(\mathrm{r})$ | 0.9999 | 0.9999 | 0.9999 | 0.9999 |
| Regression equation $(\mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{mx}+\mathrm{c})$ | $\mathrm{y}=$ | $0.0138 \mathrm{x}+(-0.0057)$ | $\mathrm{y}=0.0292 \mathrm{x}$ |  |
| +0.0160 | $\mathrm{y}=0.0064 \mathrm{x}$ | $+(-0.0007)$ | $\mathrm{y}=$ <br> $0.0042 \mathrm{x}+(-0.0001)$ |  |
| Slope $(\mathrm{m})$ | 0.0138 | 0.0292 | 0.0064 | 0.0042 |
| Intercept $(\mathrm{c})$ | -0.0057 | 0.0160 | -0.0007 | -0.00013 |
| LOD $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml})$ | 0.0292 | 0.0085 | 0.0096 | 0.0150 |
| LOQ $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml})$ | 0.0887 | 0.0259 | 0.0293 | 0.0455 |
| Standard error | 0.0055 | 0.0114 | 0.0020 | 0.0015 |

## > Mean of Six Observations

Table 4 Optical Characteristics of Pseudoephedrine Hydrochloride by Simultaneous Equation Method

| PARAMETERS | AT 243 nm | AT 220 nm | AT 264 nm | AT 257 nm |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beers law limit $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml})$ | $12-72$ | $12-72$ | $12-72$ | $12-72$ |
| Molar absorptivity $\left(\mathrm{L} \mathrm{mol}^{-1} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1)}\right.$ | 85.7945 | 924.9025 | 189.0937 | 216.3112 |
| Sandell's sensitivity $\left(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{cm}^{2} / 0.001 \mathrm{~A} . \mathrm{U}\right)$ | 2.4034 | 0.2285 | 1.0958 | 0.9669 |
| Correlation coefficient $(\mathrm{r})$ | 0.9999 | 0.9999 | 0.9999 | 0.9999 |
| Regression equation $(\mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{mx}+\mathrm{c})$ | $\mathrm{y}=0.0004 \mathrm{x}$ |  |  |  |
|  | +9.2857 | $\mathrm{y}=0.0043 \mathrm{x}$ |  |  |
|  | +0.0020 | $\mathrm{y}=0.00091 \mathrm{x}$ |  |  |
| +0.00025 | $\mathrm{y}=0.001034 \mathrm{x}$ |  |  |  |
| 0.0004 | 0.0043 | 0.00091 | 0.000382 |  |
| Slope $(\mathrm{m})$ | 9.2857 | 0.0020 | 0.00025 | 0.000382 |
| Intercept $(\mathrm{c})$ | 0.2536 | 0.3244 | 0.0401 | 0.1246 |
| LOD $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml})$ | 0.7685 | 0.9831 | 0.1216 | 0.3777 |
| LOQ $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{ml})$ | 0.00015 | 0.00173 | 0.00024 | 0.00037 |
| Standard error |  |  |  |  |

> Mean of Six Observations
Table 5 (Paracetamol, Ambroxol Hydrochloride) (by Cramer'sRule)

| Drug | SampleNo. | LabeledAmount (mg/tab) | AmountFound (mg/tab) | Percentage Obtained | Average(\%) | SD | \% RSD | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 500 | 497.90 | 99.58 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2 | 500 | 502.05 | 100.41 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3 | 500 | 500.62 | 100.12 |  |  |  |  |
| PAR | 4 | 500 | 504.35 | 100.87 | 100.20 | $0 . .4978$ | 0.4968 | 0.0138 |
|  | 5 | 500 | 502.70 | 100.54 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6 | 500 | 498.50 | 99.71 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 60 | 60.62 | 101.03 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2 | 60 | 59.33 | 98.88 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3 | 60 | 61.04 | 101.73 |  |  |  |  |
| AMB | 4 | 60 | 60.41 | 100.69 | 100.21 | 1.1066 | 1.1043 | 0.0307 |
|  | 5 | 60 | 59.79 | 99.65 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6 | 60 | 59.58 | 99.30 |  |  |  |  |

## > Mean of Six Observations

Table 6 (Levocitrizine Dihydrochloride, Pseudoephedrine Hydrochloride) (by Cramer's Rule)

| Drug | SampleNo. | LabeledAmount <br> $(\mathbf{m g} / \mathbf{t a b})$ | AmountFound <br> $(\mathbf{m g} / \mathbf{t a b})$ | Percentage <br> Obtained | Average(\%) | SD | \% RSD | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 5 | 5.0600 | 101.20 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2 | 5 | 4.9766 | 99.53 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3 | 5 | 5.0625 | 101.25 |  |  |  |  |
| LEV | 4 | 5 | 5.0416 | 100.80 | 100.10 | 1.1203 | 1.1121 | 0.0311 |


|  | 5 | 5 | 4.9583 | 99.16 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 6 | 5 | 4.9337 | 98.67 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 30 | 30.2066 | 100.68 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2 | 30 | 29.6660 | 98.88 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3 | 30 | 30.4166 | 101.71 |  |  |  |  |
| PSE | 5 | 30 | 29.5833 | 101.38 | 100.15 | 1.4649 | 1.4631 | 0.0406 |
|  | 6 | 30 | 30.6233 | 98.61 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 29.7900 | 99.30 |  |  |  |  |  |

## > Mean of Six Observations

Table 7 (LV-Plus) by Cramer's Rule- (Inter Day,Intra Day)

| Drug | Amountlabeled (mg/tab) | PercentageObtained* |  | SD |  | \%RSD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Intraday | Interday | Intraday | Interday | Intraday | Interday |
| PARA | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 500 \\ & 500 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 100.83 \\ 99.63 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 99.61 \\ 100.91 \end{gathered}$ | 0.7076 | 0.6501 | 0.7073 | 0.6484 |
|  | 500 | 100.41 | 100.24 |  |  |  |  |
| Mean |  | 100.28 | 100.25 |  |  |  |  |
| AMB | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \\ & 60 \\ & 60 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 99.57 \\ 100.44 \\ 97.30 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100.46 \\ 99.01 \\ 99.61 \end{gathered}$ | 1.6211 | 0.7285 | 1.6358 | 0.7308 |
| Mean |  | 99.10 | 99.73 |  |  |  |  |
| LEV | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 5 \\ & 5 \\ & 5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 101.66 \\ 100.37 \\ 99.21 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 99.61 \\ 98.48 \\ 100.72 \end{gathered}$ | 1.2255 | 1.1200 | 1.2205 | 1.1244 |
| Mean |  | 100.41 | 99.60 |  |  |  |  |
| PSE | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \\ & 30 \\ & 30 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100.46 \\ 99.96 \\ 99.63 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100.12 \\ 100.08 \\ 99.94 \end{gathered}$ | 0.4178 | 0.0945 | 0.4178 | 0.0944 |
| Mean |  | 100.01 | 100.04 |  |  |  |  |

Mean of Six Observations
Table 8 (by Cramer's Rule)-LV-Plus-Recovery

| Drug | Amount Present <br> $(\boldsymbol{\mu g} / \mathbf{t a b})$ | Amount <br> Added <br> $(\boldsymbol{\mu g} / \mathbf{t a b})^{*}$ | Amount Estimated <br> $(\boldsymbol{\mu g} / \mathbf{t a b})^{*}$ | Amount Recovered <br> $(\boldsymbol{\mu g} / \mathbf{t a b})^{*}$ | \% Recovered* | SD | \% RSD | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 12 | 19.20 | 31.2461 | 19.2461 | 100.24 |  |  |  |
| PARA | 12 | 24.00 | 36.0048 | 24.0048 | 100.02 | 0.1160 | 0.1159 | 0.0072 |
|  | 12 | 28.80 | 40.8124 | 28.8124 | 100.04 |  |  |  |
|  | 12 | 19.20 | 31.2248 | 19.2248 | 100.12 |  |  |  |
| AMB | 12 | 24.00 | 35.9612 | 23.9618 | 99.83 | 0.1450 | 0.1448 | 0.0161 |
|  | 12 | 28.80 | 407942 | 28.7942 | 99.97 |  |  |  |
|  | 12 | 19.20 | 31.1811 | 19.1811 | 99.90 |  |  |  |
| LEVO | 12 | 24.00 | 36.1041 | 24.1041 | 100.43 | 0.2516 | 0.2512 | 0.0279 |
|  | 12 | 28.80 | 40.8662 | 28.8662 | 100.20 |  |  |  |
|  | 12 | 19.20 | 31.1992 | 19.1992 | 99.99 |  |  |  |
| PSE | 12 | 24.00 | 36.0042 | 24.0042 | 100.02 | 0.0208 | 0.0208 | 0.0023 |
|  | 12 | 28.80 | 40.7994 | 28.7994 | 99.98 |  |  |  |

## > Mean of Three Observations

(Paracetamol, AmbroxolHydrochloride)
Table 9 (by Gauss-Jorden Elimination Method)-Paracetamol, Ambroxol Hydrochloride

| Drug | SampleNo. | LabeledAmount <br> $(\mathbf{m g} / \mathbf{t a b})$ | AmountFound <br> $(\mathbf{m g} / \mathbf{t a b})$ | Percentage <br> Obtained | Average(\%) | SD | \% RSD | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 500 | 501.87 | 100.37 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2 | 500 | 499.58 | 99.91 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3 | 500 | 502.50 | 100.50 |  |  |  |  |
| PAR | 4 | 500 | 504.16 | 100.83 | 100.17 | $0 . .4724$ | 0.4716 | 0.0131 |


|  | 5 | 500 | 499.66 | 99.83 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 6 | 500 | 497.91 | 99.58 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 60 | 60.0833 | 100.13 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2 | 60 | 59.1666 | 98.61 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3 | 60 | 61.2500 | 102.08 |  |  |  |  |
| AMB | 4 | 60 | 60.6033 | 101.00 | 100.47 | 1.3697 | 1.3632 | 0.0380 |
|  | 5 | 60 | 59.5866 | 99.31 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6 | 60 | 61.0400 | 101.73 |  |  |  |  |

## > Mean of Six Observations

Table 10 (by Gauss-Jorden Elimination Method) (Levocitrizine Dihydrochloride, Pseudoephedrine Hydrochloride)

| Drug | Sample No. | Labeled <br> Amount(mg/tab) | Amount <br> Found (mg/tab) | Percentage <br> obtained | Average <br> $(\%)$ | SD | \% RSD | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 | 5 | 4.9366 | 98.73 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2 | 5 | 5.0600 | 101.20 |  |  |  |  |
| LEV | 3 | 5 | 5.0200 | 100.40 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4 | 5 | 4.9760 | 99.53 | 100.11 | 1.2483 | 1.2478 | 0.0396 |
|  | 5 | 5 | 5.0833 | 101.66 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6 | 5 | 4.9366 | 98.73 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 | 30 | 29.5833 | 98.61 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2 | 30 | 30.8333 | 102.17 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3 | 30 | 30.4166 | 101.38 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3 | 30 | 30.5833 | 98.61 | 100.11 | 1.5001 | 1.4985 | 0.0416 |
|  | 5 | 30 | 29.7916 | 99.30 |  |  |  |  |

> Mean of Six Observations
Table 11 (by Gauss-Jorden EliminationMethod)-LV-Plus-Recovery

| Drug | Amount <br> Present <br> $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathbf{t a b})$ | Amount <br> Added <br> $(\boldsymbol{\mu g} / \mathbf{t a b})^{*}$ | Amount <br> Estimated <br> $(\boldsymbol{\mu g} / \mathbf{t a b})^{*}$ | Amount Recovered <br> $(\boldsymbol{\mu g} / \mathbf{t a b})^{*}$ | \% Recovered* | SD | \% RSD | SE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 12 | 19.20 | 31.2012 | 19.2012 | 100.01 |  |  |  |
| PARA | 12 | 24.00 | 36.0048 | 24.1042 | 100.43 | 0.2484 | 0.2481 | 0.0276 |
|  | 12 | 28.80 | 40.7994 | 28.7994 | 99.99 |  |  |  |
|  | 12 | 19.20 | 31.1990 | 19.1990 | 99.99 |  |  |  |
| AMB | 12 | 24.00 | 36.1016 | 24.1016 | 100.42 | 0.2930 | 0.2928 | 0.0325 |
|  | 12 | 28.80 | 40.7614 | 28.7614 | 99.86 |  |  |  |
|  | 12 | 19.20 | 31.1976 | 19.1976 | 99.98 |  |  |  |
| LEVO | 12 | 24.00 | 36.0028 | 24.0028 | 100.02 | 0.0305 | 0.0305 | 0.0033 |
|  | 12 | 28.80 | 40.7897 | 28.7897 | 99.96 |  |  |  |
|  | 12 | 19.20 | 31.1924 | 19.1924 | 99.96 |  |  |  |
| PSE | 12 | 24.00 | 36.1010 | 24.0010 | 100.42 | 0.2478 | 0.2475 | 0.0275 |
|  | 12 | 28.80 | 40.8107 | 28.8107 | 100.03 |  |  |  |

> Mean of Three Observations
Table 12 (LV-Plus)-(by Gauss-Jorden Elimination Method)

| Drug | Amountlabeled (mg/tab) | PercentageObtained* |  | SD |  | \%RSD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Intraday | Interday | Intraday | Interday | Intraday | Interday |
|  | 500 | 100.83 | 99.61 |  |  |  |  |
| PARA | 500 | 99.63 | 100.91 | 0.7076 | 0.6501 | 0.7073 | 0.6484 |
|  | 500 | 100.41 | 100.24 |  |  |  |  |
| Mean |  | 100.28 | 100.25 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 60 | 99.57 | 100.46 |  |  |  |  |
| AMB | 60 | 100.44 | 99.01 | 1.6211 | 0.7285 | 1.6358 | 0.7308 |
|  | 60 | 97.30 | 99.61 |  |  |  |  |
| Mean |  | 99.10 | 99.73 |  |  |  |  |


|  | 5 | 101.66 | 99.61 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEV | 5 | 100.37 | 98.48 | 1.2255 | 1.1200 | 1.2205 | 1.1244 |
|  | 5 | 99.21 | 100.72 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Mean | 100.41 | 99.60 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 30 | 100.46 | 100.12 |  |  |  |  |
| PSE | 30 | 99.96 | 100.08 | 0.4178 | 0.0945 | 0.4178 | 0.0944 |
|  | 30 | 99.63 | 99.94 |  |  |  |  |
| Mean |  | 100.01 | 100.04 |  |  |  |  |

> Mean of Six Observations

- UV Spectra of Paracetamol ( $10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{Ml}$ )


Fig 1 UV- Spectra of Paracetamol ( $10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{Ml}$ )

- UV Spectra of Ambroxol Hydrochloride ( $10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ )

- UV Spectra of Levocetirizine Dihydrochloride ( $10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ )


Fig 3 UV- Spectra of LVD

- UV Spectra of Pseudoephedrine Hydrochloride ( $10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ )


Fig.4. UV- Spectra of PHE

- Overline Specturm of Paracetamol, Ambroxol Hydrocholoride, Levocetirizine Dihydrocholoride and Pseudoephedrine Hrdrochloride


Fig 5 Overlain Spectra of PARA, AMB, LVD, PHE

