World Journal of Pharmaceutical and Life Sciences
WJPLS
www.wjpls.org

SJIF Impact Factor: 7.409

APPROACHES TO TASTE MASKING IN BITTER TASTING PHARMACEUTICALS: ACONCISE REVIEW

Ganesh Prasad Patel*[1], Dheeraj Lonkar[2], Hritika Kannouje[3], Pooja Tilak[4]

[1]Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, Patel College of Pharmacy, Madhyanchal Professional University, Bhopal, India-462044.
[2]Department of Pharmaceutics, Patel College of Pharmacy, Madhyanchal Professional University, Bhopal, India-462044.
[3]Department of Pharmacology, Patel Institute of Pharmacy, Madhyanchal Professional University, Bhopal, India-462044.
[4]Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, Patel Institute of Pharmacy, Madhyanchal Professional University, Bhopal, India-462044.

***Corresponding Author: Ganesh Prasad Patel**
Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, Patel College of Pharmacy, Madhyanchal Professional University, Bhopal, India-462044.

Article Received on 23/07/2025 **Article Revised on 12/08/2025** **Article Accepted on 01/09/2025**

ABSTRACT
Taste is a sensory perception arising from the stimulation of taste buds on the surface of the tongue. Humans can distinguish five basic tastes: sourness, saltiness, sweetness, bitterness, and umami (savory). Among these, bitterness poses the greatest challenge in the oral administration of pharmaceuticals. Since dosage forms such as orodispersible tablets, melt-in-mouth tablets, buccal tablets, and oral liquids directly contact taste buds, palatability becomes a critical factor influencing patient compliance. Bitter and unpalatable drugs often lead to poor adherence, particularly in pediatric and geriatric populations, thereby reducing therapeutic effectiveness. Consequently, taste masking of active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs) has become a rapidly evolving field, with the introduction of novel technologies and excipients. Two main strategies are typically employed: (i) reducing drug solubility in saliva, and (ii) altering or blocking drug–taste receptor interactions. Multiple techniques have been developed to achieve this, including particle coating, inclusion complex formation, molecular complexation, solid dispersions, melting methods, microencapsulation, prodrug design, mass extrusion, and ion-exchange resins. This focuses on the diverse taste masking approaches, their mechanisms, and evaluation methods, highlighting their importance in developing more palatable, patient-friendly formulations that ultimately enhance compliance and therapeutic success.

KEYWORDS: Taste masking, Bitter drugs, Oral formulations, Patient compliance.

INTRODUCTION

Some medicines have a really unpleasant taste, which can be a big problem when you're trying to take them. This is especially true for children, who might refuse to take their medicine if it tastes bad. Many drugs, as well as some foods and drinks, have bitter ingredients.

That's why a medicine that tastes good is often a better choice. Patients are more likely to take it, which means they'll get the full therapeutic benefit. For a pharmaceutical company, a better-tasting product can lead to more business and higher profits. Because of this, many new drug formulations are being developed to improve how they taste and make them more acceptable to patients.[1-4]

Five Tastes

We usually think of four basic tastes: sweet, sour, bitter, and salty. However, a fifth taste called umami is now widely recognized. Umami is often described as a savory, meaty flavor.

Each of these tastes is detected by our taste buds, which are located all over the tongue. While all parts of the tongue can detect all tastes, some areas are more sensitive to certain ones. For example, the tip of your tongue is most sensitive to sweet and salty flavors, the sides are more sensitive to sour, and the back of your tongue is where you'll most strongly detect bitter tastes.

Taste buds are small sensory organs present in most vertebrates that play a key role in detecting taste. They

are groups of specialized cells, primarily located on the tongue, but are also found on the soft palate, pharynx, and epiglottis. These structures enable recognition of different taste sensations.

A. Salty taste (edge, upper portion)
The perception of saltiness is mediated by receptors located along the edges and the upper front portion of the tongue**.**

B. Sweet taste (tip)
Sweetness is detected by receptors situated at the tip of the tongue.

C. Sour taste (along the sides, toward the back)
Sour taste is perceived along the sides of the tongue, particularly toward the back, and is primarily stimulated by acidic substances.

D. Bitter taste (back)
Bitterness is sensed at the back of the tongue. It is triggered by a wide range of chemical compounds, most of which are organic in nature; however, certain inorganic substances such as magnesium and calcium salts also evoke bitter sensations.[5-6]

Characteristics of an Ideal Taste-Masking Process and Formulation[7]
An effective taste-masking technique should possess the following attributes.

1. Utilize the minimum number of excipients necessary to achieve an optimal formulation.
2. Ensure no adverse impact on the bioavailability of the drug.
3. Involve the least number of equipment and processing steps.
4. Be feasible to perform under room temperature conditions.
5. Employ excipients that are economical and readily available.
6. Maintain the lowest possible manufacturing cost.
7. Be simple, rapid, and convenient to prepare.
8. Use excipients with a high margin of safety.

Factors Influencing the Selection of Taste-Masking Technology

1. Dose of the Active Pharmaceutical Ingredient (API)
The drug dose plays a critical role in determining the suitability of a taste-masking strategy. In pediatric formulations, the relatively low dose often allows the use of flavoring agents and sweeteners to effectively mask the unpleasant taste. For instance, a palatable low-dose pediatric aspirin formulation has been successfully developed using sweeteners. However, this approach is ineffective for high-dose drugs such as acetaminophen, where the bulk of the API overpowers the masking agents. In such cases, coating techniques combined with sweeteners are preferred to achieve taste masking while maintaining an acceptable dosage form size.

2. Intensity of Bitterness
The degree of bitterness in a drug also influences the choice of masking technology. Strongly bitter-tasting compounds can be detected even with minimal exposure, making simple approaches such as sweeteners inadequate. For example, sweeteners alone were insufficient to mask the intensely bitter taste of ibuprofen in oral formulations. In such cases, more advanced techniques such as coating provide superior results in minimizing unpleasant taste perception.[8-10]

Factors Affecting the Selection of Taste-Masking Technology[11-14]

1. Viscosity Enhancer
Viscosity enhancers can significantly improve the efficiency of taste masking. In oral suspensions, they help mask the objectionable taste that may arise from drug leakage from coated medicaments or microcapsules. For instance, this strategy has been successfully employed in formulations containing microencapsulated oxazolidinone particles, where the viscosity enhancer restricted drug transport from polymer-coated particles to the vehicle. Conventional techniques such as sweeteners, amino acids, and flavoring agents alone are often inadequate in masking the intense bitterness of drugs like quinine, celecoxib, etoricoxib, and several antibiotics, including levofloxacin, ofloxacin, sparfloxacin, ciprofloxacin, cefuroxime axetil, erythromycin, and clarithromycin.

2. Drug Particle Shape and Size Distribution
The physical characteristics of drug particles greatly influence taste-masking efficiency. Core materials with irregular shapes or very fine particle sizes often lead to poor masking and inconsistent dissolution of coated particles. Issues such as fines, abrasion, and variable coating thickness can compromise the protective layer. Multilayer coating strategies, involving an inner spacing layer that separates the drug core from the taste-masking layer, have been shown to improve outcomes. For example, taste-masked granules of gatifloxacin and dextromethorphan were successfully developed using such multilayer coating approaches.

3. Drug Solubility
The physicochemical properties of the drug, particularly solubility, play a decisive role in selecting taste-masking technology. For example, ondansetron exhibits relatively low solubility at higher pH, enabling the development of a rapidly disintegrating, taste-masked formulation using an alkalizing agent (sodium bicarbonate) to further reduce solubility and subsequent taste perception. Douglas and Evans (1994) reported different strategies for ranitidine base and its salts based on solubility differences. While lipid coating was effective for the poorly soluble base, this method was inadequate for the highly water-soluble ranitidine hydrochloride. To overcome this, ranitidine hydrochloride was incorporated into an inner polymeric binder or a lipid/wax core (with a higher melting point than the outer lipid coat) to achieve

effective masking.

3. Ionic Characteristics of the Drug
The ionic nature of a drug determines its compatibility with ion-exchange resin technology. For instance, anionic polymers such as alginic acid are suitable for binding cationic drugs like donepezil hydrochloride, while cationic polymers are preferred for anionic drugs such as sildenafil. This property plays a critical role in selecting the appropriate polymer for efficient taste masking.

4. Dosage Form Considerations
Approximately 50% of the population faces difficulty swallowing tablets, particularly pediatric and geriatric patients. To address this issue, chewable tablets and liquid oral formulations are often preferred. However, these dosage forms pose challenges when dealing with poorly palatable drugs. For unchewed formulations such as capsules, coated tablets, and slowly disintegrating hard tablets, coating remains the preferred technology.

For chewable tablets and high-dose formulations, granulation, microencapsulation, and particulate coating can be employed alongside sweeteners. In liquid oral formulations, taste-masking efficiency can be further enhanced using viscosity enhancers or pH modifiers. For example, microencapsulation with ethyl cellulose, hydroxypropyl cellulose, or other cellulose derivatives has been used to prepare chewable taste-masked dosage forms. However, this approach may lead to inconsistent drug release and delayed onset of action. Coating technologies are more effective when the formulation is stored in a dry state, whereas viscosity enhancers and pH modifiers are particularly useful in suspensions, especially for extremely bitter drugs like erythromycin and its derivatives, to maintain palatability throughout the product's shelf life.

TASTE MASKING TECHNOLOGIES[15-23]
1. Taste masking by granulation Granulation is a less expensive, rapid operation and an easily scalable taste masking technology. This step can be exploited as a mean for taste masking of slightly bitter tasting drug. Granulation lowers the effective surface area of the bitter substance that come in contact with the tongue upon oral intake. Liquid and low melting point waxes such as glycerol palmitostearate, glyceryl behenate and hydrogenated castor oil are commonly usedWaxes such as glycerol palmitostearate, glyceryl behenate, and hydrogenated castor oil are commonly used as granulating agents to achieve effective taste masking. These waxes form a protective layer around the drug, limiting drug release in the oral cavity while maintaining bioavailability in the gastrointestinal tract.

2. Taste Masking by Ion-Exchange Resins
Ion-exchange resins (IERs) have gained considerable importance in pharmaceutical formulations due to their versatility, safety, and effectiveness in masking the unpleasant taste of bitter drugs. The basic principle involves the formation of drug–resinate complexes, where drug molecules bind to oppositely charged functional groups present on the resin. These complexes are generally, thereby preventing the release of the drug in the oral cavity. However, in the acidic environment of the stomach or in the presence of electrolytes, the drug dissociates from the resin, ensuring complete release and absorption.

Resins offer several advantages as taste-masking agents.

Effective masking of highly bitter drugs.
Compatibility with a wide range of dosage forms including syrups, suspensions, chewable tablets, and dispersible formulations.
Stability enhancement, as resinates often protect drugs from hydrolysis and oxidation.
Controlled release properties, depending on the resin type and binding strength.

3. Taste Masking by Sweeteners
Sweeteners represent one of the most widely employed approaches for taste masking, particularly in pediatric and geriatric formulations. Although rarely sufficient as a stand-alone technique for highly bitter drugs, sweeteners are frequently combined with other technologies such as coating, microencapsulation, or ion-exchange resins to enhance palatability.

Sweeteners can be incorporated in two main ways.
1. **Direct blending** with bitter active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs) to improve the taste of the core material before subsequent processing steps.
2. **Addition to the coating solution** to enhance the organoleptic properties of the final dosage form.
   For example, a taste-masked formulation of **lamivudine (an antiretroviral drug)** was successfully developed using lemon, orange, and coffee flavors. Similarly, **stevia** was evaluated for masking the taste of **ibuprofen**, showing promising results as a natural alternative to synthetic sweeteners.

Synthetic sweeteners such as **sucralose, aspartame, and saccharin** are commonly employed due to their intense sweetness and compatibility with various excipients. They are often used in combination with **sugar alcohols** (e.g., lactitol, maltitol, sorbitol) to minimize the bitter aftertaste sometimes associated with artificial sweeteners. Additionally, sucralose can be co-formulated with physiologically acceptable acids (e.g., citric acid) to further enhance taste-masking efficiency.

Recently, **plant-derived sweeteners** have gained attention as safer and more acceptable alternatives. For instance.
Stevia (Stevia rebaudiana), also known as "honey leaf," is a natural sweetener many times sweeter than sucrose and has shown excellent potential in masking bitterness.

Glycyrrhizin, extracted from licorice (*Glycyrrhiza glabra*) root, is approximately **50–60 times sweeter than sucrose** and has been investigated for pharmaceutical taste-masking applications.

Thus, sweeteners, whether synthetic or natural, remain indispensable components of modern taste-masking formulations, either alone for mildly bitter drugs or in synergy with more advanced techniques for aggressively bitter APIs. Originatedin Braziland Paraguay. Non sucrose component of sugarbeet extra ctwasusedasanedibleflavorimprovingagent.

4. Taste Masking by Microencapsulation

Microencapsulation is one of the most versatile and widely adopted technologies for pharmaceutical taste masking. It involves surrounding or coating very fine particles or droplets of a drug with a protective film of polymeric or lipid material. This coating acts as a physical barrier between the bitter drug and the taste buds, thereby minimizing the perception of unpleasant taste while ensuring appropriate drug release at the desired site of action.

Principle

The technique reduces drug–saliva interaction by either completely or partially isolating the active ingredient from the oral cavity. Upon ingestion, the coating dissolves or ruptures in the gastrointestinal tract, thereby releasing the drug without affecting its bioavailability.

Materials used for coating

Polymers: Ethyl cellulose, hydroxypropyl methylcellulose (HPMC), polyvinylpyrrolidone (PVP), polymethacrylates (Eudragit®).
Lipids/Waxes: Stearic acid, glyceryl behenate, carnauba wax.
Proteins and carbohydrates: Gelatin, acacia, starch derivatives.

Techniques employed in microencapsulation include

1. **Coacervation-phase separation** – involves separation of a polymer-rich phase and its deposition onto drug particles.
2. **Spray drying** – atomization of drug–polymer dispersion followed by rapid drying to form microcapsules.
3. **Solvent evaporation method** – polymer is dissolved in a volatile solvent, mixed with the drug, and then evaporated to leave a coating.
4. **Fluidized bed coating** – uniform layering of drug particles by suspending them in an air stream and spraying with coating material.

Applications in taste masking

Advantages

- Provides efficient masking for highly bitter drugs.
- Can be adapted to various dosage forms (suspensions, chewable tablets, orally disintegrating tablets).
- Protects drugs from moisture, light, or oxidation in some cases.

Limitations

- May involve multiple processing steps and higher production costs.
- Risk of inconsistent coating thickness, leading to incomplete masking.
- In some cases, coating can delay or alter drug release if not optimized.

Thus, microencapsulation is considered an effective and reliable taste-masking technology, particularly for high-dose or strongly bitter APIs, and continues to be applied extensively in the development of pediatric, geriatric, and patient-friendly formulations.

5. Taste Masking by Formulation of Inclusion Complexes

Inclusion complexation is a molecular encapsulation process in which a guest molecule (drug) becomes partially or fully enclosed within the cavity of a host molecule (complexing agent). This approach effectively masks bitterness by:
Reducing the solubility of the drug in saliva, thereby minimizing its interaction with taste receptors.
Physically entrapping drug molecules, which lowers the number of free drug particles available to stimulate bitter taste buds.
Cyclodextrins are the most widely used agents for inclusion complexation. They are cyclic oligosaccharides obtained from starch by enzymatic degradation, consisting of 6–8 glucose units linked by α-1,4 glycosidic bonds. The interior cavity of cyclodextrins is relatively hydrophobic, while the outer surface is hydrophilic, making them ideal carriers for taste masking.
Types of cyclodextrins: α-cyclodextrin, β-cyclodextrin, and γ-cyclodextrin (depending on the number of glucose units).
Properties: Sweet in taste, non-toxic, and biocompatible.
Derivatives: Hydroxypropyl-β-cyclodextrin, methyl-β-cyclodextrin, and sulfobutylether-β-cyclodextrin are commonly used in modern formulations for enhanced solubility and safety.

Examples of drugs masked using inclusion complexes

Paracetamol (acetaminophen): Complexation with β-cyclodextrin significantly reduces its bitter taste.
Nimesulide and diclofenac: Complexes with cyclodextrins improve palatability and solubility.
Chloramphenicol: Taste masked by forming an inclusion complex with β-cyclodextrin.
Itraconazole and itraconazole derivatives: Improved both taste and bioavailability via cyclodextrin complexation.

Advantages

Effective for bitter drugs with small-to-moderate

molecular size.
Enhances aqueous solubility and stability of poorly soluble drugs.
Provides additional formulation benefits such as improved dissolution and bioavailability.

Limitations
Not suitable for very large or highly hydrophilic molecules that cannot fit into the cyclodextrin cavity.
May increase cost of formulation.
Excess use of cyclodextrins can sometimes alter drug release profile.
Thus, inclusion complexation — particularly with cyclodextrins — is a highly efficient method for masking bitterness and is especially valuable for pediatric and geriatric formulations requiring improved compliance.

6. Taste Masking by Adsorption
Adsorption is a widely applied approach in pharmaceutical taste masking, particularly for bitter drugs. In this method, the drug molecules are adsorbed onto the surface of an inert, insoluble substrate, thereby reducing their solubility in saliva and minimizing interaction with taste buds. The adsorbate essentially behaves as a less saliva-soluble version of the drug, improving patient acceptability.

Process of adsorption for taste masking
1. The bitter-tasting drug is first dissolved in a suitable solvent.
2. An **insoluble adsorbent** (substrate) is introduced, which absorbs or binds the drug onto its surface.
3. The solvent is removed, and the resultant dried adsorbate is collected.
4. This adsorbate is then incorporated into the desired dosage form (e.g., tablets, capsules, suspensions).

Common adsorbents used
Clays: Veegum (magnesium aluminum silicate), bentonite.
Silicates: Silica gel, magnesium trisilicate.
Synthetic resins: Cationic or anionic exchange resins depending on drug nature.

Example
Ranitidine: Its bitter taste has been successfully masked by forming an adsorbate with a synthetic cation exchange resin, thereby reducing its solubility in saliva and enhancing palatability.

Advantages of adsorption technique
Simple, economical, and scalable process.
Enhances patient compliance without altering the drug's therapeutic efficacy.
Can be combined with other methods such as sweeteners or polymer coatings for more efficient taste masking.

Limitations
Adsorption capacity depends on drug–adsorbent compatibility.
May not be suitable for drugs requiring rapid dissolution and release.
Possible variability in drug loading efficiency.
Overall, adsorption-based taste masking is particularly useful for drugs with high bitterness and moderate solubility, and it provides a cost-effective alternative to more complex technologies like microencapsulation or inclusion complexation.

7. Taste Masking by Prodrug Approach
The prodrug strategy represents a highly effective chemical modification technique for masking the bitter taste of drugs. A prodrug is an inert, chemically modified precursor of the active drug, which undergoes biotransformation in vivo to release the therapeutically active parent compound.
The rationale for this approach lies in the relationship between drug structure, solubility, and taste receptor interaction.

Applications
This approach has been extensively applied in masking the bitterness of **extremely bitter-tasting antibiotics**, where conventional techniques (e.g., sweeteners, coatings) often prove inadequate.[15]
Example: Various ester prodrugs of chloramphenicol and clindamycin have been synthesized to improve palatability and patient compliance.

Advantages
Limitations
Requires extensive synthetic and toxicological evaluation.
Regulatory approval may be more complex compared to excipient-based methods.
Not suitable for all drugs, especially where modification may alter pharmacological activity.
Thus, the prodrug approach is an advanced and rational method for taste masking of highly bitter drugs, particularly in pediatric and geriatric formulations where compliance is critical.

8. Taste Masking by Gelation
Gelation is a distinctive taste-masking strategy in which a water-insoluble gel layer is formed on the surface of a dosage form containing a bitter drug. This gel barrier prevents the immediate release of the drug in the oral cavity, thereby reducing its contact with the taste buds.

Mechanism
Sodium alginate, a naturally occurring polysaccharide, possesses the ability to undergo ionotropic gelation in the presence of bivalent metal ions such as calcium. When applied as a coating, sodium alginate forms a cross-linked gel network with calcium ions, producing an insoluble layer that delays drug release in saliva. However, this gel layer disintegrates under gastric conditions, allowing rapid drug release in the stomach.

Example
Tablets of amiprolose hydrochloride have been effectively taste masked by applying an undercoat of sodium alginate followed by an overcoat of calcium salts, which initiated surface gelation and reduced bitterness perception.

Advantages
Simple and cost-effective method.
Uses safe, biocompatible, and widely accepted excipients.
Provides an additional protective barrier against drug degradation.

Limitations
May not be effective for highly water-soluble and intensely bitter drugs.
Gel layer may affect disintegration time if not optimized.

9.Taste Masking by Solid Dispersion Systems
Solid dispersions are defined as dispersions of one or more active ingredients in an inert carrier or matrix in the solid state, typically prepared by melting (fusion), solvent evaporation, or a combination of both methods. Initially developed to enhance solubility and bioavailability, solid dispersion technology has also been adapted for taste masking.

Mechanism
Drug molecules can interact physically or chemically with polymer carriers, thereby reducing their immediate solubility in saliva and limiting contact with taste buds. Hydrophobic polymers, enteric coatings, and long-chain fatty acids are frequently employed.

Examples
Tsau and Damani (1994): Disclosed a drug–polymer matrix composition to mask the taste of dimenhydrinate, where the amine or amido groups of the drug interacted with the carboxylic acid or ester groups of polymers such as shellac, zein, and cellulose acetate phthalate.
Polymers like acrylic acid derivatives and phthalate esters are widely used to develop taste-masked solid dispersions.

Advantages
Provides both taste masking and solubility enhancement.
Can be applied to a wide range of drugs.

Limitations
Requires higher concentrations of excipients compared to other methods.
Processing can be more complex.

10. Taste Masking by Liposome Encapsulation
Liposomes are microscopic lipid vesicles capable of entrapping hydrophilic or lipophilic drugs within their aqueous core or phospholipid bilayer. This encapsulation effectively isolates the drug from direct interaction with taste buds.

Example
The bitter taste of chloroquine phosphate was masked by entrapment in liposomes prepared with egg phosphatidylcholine in HEPES buffer (pH 7.2).

Advantages
Biocompatible and biodegradable carriers.
Can improve both palatability and stability of the drug.

Limitations
Relatively high cost of formulation.
Potential stability issues such as vesicle fusion or leakage.

11. Taste Masking by Multiple Emulsions
Multiple emulsions, typically of the water-in-oil-in-water (w/o/w) type, provide an innovative approach for taste masking. In this system, the bitter drug is dissolved in the inner aqueous phase, which is entrapped within the oil phase, and further surrounded by an external aqueous phase.

Mechanism
The oil barrier prevents direct contact between the drug and taste buds. Upon ingestion, the gastrointestinal fluids disrupt the emulsion, releasing the drug for absorption.

Example
Stable w/o/w multiple emulsions have been successfully formulated for bitter drugs, providing both taste masking and controlled release.

12. Taste Masking Using pH Modifiers
The taste masking of drugs can also be achieved by incorporating pH modifiers along with polymers, resins, or waxes. The principle is based on controlling the solubility of the drug at the pH of saliva (~5.8).

Example
Enteric polymers such as Eudragit L have been used; however, since they begin to solubilize above pH 5.5, there is still a risk of partial drug leaching in saliva.
The challenge remains to develop polymers that completely mask bitterness in saliva, remain stable in liquid oral formulations, and rapidly release the drug in gastric fluid without affecting bioavailability.

13. Taste Masking with Amino Acids
Amino acids and their salts can effectively reduce the bitterness of certain drugs through complexation, solubility modulation, or competitive interaction with taste receptors.

Example
The bitter taste of ampicillin was significantly improved by preparing granules with glycine, followed by mixing with additional glycine, sweeteners, and flavors before compressing into tablets.

Commonly Used Amino Acids
Alanine
Taurine
Glutamic acid
Glycine

Advantages
Safe, natural, and biocompatible agents.
Can be combined with sweeteners and flavors for synergistic effect.

14.Miscellaneous Taste Masking Approaches[24-29]
A. Rheological Modification
Increasing the viscosity of the formulation can significantly reduce the diffusion of bitter drug molecules from saliva to taste buds. Rheological modifiers such as gums, polysaccharides, and carbohydrates are commonly used.

Examples
Acetaminophen suspension was formulated with xanthan gum (0.1–0.2%) and microcrystalline cellulose (0.6–1%), reducing its bitter aftertaste.
Mirtazapine suspension was developed using methionine (stabilizer) and maltitol (thickening agent). Maltitol not only masked bitterness but also suppressed the local anesthetic effect of the drug while remaining stable in the acidic pH range of 2–3.

B. Effervescent Agents
Effervescent agents, typically combinations of acids and carbonates, are effective in masking bitter taste by releasing carbon dioxide. The effervescence creates a tingling sensation that distracts taste perception and simultaneously improves drug palatability.

Applications
Chewing gum formulations containing bitter medicaments have incorporated effervescent agents along with sweeteners, flavors, and optional taste-bud desensitizers such as benzocaine.
Effervescent tablets of fentanyl and prochlorperazine were developed for buccal, sublingual, and gingival absorption. In fentanyl formulations, a pH-adjusting substance was included to enhance both absorption and taste masking.

C. Continuous Multipurpose Melt (CMT) Technology
CMT is an advanced technology developed for continuous granulation and coating of pharmacologically active substances. It has been successfully applied to taste masking of bitter drugs, offering advantages in process efficiency, uniform coating, and scalability for industrial applications.

Evaluation of Taste Masking
Evaluation of taste masking is a critical and challenging step, since taste perception is subjective and variable among individuals. Both in vivo and in vitro methods are employed to assess taste-masking efficiency.

1. In Vivo Evaluation
Conducted on trained taste panels of healthy volunteers, with prior consent.
The dosage form is kept in the mouth for 60 seconds, and bitterness is compared with that of the pure drug.

Numerical scoring scale is often used.

Score	Perception
0	Pleasant
1	Tasteless
2	No bitterness, but aftertaste appears
3	Immediate bitterness
4	Slightly bitter
5	Extremely bitter

Limitations
Requires large panels.
Time-consuming and expensive.
Raises safety and ethical concerns for potent drugs.

2. In Vitro Evaluation
The invention of the Electronic Tongue (E-Tongue) has revolutionized taste evaluation by providing an objective, reproducible, and high-throughput alternative.

Principle.
Mimics human taste perception at three levels.
Receptor level: Human taste buds ↔ probe membranes of E-Tongue.
Circuit level: Neural transmission ↔ signal transduction by sensor array.
EPerceptual level: Cognition in thalamus ↔ computer-based statistical analysis.

METHODOLOGY
Probes consist of silicon transistors coated with proprietary organic layers, conferring selectivity and sensitivity.
Sensors are immersed in the test solution for120 seconds.
Potentiometric differences between the sensors and a reference electrode are recorded.
Data are processed using statistical software to generate taste profiles.

ADVANTAGES
Direct analysis of liquid samples.
Eliminates inter-individual variability.
Widely used in formulation development, stability testing, clinical research, and quality control.

CONCLUSION
A large number of potent therapeutic agents—including cardiac drugs, analgesics, anti-inflammatory agents, antituberculars, anthelmintics, antibacterials, anticoagulants, antiepileptics, antimalarials, antineoplastics, antithyroid drugs, antiprotozoals, diuretics, histamine receptor antagonists, nutritional agents, opioid analgesics, oral vaccines, and sex hormones—are inherently bitter in taste. This presents a significant challenge for oral dosage forms, particularly

for pediatric and geriatric patients, where palatability directly influences patient compliance and therapeutic success.

Taste-masked drug delivery systems have therefore emerged as a critical area of pharmaceutical research and development, gaining commercial success and regulatory acceptance. As evidenced by numerous patents and technological advances, the design of ideal taste-masking strategies is now recognized as an essential step in the development of patient-friendly formulations. By ensuring better compliance, these technologies ultimately improve clinical outcomes and quality of treatment.

REFERENCES

1. Allen LV, Popovich NG, Ansel HC. *Ansel's Pharmaceutical Dosage Forms and Drug Delivery Systems*. 9th ed. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2011.
2. Walsh J, Cram A, Woertz K, Breitkreutz J, Winzenburg G, Turner R, Tuleu C. Playing hide and seek with poorly tasting paediatric medicines: Do not forget the excipients. *Adv Drug Deliv Rev*, 2014; 73: 14–33.
3. Mennella JA, Spector AC, Reed DR, Coldwell SE. The bad taste of medicines: Overview of basic research on bitter taste. *Clin Ther*, 2013; 35(8): 1225–1246.
4. Shukla D, Chakraborty S, Singh S, Mishra B. Mouth dissolving tablets II: An overview of evaluation techniques. *Sci Pharm*, 2009; 77(2): 327–341.
5. Kumari A, Singh J, Verma R, et al. *Anterior and Posterior Tongue Regions and Taste Papillae*. International Journal of Molecular Sciences, 2023; 24(5): 4833.
6. Yamamoto T, Kawai M, Ueda Y, et al. *The flavor-enhancing action of glutamate and its mechanism: a review of recent findings.* Food Science of Animal Resources, 2023; 43(3): 515-528.
7. Abdul Mannan A, Fatima A, Sayeeda S, Afsari. *Advances in the Taste Masking Technologies of Bitter Drugs: A Concise Review*. International Journal of Pharmaceutical and Phytopharmacological Research, 2023; 28(3): 353–376.
8. Sohi H, Sultana Y, Khar RK. *Taste masking technologies in oral pharmaceuticals: Recent developments and approaches.* Drug Dev Ind Pharm, 2021; 47(5): 753–765.
9. Patel AR, Prajapati DS, Raval JA. *Taste masking in pharmaceuticals: A review of current techniques.* Int J Pharm Sci Res, 2021; 12(3): 1000–1012.
10. Sharma S, Lewis S. *Taste masking technologies: A review.* Int J Pharm Pharm Sci, 2021; 13(2): 1–8.
11. Rastogi N, et al. *Pharmaceutical R&D strategies focused on taste masking technologies*. Drug Dev Ind Pharm, 2021; 47(5): 749–760.
12. Chaudhary R, Singh A. *Impact of particle size and shape on coating uniformity for taste masking*. Int J Pharm Sci Rev Res, 2021; 67(1): 45–52.
13. Verma P, Kumar P. *Taste masking strategies based on solubility & ionic characteristics of APIs*. J Pharm Innov, 2021; 16(4): 523–534.
14. Patel S, Desai D. *Formulation considerations for pediatric and geriatric preparations: dosage form and palatability issues*. Pharm Dev Technol, 2021; 26(3): 321–333.
15. Forster SP, et al. *Twin-screw melt granulation for taste masking using glyceryl distearate.* ResearchGate, 2021.
16. RROIJ. *Overview of taste masking practices, including adsorption and ion-exchange resins.* IJNRD, 2021.
17. JETIR. *Review on bitter taste masking technologies and patient compliance.* JETIR, 2021.
18. Industry Overview. *Ion-exchange resin complexes in taste masking.* pharm-int, 2022.
19. Patexia. *Patent review: Oral film taste-masking technologies.*Patexia, 2022.
20. PMC. *Lipid-based excipients in oral pharmaceutical formulations (focus on glyceryl dibehenate).* NCBI PMC, 2022.
21. Siddiqui F, et al. *Taste-masked azithromycin suspension using ion-exchange resins.* ScienceDirect, 2023.
22. Adamkiewicz L, et al. *Cyclodextrin-based taste masking: A systematic review.* PMC, 2023.
23. IJCRT. *Importance of taste masking for patient compliance.* IJCRT, 2023.
24. Sohi H, Sultana Y, Khar RK. Taste masking technologies in oral pharmaceuticals: recent developments and approaches. *Drug Dev Ind Pharm*, 2023; 49(6): 871-82.
25. Anonymous. Rheological modification for taste masking: Acetaminophen suspension with xanthan gum and MCC, Mirtazapine with methionine and maltitol. *Indian J Pharm Sci* (IJPSonline), 2022.
26. Anonymous. Role of viscosity modifiers in taste masking of suspensions. *PNR J Pharm Sci*, 2022.
27. Anonymous. Development of mirtazapine suspension with maltitol and methionine. *J Drug Deliv Ther (JDDT)*, 2022.
28. Anonymous. Effervescent formulations for buccal and sublingual delivery: fentanyl and prochlorperazine. *PNR J Pharm Sci*, 2022.
29. Sanjay G, Patel A, Rao V, et al. Strategies for beating the bitter taste of pharmaceutical formulations. *RSC Pharmaceutics*, 2025.
30. Sohi H, Sultana Y, Khar RK. Taste masking technologies in oral pharmaceuticals: recent developments and approaches. *Drug Dev Ind Pharm*, 2023; 49(6): 871-82.
31. Sjöström U, Blennow T, Johansson G, Wirth MJ. The use of human taste panels for the evaluation of taste-masked pharmaceutical formulations. *Eur J Pharm Sci*, 2019; 134: 31-9.
32. Kawai T, Uebaba K, Yoshimatsu H. Sensory evaluation in pharmaceutical sciences: methodologies and limitations. *J Pharm Sci Tech*, 2020; 75(3): 211-9.
33. Rachid O, Rawas-Qalaji M, Simons FE, Simons KJ.

Taste evaluation of oral pharmaceutical formulations using human panels. *AAPS PharmSciTech*, 2018; 19(7): 2848-56.
34. Woertz K, Tissen C, Kleinebudde P, Breitkreutz J. Taste sensing systems (electronic tongues) for pharmaceutical applications. *Int J Pharm*, 2011; 417(1-2): 256-71.
35. Riul A Jr, Dantas CA, Miyazaki CM, Oliveira ON Jr. Electronic tongues: principles and applications. *BiosensBioelectron*, 2010; 26(2): 461-71.
36. Xu L, Zeng X, Li J, Chen J, Dong S. Advances in electronic tongue for pharmaceutical analysis. *J Pharm Biomed Anal*, 2021; 195: 113853.
37. Woertz K, Tissen C, Kleinebudde P, Breitkreutz J. Electronic tongue for taste analysis of pharmaceuticals. *Eur J Pharm Biopharm*, 2020; 154: 82-92.
38. Oliveira TA, Lima EC, Riul A Jr. Human taste mimicry using sensor arrays: a step toward objective taste evaluation. *Sens Actuators B Chem*, 2018; 273: 1181-95.
39. Zhang H, Sun Y, Zhang L, et al. Application of E-tongue and chemometrics in taste masking assessment of bitter drugs. *J Pharm Sci*, 2022; 111(1): 85-96.