

A New Model-Based Approach for the Development of Freeze-Drying Cycles Using a Small-Scale Freeze-Dryer

*Original*

A New Model-Based Approach for the Development of Freeze-Drying Cycles Using a Small-Scale Freeze-Dryer / Massei, A., Fissore, D.. - In: JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES. - ISSN 1520-6017. - STAMPA. - 112:8(2023), pp. 2176-2189. [10.1016/j.xphs.2023.05.007]

*Availability:*

This version is available at: 11583/2982847 since: 2023-10-08T17:16:29Z

*Publisher:*

elsevier

*Published*

DOI:10.1016/j.xphs.2023.05.007

*Terms of use:*

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

*Publisher copyright*

Elsevier postprint/Author's Accepted Manuscript

© 2023. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license  
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>. The final authenticated version is available online at:  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.xphs.2023.05.007>

(Article begins on next page)

1 *Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*

2 [https://jpharmsci.org/article/S0022-3549\(23\)00194-6/fulltext](https://jpharmsci.org/article/S0022-3549(23)00194-6/fulltext)

3 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xphs.2023.05.007>

4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **A new model-based approach for the development of freeze-drying**  
9 **cycles using a small-scale freeze-dryer**

10  
11 Ambra Massei, Davide Fissore

12  
13 Dipartimento di Scienza Applicata e Tecnologia,

14 Politecnico di Torino,

15 corso Duca degli Abruzzi 24, 10129 Torino

16 **Abstract**

17 This paper presents a model-based approach for the design of the primary drying stage of a freeze-  
18 drying process using a small-scale freeze-dryer (MicroFD<sup>®</sup> by Millrock Technology Inc.).  
19 Gravimetric tests, coupled with a model of the heat transfer to the product in the vials that account  
20 also for the heat exchange between the edge vials and the central vials, are used to infer the heat  
21 transfer coefficient from the shelf to the product in the vial ( $K_v$ ), that is expected to be (almost) the  
22 same in different freeze-dryers. Differently from other approaches previously proposed, the operating  
23 conditions in MicroFD<sup>®</sup> are not chosen to mimic the dynamics of another freeze-dryer: this allows  
24 saving time and resources as no experiments are needed in the large-scale unit, and no additional tests  
25 in the small-scale unit, apart from the three gravimetric tests usually needed to assess the effect of  
26 chamber pressure on  $K_v$ . With respect to the other model parameter,  $R_p$ , the resistance of the dried  
27 cake to mass transfer, it is not influenced by the equipment and, thus values obtained in a freeze-dryer  
28 may be used to simulate the drying in a different unit, provided the same filling conditions are used,  
29 as well as the same operating conditions in the freezing stage, and cake collapse (or shrinkage) is  
30 avoided. The method was validated considering ice sublimation in two types of vials (2R and 6R) and  
31 at different operating conditions (6.7, 13.3 and 26.7 Pa), with the freeze-drying of a 5% w/w sucrose  
32 solution as a test case. An accurate estimate for both  $K_v$  and  $R_p$  was obtained with respect to the values  
33 obtained in a pilot-scale equipment, determined through independent tests for validation purposes.  
34 Simulation of the product temperature and drying time in a different unit was then possible, and  
35 results were validated experimentally.

36

37 **Keywords**

38 Freeze-drying, Micro freeze-dryer, Mathematical modelling, Scale-up, Optimization

39 **List of abbreviations**

40 API Active Pharmaceutical Ingredient

41 FDA Food and Drug Administration

42

43 **Nomenclature**

44  $A$  Mass transfer experimental parameter to determine  $R_p$ ,  $s^{-1}$

45  $A_L$  Exchange area between the LyoSim<sup>®</sup> and the external layer,  $m^2$

46  $A_{v,b}$  Cross-section area of the vial,  $m^2$

47  $A_{v,i}$  Cross-section area of the product in the vial,  $m^2$

48  $A_{12}$  Heat exchange area vial-to-vial,  $m^2$

49  $a_0$  Mass transfer experimental parameter to determine  $r_e/\tau$ ,  $m$

50  $a_1$  Mass transfer experimental parameter to determine  $r_e/\tau$ , -

51  $B$  Mass transfer experimental parameter to determine  $R_p$ ,  $m^{-1}$

52  $C$  Heat transfer experimental parameter to determine  $K_v$ ,  $W m^{-2} K^{-1}$

53  $c_p$  Specific heat of ice,  $J kg^{-1} K^{-1}$

54  $c_w$  Water vapor concentration,  $mol m^{-3}$

55  $D$  Heat transfer experimental parameter to determine  $K_v$ ,  $W m^{-1} K^{-1} Pa^{-1}$

56  $D_e$  Effective Knudsen diffusivity,  $m^2 s^{-1}$

57  $E$  Heat transfer experimental parameter to determine  $K_v$ ,  $Pa^{-1}$

58  $\Delta H_S$  Enthalpy of ice sublimation,  $J kg^{-1}$

59  $I_{xy}$  Convention used to identify the integral,  $K s$

60  $J_q$  Heat flux to the product,  $W m^{-2}$

61  $J_w$  Mass flux,  $kg s^{-1} m^{-2}$

62  $K$  Constant for the calculation of the Knudsen diffusivity,  $m s^{-1} K^{-0.5}$

63  $KK$  Constant for the calculation of the mass transfer resistance  $R_p$ ,  $kg Pa^{-1} s^{-1}$

64	$K_L$	Heat transfer coefficient between the LyoSim <sup>®</sup> and the external layer, $W m^{-2}K^{-1}$
65	$K_v$	Heat transfer coefficient between the shelf and the product in the vial, $W m^{-2}K^{-1}$
66	$K_v^*$	Effective heat transfer coefficient between the shelf and the product in the vial,
67	$W m^{-2}K^{-1}$	
68	$K_{12}$	Heat transfer coefficient between two nearby vials, $W m^{-2}K^{-1}$
69	$K_{12}^*$	Effective heat transfer coefficient between two nearby vials, $W m^{-2}K^{-1}$
70	$L$	Thickness of the product, m
71	$M_w$	Water molecular weight, $kg mol^{-1}$
72	$\Delta m$	Weight loss in the vial during the gravimetric test, kg
73	$m$	Mass of sublimated water at a generic instant, kg
74	$m_{sub}$	Total mass of sublimated water during the process, kg
75	$m_w^*$	Instantaneous amount of sublimated ice mass, kg
76	$\Delta m$	Weight loss in the external vials during the gravimetric test, kg
77	$N_{lat}$	Number of vials directly in contact with the external layer, -
78	$\Delta P$	Water vapor pressure difference, Pa
79	$P_c$	Total chamber pressure, Pa
80	$p_w$	Water vapor partial pressure, Pa
81	$Q$	Total amount of heat received by the product from the shelf, J
82	$Q_{ACC}$	Amount of heat accumulated by the product during the process, J
83	$Q_{base}$	Amount of heat received by the vials from the shelf, J
84	$Q_{LAT}$	Amount of heat exchanged by a central vial with the surrounding ones, J
85	$Q_{LyoSim}$	Amount of heat received by the external layer from the LyoSim <sup>®</sup> , J
86	$Q_{subl}$	Amount of heat lost by the vials due to sublimation, J
87	$R$	Ideal gas constant, $J mol^{-1}K^{-1}$

88	$R_p$	Resistance of the dried cake to the vapor, Pa s m <sup>2</sup> kg <sup>-1</sup>
89	$R_{p,0}$	Mass transfer experimental parameter to determine $R_p$ , m s <sup>-1</sup>
90	$r_e$	Effective pore radius, m
91	$T$	Product temperature profile, K
92	$t$	Time, s
93	$\Delta t$	Duration of the ice sublimation stage, s
94	$T_B$	Temperature of the product at the bottom of the vial, K
95	$T_L$	Temperature of the silicone-based heat transfer fluid is pumped through the ring, K
96	$T_S$	Temperature of the silicone-based heat transfer fluid is pumped through the shelf, K
97		
98	Greeks	
99	$\varepsilon$	Void fraction, -
100	$\lambda$	Thermal conductivity, W m <sup>-1</sup> K <sup>-1</sup>
101	$\rho$	Density, kg m <sup>-3</sup>
102	$\tau$	Tortuosity of the solid matrix, -
103		
104	Subscripts	
105	$c$	Drying chamber
106	<i>dried</i>	Dried product
107	<i>frozen</i>	Frozen product
108	$I$	Interface of sublimation
109	<i>ice</i>	Ice
110	1, ext	External layer of vials
111	2, int	Internal layer of vials
112	—	Mean value



## 114 1. Introduction

115 Freeze-drying is a process widely used to provide physical and chemical stability to  
116 biopharmaceuticals during shipping and long-term storage through three different steps. Firstly, the  
117 containers, usually vials, with the formulation containing the active pharmaceutical ingredient (API),  
118 are loaded into the freeze-dryer. The solution is frozen and, then, water is removed by sublimation  
119 (primary drying) by lowering the pressure and by increasing the temperature of the shelf, as ice  
120 sublimation is endothermic. Lastly, the bounded water is removed (secondary drying) by increasing  
121 again the temperature of the shelf to accelerate water desorption. So, at the end of the freeze-drying  
122 process the active ingredient is locked into a porous solid matrix, which allows for slowing down  
123 chemical-physical degradation reactions.<sup>1,2</sup>

124 The main advantage of freeze-drying over other drying techniques is the ability to treat thermolabile  
125 products since it operates at low pressures and temperatures. However, the freeze-drying is a long  
126 and expensive process. The primary drying is the longest and most critical phase. The aqueous  
127 formulations often contain amorphous or crystalline excipients. Thus, during this step it is necessary  
128 to assure that the product temperature remains below a certain critical value, namely, respectively,  
129 the glass transition temperature or the eutectic temperature, to prevent the collapse of the cake or the  
130 product melting. A careful identification of the design space is required.<sup>3,4</sup> The FDA defined it as “*the*  
131 *multidimensional combination of input variables and process parameters that have been*  
132 *demonstrated to provide assurance of quality*”.<sup>5</sup> Here, the input variables are the operating conditions  
133 of the freeze-drying process: the temperature of the heating fluid and the pressure in the drying  
134 chamber. The adequate combination of these two parameters is often obtained through an extended  
135 experimental campaign with the goal to meet the process needs (i.e. the target residual moisture and  
136 the temperature of the product during processing) and, if possible, to minimize drying time.  
137 Mathematical modeling was proven to be effective to get the design space<sup>6-8</sup>, but, in all cases, the  
138 model parameters,  $K_v$  and  $R_p$ , used to model, respectively, the heat transfer to the product in the vial  
139 and the mass transfer from the product to the chamber, must be estimated experimentally. This is time

140 consuming, due to the length of the cycle, and also the loading/unloading and sample preparation  
141 operations play an important role. Moreover, one challenge for researchers is represented by the  
142 limited availability of the active pharmaceutical ingredient, which is a relevant cost for  
143 pharmaceutical industry.<sup>9,10</sup>

144 To address these issues, a different approach using a small-scale freeze-dryer could be helpful. In  
145 fact, the time required for batch preparation is reduced and the amount of API is minimized in this  
146 case, thus leading to a more rapid drug development stage and, finally, to a faster introduction of  
147 drugs into the market. In this framework it would be really useful to get similar dynamics in the  
148 different situations: laboratory, pilot and manufacturing scale. The major difficulty for the scale-  
149 down/scale-up procedures is given by the intrinsic heterogeneity of the freeze-drying process.<sup>11-13</sup> As  
150 highlighted in previous studies, the heat transfer in a batch does not occur uniformly: the edge vials,  
151 unlike the central ones, are heated by radiation from chamber walls and by conduction in the gas  
152 surrounding the vials.<sup>14,15</sup> As a consequence, the drying time is shorter (and the product temperature  
153 is higher) in the edge vials with respect to the central ones. Also vial packing density may influence  
154 heat transfer to the vials of the batch: this is due to a different number of vials surrounding the  
155 monitored one, that affects the heat transfer to the lateral surface of vials during primary drying as  
156 each vial acts as a “heat sink”, due to ice sublimation that is an endothermic phenomenon, resulting  
157 in a cooling effect.<sup>16</sup> This issue was investigated also by Elhers et al.<sup>17</sup>, who focused also on the inter-  
158 vials distance, pointing out that, in the considered layout, energy transfer by gas conduction enables  
159 the cooling effect of a neighboring vial over a distance up to 10 mm. While in an industrial freeze-  
160 dryer the fraction of edge vials is limited, on a small-scale its impact is significantly greater.<sup>18,15</sup>

161 Obeidat et *al.* developed a prototype version of a mini-freeze dryer with adjustable chamber wall  
162 temperatures able to emulate the behavior in a much larger freeze-dryer by using only 7 vials.<sup>19</sup> Also,  
163 another prototype was investigated by introducing in the drying chamber a cylindrical temperature-  
164 controlled wall. The main limitation of both configurations was the edge vial effect and a non-  
165 consistent batch uniformity with respect to temperature. A different system was proposed by

166 Thompson et *al.*: the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> (Millrock Technology Inc., Kingston, NY).<sup>20</sup> In this equipment the  
167 external vials of the small batch are surrounded by an aluminum ring (LyoSim<sup>®</sup>) whose temperature  
168 may be adjusted independently from that of the shelf. The ring has the role to mimic the presence of  
169 an additional row of vials: by changing its temperature, the edge effect in the batch may be  
170 minimized.<sup>20</sup>

171 Goldman et *al.* investigated this device by loading a batch of 7 vials (20R).<sup>21</sup> They demonstrated the  
172 ability of the MicroFD<sup>®</sup>, through a proper selection of the temperature of the ring, to get a batch  
173 where the dynamics of central or edge vials of a different unit may be reproduced. Other studies of  
174 Fissore et. *al.* evidenced that, by means of a proper tuning of the ring temperature, the dynamics of  
175 central vials of a larger unit may be reproduced and, thus, by means of tests carried out in MicroFD<sup>®</sup>  
176 it was possible to accurately estimate the model parameters  $K_v$  and  $R_p$ , that could be then used to  
177 simulate *in silico* product evolution in a pilot-scale unit (REVO<sup>®</sup> by Millrock Technology Inc.,  
178 Kingson, NY).<sup>9,22</sup> They analyzed 10% w/w sucrose and 5% w/w mannitol aqueous solutions in  
179 different vials (6R and 20R), focusing the study on product temperature and batch drying time. They  
180 assessed that for ring temperature offset values ranging from -1°C to -5°C the product temperature  
181 was very close to the one obtained in the central vials processed in the REVO<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer.

182 It has to be highlighted that in all these studies it was needed to carry out one or more gravimetric  
183 tests in the large-scale unit, to get knowledge about the heat transfer from the chamber to the vial ( $K_v$ )  
184 that, than, has to be replicated in MicroFD<sup>®</sup> by a proper adjustment of the ring temperature, thus  
185 making necessary other gravimetric tests in this unit. Once the equivalence of heat transfer has been  
186 obtained, then product (API) drying may be investigated experimentally in MicroFD<sup>®</sup>, i.e. the effect  
187 of the temperature of the heat transfer fluid pumped through the shelf, commonly referred to as shelf  
188 temperature, and chamber pressure on drying time and product temperature. This method allows using  
189 a small amount of API for cycle development and optimization without the necessity of using a larger  
190 scale freeze-dryer (partially loaded), as few vials are loaded into MicroFD<sup>®</sup>, but time is needed to get  
191  $K_v$  in the large-scale unit, and to find the ring temperature that provides equivalent heat exchange in

192 the MicroFD<sup>®</sup>, although batch preparation time in MicroFD<sup>®</sup> is very short.  
193 This paper shows an innovative method to use the data obtained in MicroFD<sup>®</sup> to design a freeze-  
194 drying cycle for a larger scale unit, without any need for additional tests in this second freeze-dryer,  
195 and without any optimization of the ring temperature. Tests in a larger-scale unit (REVO<sup>®</sup>) were  
196 carried out for validation purposes, but in the proposed pipeline they are not necessary. Unlike before,  
197 gravimetric tests were carried out by always setting the temperature of the heat transfer fluid pumped  
198 through the ring equal to that of the fluid pumped through the shelf: by this way, we are not sure to  
199 be able to get a uniform batch, and to replicate the behavior of any group of vials of a different unit.  
200 Therefore, the model used to process the data encompasses a vial-to-vial heat exchange, thus allowing  
201 to discriminate between the heat exchange from the shelf to the vial, which is expected not to be  
202 influenced by the freeze-dryer, and the heat contribution from the edge vials. Modeling framework is  
203 shown in Section 2 of this paper, while results obtained processing a 5% sucrose solution in different  
204 type of vials (2R and 6R) are presented and discussed in the following Section, aiming to point out  
205 strengths and drawbacks of this approach.

206 It has to be remarked that the proposed method is focused on the central vials of the batch, that  
207 constitute the majority of the batch and are characterized by the longest drying time. The temperature  
208 in the edge vials is higher than in the central ones, and this is usually managed by selecting a proper  
209 safety margin, i.e. lowering the selected temperature of the fluid pumped through the shelf of a  
210 couples of degrees, or setting a target temperature for the central vials a couple of degrees lower than  
211 the effective limit value. In some cases, the edge vials may be empty, in such a way that no safety  
212 margin is needed. In all cases, drying time in edge vials is shorter than in central vials and, thus, this  
213 does not represent an issue when optimizing a cycle.

214

## 215 **2. Materials and Methods**

### 216 *2.1 Freeze-drying units*

217 A laboratory-scale freeze-dryer, namely MicroFD<sup>®</sup>, and a pilot-scale freeze-dryer, namely REVO<sup>®</sup>,

218 by Millrock Technology Inc. (Kingston, NY) were used to carry out the experimental tests.

219 The MicroFD<sup>®</sup> device is characterized by a circular shelf of 6 in diameter. A silicone-based heat  
220 transfer fluid is pumped through the shelf to heat or cool the product (depending on the phase) by  
221 operating at temperatures ranging from -60°C to +60°C. There is an independent thermal circuit,  
222 LyoSim<sup>®</sup>, used to control the temperature of the aluminum ring. The temperature of LyoSim<sup>®</sup> can be  
223 adjusted by setting an offset from the product temperature, measured through thermocouples placed  
224 in some of the vials of the batch, or from the temperature of the fluid pumped through the shelf ( $T_S$ ).  
225 Negative offset values compensate for the additional heat due to the edge effect and allow the  
226 dynamics of central vials of a larger unit to be simulated. The dimensions of LyoSim<sup>®</sup> can be  
227 appropriately adjusted, depending on the type of vials used, in order to guarantee the contact (and,  
228 thus, an efficient heat exchange) between the ring and the external vials of the batch. As an example,  
229 it is possible to load 37 each 2R vials or 19 each 6R vials.

230 The REVO<sup>®</sup> device is a pilot-scale freeze-dryer characterized by up to 12 sq ft of shelf area.  
231 Experiments with 6R vials involved 163 vials arranged according to a hexagonal array: 13 rows  
232 containing either 13 or 12 vials. Instead, for the 2R vials, 245 vials were used: 14 rows containing  
233 either 18 or 17 vials. Figure 1 shows the schematic arrangements of vials for the four kinds of tests  
234 conducted in this study. According to the target of this study, in the REVO<sup>®</sup> device only central vials  
235 are considered for cycle development.

236 Several T-type thermocouples (Tersid, Milano, Italy) were used during the tests in both units, paying  
237 attention to put them in close contact with the vial bottom. In particular, five thermocouples were  
238 used in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> device: two monitored the temperature of the edge vials and the other three  
239 that of the central vials. Instead, three thermocouples were used for the REVO<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer,  
240 monitoring the behavior of the central vials. Temperature probes positioning is also shown in Figure  
241 1. In both devices the chamber pressure was monitored using a capacitive (Baratron 626A, MKS  
242 Instruments, Andover, USA) and a thermal conductivity (Pirani PSG-101-S, Bad Ragaz,  
243 Switzerland) pressure gauge.

244

## 245 *2.2 Product, vials and operating conditions*

246 For the study of the heat transfer process, gravimetric tests were carried out using only water, since  
247 the heat transfer coefficient to the vials does not depend on the product. For the 6R vials the filling  
248 volume was equal to 3 mL, while for the 2R vials it was equal to 1.5 mL. All the vials were weighted  
249 using a XS-BL-224 balance (Nuova Tecnogalenica s.r.l., Cernusco sul Naviglio, Italy) and then  
250 partially stoppered using an igloo stopper (NovaPure Chlorobutyl Igloo Stoppers, West Pharma,  
251 Exton, PA). The offset of LyoSim<sup>®</sup> was set equal to 0°C with respect to  $T_S$  in these gravimetric test,  
252 so the temperature of LyoSim<sup>®</sup> was always equal to  $T_S$ . During the freezing stage,  $T_S$  was set equal to  
253 -50°C. After making sure that the product temperatures, measured by the different thermocouples,  
254 had stabilized at around -50°C, the ice sublimation stage was activated by considering a holding time  
255 of 180 minutes and setting the  $T_S$  at -10°C. In all tests, the shelf cooling rate was set at -1°C/min and  
256 the heating rate at +1°C/min, in both freezing and sublimation stages. At the end of the described  
257 cycle, atmospheric pressure in the chamber was restored and all the vials were manually closed. Then,  
258 each vial was weighted again to calculate the weight loss, so the amount of ice sublimated during the  
259 process. Three different pressures were tested: 6.7, 13.3 and 26.7 Pa.

260 Complete freeze-drying cycles were carried out using 5% w/w aqueous sucrose solution, both in 2R  
261 and 6R vials, to estimate the resistance of the dried cake to vapor flow. Sucrose was purchased from  
262 Fisher Chemical (Geel, Belgium). The solution was prepared using distilled water (demineralizer RO  
263 30 CUBIC – Gamma 3 s.n.c., Castelveverde, Italy). To ensure complete dissolution of the sugar in  
264 water, the solution was stirred for 15 minutes using a magnetic stirrer. Then, the solution was filtered  
265 using 0.45 µm hydrophilic filters (Labbox Labware S.L., Barcelona, Spain) and poured in either 6R  
266 (3 mL per vial) or 2R (1.5 mL per vial) vials. These experiments were carried out both in the  
267 MicroFD<sup>®</sup>, considering an offset for LyoSim temperature equal to -3°C, aiming to test the  
268 performance of the method also in another case, and REVO<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryers. Also in this case, all vials  
269 were partially stoppered using an igloo stopper (NovaPure Chlorobutyl Igloo Stoppers, West Pharma,

270 Exton, PA). The aim of these kind of tests was the acquisition of the product temperature profiles and  
271 of the ratio between the Pirani and Baratron pressure gauges signals to assess the end of primary  
272 drying.<sup>23</sup> In this case, the product temperature was monitored in four vials. The test was done only  
273 for the chamber pressure equal to 13.3 Pa and  $T_S$  was set to  $-10^\circ\text{C}$  during the primary stage. The  
274 cooling phase was carried out by setting a ramp down to  $-50^\circ\text{C}$ . In all tests, the shelf cooling rate was  
275 set at  $-1^\circ\text{C}/\text{min}$ , and the heating rate at  $+1^\circ\text{C}/\text{min}$ . Differently from the gravimetric tests, the holding  
276 phase of primary drying was not decided a priori, but the end of the cycle was suggested by the profile  
277 of the ratio between the Pirani and Baratron pressure gauges signals as a function of time. In other  
278 words, the atmospheric pressure in the chamber was restored when this ratio was about equal to 1,  
279 index of complete sublimation.

280

## 281 *2.3 Mathematical Modelling*

### 282 2.3.1 $K_v$ calculation from gravimetric test carried out in a pilot-scale freeze-dryer

283 As underlined in Section 1, the primary drying phase is the longest and the most expensive step of  
284 the whole freeze-drying process. Since the radial thermal and composition gradients in each vial are  
285 usually negligible, a mono-dimensional model may be accurate enough to calculate the evolution of  
286 the product temperature and the time required to complete ice the sublimation.<sup>24-28</sup>

287 In each vial, the product receives heat from the fluid flowing into the shelf. The heat flux,  $J_q$ , is  
288 directly proportional to the difference between the temperature of the fluid flowing into the shelf,  $T_S$ ,  
289 and the one of the product at the bottom of the vial,  $T_B$ , as shown in Eq. (1):

$$290 \quad J_q = K_v (T_S - T_B) \quad (1)$$

291 The coefficient of proportionality,  $K_v$ , is the heat transfer coefficient between the product and the  
292 heating fluid inside the shelf, i.e. the shelf. Equation (1) is correct for the so called “central vials”, i.e.  
293 those vials located in the central part of the shelf, as they receive heat only from the shelf itself. Vials  
294 located at the edges of the shelf receive also an additional amount of heat, mainly due to radiation

295 from chamber walls: in this case eq. (1) is still used, but  $K_v$  has now to be regarded as an “effective”  
296 heat transfer coefficient, that allows obtaining the total heat flux to the vials considering the driving  
297 force ( $T_S - T_B$ ).

298 The heat transferred to the product in the vials is used mainly for ice sublimation: heat accumulation  
299 in the vials is usually neglected due to the large thermal inertia of the product in the vial, that makes  
300 very slow the rise of temperature (i.e. the heat accumulation) in comparison with ice sublimation.  
301 Taking into account this assumption, in each gravimetric test used to get the value of  $K_v$  the total  
302 amount of heat received by the product can be calculated by Eq. (2):

$$303 \quad Q = \Delta m \cdot \Delta H_s \quad (2)$$

304 as the weight loss in each vial ( $\Delta m$ ) due to ice sublimation is measured, and the enthalpy of  
305 sublimation ( $\Delta H_s$ ) is known. The total amount of heat transferred to the vial can be also expressed by  
306 Eq. (3):

$$307 \quad Q = K_v A_{v,b} \int_0^{\Delta t} (T_S - T_B) dt \quad (3)$$

308 where  $\Delta t$  is the duration of the ice sublimation step in the gravimetric run. By comparing Eq. (2) and  
309 Eq. (3), it is possible to get the parameter  $K_v$ :

$$310 \quad K_v = \frac{\Delta m \cdot \Delta H_s}{A_{v,b} \int_0^{\Delta t} (T_S - T_B) dt} \quad (4)$$

311 Equation (4) may be used to calculate  $K_v$  from the data of weight loss ( $\Delta m$ ) and product temperature  
312 ( $T_B$ ) obtained in gravimetric test, e.g. in the REVO<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer. When the weight loss (and product  
313 temperature) in central vials is considered, the true value of  $K_v$  is obtained. When the weight loss (and  
314 product temperature) in edge vials is considered, an effective value of  $K_v$  is obtained as the model  
315 assumes that all the heat is provided to the vials from the shelf, while for edge vials a certain fraction  
316 of heat arrives also from radiation and conduction in the external gas surrounding the vials.

317

318 2.3.2  $K_v$  calculation from gravimetric test carried out in MicroFD<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer

319 When performing the gravimetric test in MicroFD<sup>®</sup> a deeper analysis of the heat fluxes is required.

320 As it is shown in Figure 2, the system may be simplified by considering two layers:

321 • The external layer, directly in contact with the ring, considered homogeneous (the first row in  
322 Figure 1 in dark grey).

323 • The internal layer, considered homogeneous.

324 Experimental measurements of temperature and weight loss allowed to validate this hypothesis.

325 Figure 2 points out all the heat fluxes present in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer: the heat fluxes exchanged

326 between each vial in the layer and the shelf, namely  $\dot{Q}_{base,int}$  (for the internal layer) and  $\dot{Q}_{base,ext}$  (for

327 the external layer); the one between the LyoSim<sup>®</sup> and the external layer ( $\dot{Q}_{LyoSim}$ ); the vial-to-vial term

328 ( $\dot{Q}_{LAT}$ ) and the sublimation terms, namely  $\dot{Q}_{subl,int}$  (for the internal layer) and  $\dot{Q}_{subl,ext}$  (for the external

329 layer). If we carry out the gravimetric test in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer, the weight loss in each vial

330 is measured, as well as the temperature in some vials (of the internal and of the external layer), and

331 these fluxes may be calculated as outlined in the followings. In fact,  $\dot{Q}_{base,int}$  and  $\dot{Q}_{base,ext}$  may be

332 calculated as shown in the following equations. At first, the total amount of heat received from the

333 bottom may be expressed as:

334 
$$Q_{base,int} = N_{int} K_v A_{v,b} \int_0^{\Delta t} (T_S - \bar{T}_2) dt = N_{int} K_v^* \int_0^{\Delta t} (T_S - \bar{T}_2) dt \quad (5)$$

335 
$$Q_{base,ext} = N_{ext} K_v A_{v,b} \int_0^{\Delta t} (T_S - \bar{T}_1) dt = N_{ext} K_v^* \int_0^{\Delta t} (T_S - \bar{T}_1) dt \quad (6)$$

336 The integral is known as  $T_S$  is measured and  $\bar{T}_1$  and  $\bar{T}_2$  are the mean product temperature profiles,

337 respectively in the external layer and in the internal one, all monitored during the test. They were

338 considered equal to the average of temperatures measured by thermocouples in the outer and central

339 vials. The two parameters,  $N_{int}$  and  $N_{ext}$ , refer, respectively to the number of vials in the internal layer

340 and in the external one. They were added in the formulas to take into account that all the central or

341 external vials exchange heat with the shelf. The two values of the multiplicative factors change  
 342 depending on the arrangement used. Specifically, the first layer is made up of 7 vials in the case of  
 343 6R vial and of 19 vials in case of 2R vials. Instead, the outer layer is made up of 12 vials in the case  
 344 of 6R vials and of 18 vials for the 2R vials. Finally, the mean heat fluxes exchanged,  $\dot{Q}_{base,int}$  and  
 345  $\dot{Q}_{base,ext}$  are calculated by dividing the two amounts of heat by the duration of the ice sublimation step,  
 346 here reported as  $\Delta t$ :

$$347 \quad \dot{Q}_{base,int} = \frac{Q_{base,int}}{\Delta t}, \quad \dot{Q}_{base,ext} = \frac{Q_{base,ext}}{\Delta t} \quad (7)$$

348 With respect to the sublimation terms, i.e.  $\dot{Q}_{subl,int}$  and  $\dot{Q}_{subl,ext}$ , the heat of sublimation can be expressed  
 349 as the product between the enthalpy of sublimation,  $\Delta H_s$ , and the amount of sublimated ice,  $\overline{\Delta m_2}$ , for  
 350 the internal layer, and  $\overline{\Delta m_1}$  for the external one. They represent, respectively, the average mass  
 351 variations of the central and of the external vials. Therefore, the amounts of heat lost due to  
 352 sublimation,  $Q_{subl,int}$  and  $Q_{subl,ext}$ , and the corresponding heat fluxes ( $\dot{Q}_{subl,int}$  and  $\dot{Q}_{subl,ext}$ ) in the two  
 353 groups of vials can be found by the following equations:

$$354 \quad Q_{subl,int} = N_{int} \Delta H_s \overline{\Delta m_2}, \quad \dot{Q}_{subl,int} = \frac{Q_{subl,int}}{\Delta t} \quad (8)$$

$$355 \quad Q_{subl,ext} = N_{ext} \Delta H_s \overline{\Delta m_1}, \quad \dot{Q}_{subl,ext} = \frac{Q_{subl,ext}}{\Delta t} \quad (9)$$

356 With respect to the vial-to-vial term,  $\dot{Q}_{LAT}$ , it is convenient to look at the Figure 3, where the zoom  
 357 of the arrangement for the 6R vials in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> is reported (All the following findings are valid  
 358 also for the 2R arrangement by only changing the multiplicative factors in the formulas, as explained  
 359 above). Each vial can be subdivided into six slices to better point out the vial-to-vial heat exchange.  
 360 Focusing on the vials of the central layer it is possible to assess that:

361 1. The slices 3 and 4 of the vials in the central layer exchange heat with vials at the same temperature.

362 Therefore, the net heat flux in these slices is zero. The heat flux for each slice is designed,

363 respectively, as  $\dot{Q}_3$  and  $\dot{Q}_4$ .

364 2. The slices 1 and 6 of the vials in the central layer exchange heat with two vials of the external  
365 layer. The heat flux for each slice is designed, respectively, as  $\dot{Q}_1$  and  $\dot{Q}_6$ . The two contributions  
366 are equal, so the total heat flux, for the two slices, is given by  $2\dot{Q}_1$ .

367 3. The slices 2 and 5 of the vials in the central layer exchange heat in a similar way, with a vial of  
368 the central layer, at the same temperature, and with a vial of the external layer. The heat flux for  
369 each slice is designed, respectively, as  $\dot{Q}_2$  and  $\dot{Q}_5$ . As an example, by focusing on the slice 5 of  
370 the central vial, it exchanges heat only with the slice 6 of the vial of the external layer (being at  
371 different temperatures), while the net heat flux with the slice 1 of the other vial of the central layer  
372 is 0 (being at the same temperature). Therefore, the amount of heat flux for slices 2 and 5 is half  
373 that exchanged by slices 1 and 6. This finding is helpful for the evaluation of each contribution in  
374 the followings and explains the presence of the multiplicative factor “1/2” in the Eq. (12) reported  
375 below. Moreover, since the two contribution (slice 2 and 5) are equal between each other, the total  
376 heat flux is given by  $2\dot{Q}_2$ .

377 All these findings are useful to explicit the contribution of vial-to-vial heat flux,  $\dot{Q}_{LAT}$ , given by the  
378 sum of the contributions of the six slices:

$$379 \quad \dot{Q}_{LAT} = \sum_{i=1}^6 \dot{Q}_i = 2\dot{Q}_1 + 2\dot{Q}_2 \quad (10)$$

380 The contribution of each slice can be expressed as the product between the vial-to-vial heat transfer  
381 coefficient,  $K_{12}$ , the corresponding exchange area,  $A_{12}$ , and the driving force, so the temperature  
382 difference between the two layers:

$$383 \quad \dot{Q}_1 = K_{12}A_{12}(\bar{T}_1 - \bar{T}_2) = K_{12}^*(\bar{T}_1 - \bar{T}_2) \quad (11)$$

$$384 \quad \dot{Q}_2 = \frac{1}{2}K_{12}A_{12}(\bar{T}_1 - \bar{T}_2) = \frac{1}{2}K_{12}^*(\bar{T}_1 - \bar{T}_2) \quad (12)$$

385 It may be highlighted that the vial-to-vial heat transfer is due to several mechanisms, i.e. contact,

386 radiation and conduction in the gas, in a way similar to that occurring from the shelf to the product in  
 387 the vial. This motivates the assumption of a linear driving force (taking also into account that the  
 388 Stephan Boltzmann law may be approximated by a liner equation in case of low temperature  
 389 difference). The evaluation of the exchange area is difficult, therefore it is convenient to use the  
 390 effective heat exchange coefficient,  $K_{12}^*$ , given by the product between the vial-to-vial heat transfer  
 391 coefficient and the area itself. The presence of the multiplicative factor “1/2” was discussed before.  
 392 By substituting Eq. (11) and Eq. (12) in Eq. (10) it is possible to get:

$$393 \quad \dot{Q}_{LAT} = \sum_{i=1}^6 \dot{Q}_i = 3K_{12}^* (\bar{T}_1 - \bar{T}_2) \quad (13)$$

394 It should be highlighted that the perfectly central vial (indicated by the label “TP5” in Figure 1a) is  
 395 surrounded by vials at the same temperature, thus the contribution  $\dot{Q}_{LAT}$  is equal to 0 (the same  
 396 consideration is valid for the seven central vials of the arrangement 2R in Fig. 1d). In other words,  
 397 the term  $\dot{Q}_{LAT}$  has to be multiplied by the number of central vials directly in contact with the external  
 398 ones. Depending on the arrangement used, and as it is clearly visible in Fig. 1a and 1d, this  
 399 multiplicative factor resulted equal to 6 (for 6R vials) or to 12 (for 2R vials).

400 The last contribution of heat in Figure 2 is given by the amount of heat that the external layer receives  
 401 from the ring, being in direct contact with it, expressed by Eq. (14):

$$402 \quad Q_{LyoSim} = K_L A_L \int_0^{\Delta t} (T_L - \bar{T}_1) dt \quad (14)$$

403 where  $K_L$  is the heat transfer coefficient between the external layer and LyoSim<sup>®</sup> and  $A_L$  is the  
 404 corresponding exchange area. The temperature of fluid flowing into the ring is reported as  $T_L$ . All the  
 405 other parameters are described above. The heat flux from the ring is obtained by dividing  $Q_{LyoSim}$  by  
 406  $\Delta t$ , as in the previous cases.

407 The various heat fluxes highlighted in Figure 2 for the layer 2 of vials, i.e. the central ones, are thus  
 408 summarized in the following:

409 
$$\dot{Q}_{base,int} = \frac{N_{int} K_v^* \int_0^t (T_S - \bar{T}_2) dt}{\Delta t}, \quad \dot{Q}_{LAT} = 3K_{12}^* (\bar{T}_1 - \bar{T}_2), \quad \dot{Q}_{subl,int} = \frac{N_{int} \Delta H_s \overline{\Delta m_2}}{\Delta t} \quad (15)$$

410 and the corresponding amount of heat transferred during the test are summarized in the following:

411 
$$Q_{base,int} = N_{int} K_v^* \int_0^t (T_S - \bar{T}_2) dt, \quad Q_{LAT} = 3K_{12}^* \int_0^{\Delta t} (\bar{T}_1 - \bar{T}_2) dt, \quad Q_{subl,int} = N_{int} \Delta H_s \overline{\Delta m_2} \quad (16)$$

412 One of the aims of the present paper is to estimate  $K_v$  starting from the experimental data of the  
 413 MicroFD<sup>®</sup> and compare it with that obtained from the REVO<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer to validate the method.  
 414 For the calculations of all the heat fluxes, two parameters are unknown:  $K_v^*$  (equal to the product  
 415 between  $A_{v,b}$  and  $K_v$ ) and  $K_{12}^*$ , being all the temperatures and weight loss measured. The global energy  
 416 balance at the inner layer allows to find the relationship between  $K_v^*$  and  $K_{12}^*$ :

417 
$$N_{int} Q_{base,int} + N_{LAT} Q_{LAT} = N_{int} Q_{subl,int} + N_{int} Q_{ACC} \quad (17)$$

418 where  $Q_{base,int}$ ,  $Q_{LAT}$  and  $Q_{subl,int}$  are shown in Eq. (16). The term  $N_{LAT}$  represents the number of vials  
 419 directly in contact with the external layer in the two arrangements, 6R and 2R. The values are clearly  
 420 visible in Fig. 1a and 1b and are, respectively, equal to “6” and “12”. Besides, it may be convenient  
 421 to define the integrals appearing in Eq. (16) in a generic way by Eq. (18):

422 
$$I_{xy} = \int_0^{\Delta t} (T_x - T_y) dt \quad (18)$$

423 Their values are known, as they just involve temperature measurements. By substituting each term in  
 424 Eq. (17), Equation (19) is thus obtained:

425 
$$N_{int} K_v^* I_{S2} + 3N_{LAT} K_{12}^* I_{12} = N_{int} \Delta H_s \overline{\Delta m_2} + N_{int} Q_{ACC} \quad (19)$$

426 and the coefficient  $K_{12}^*$  may be expressed as a function of known or measured variables, and of the  
 427 only desired unknown ( $K_v^*$ ):

428 
$$K_{12}^* = \frac{N_{int} \Delta H_s \overline{\Delta m_2} + N_{int} Q_{ACC} - N_{int} K_v^* I_{S2}}{3N_{LAT} I_{12}} \quad (20)$$

429  $Q_{ACC}$  is the heat accumulation term, that is explicitly taken into account in eq. (17) to increase the  
 430 accuracy of the method, taking also into account the duration of the test that may be slow and, thus,  
 431 the role of the heat accumulation occurring in the first part may be not negligible. The accumulation  
 432 term may be calculated from the following equation:

$$433 \quad Q_{ACC} = \int_0^{\Delta t} \left[ \frac{d}{dt} (m_{ice} c_p T_{ice}) \right] dt \quad (21)$$

434 It is convenient to express the mass of ice as a function of the thickness of the ice. For each time  
 435 interval, the mass of ice and its thickness at the generic instant  $t$  can be calculated by Eq. (22) and  
 436 (23):

$$437 \quad m_{ice}(t) = m_{ice}(0) - \int_0^t J_w dt \quad (22)$$

$$438 \quad L_{ice}(t) = \frac{m_{ice}(t)}{\rho_{ice} A_{v,i}} \quad (23)$$

439 being  $J_w$  the sublimation flux. By expressing the mass of ice as a function of its thickness, the  
 440 accumulation term becomes:

$$441 \quad \begin{aligned} Q_{ACC} &= \int_0^{\Delta t} \left[ \frac{d}{dt} (m_{ice} c_p T_{ice}) \right] dt = c_p \int_0^{\Delta t} \left[ m_{ice} \frac{d}{dt} (T_{ice}) \right] dt + c_p \int_0^{\Delta t} T_{ice} \left[ \frac{d}{dt} (m_{ice}) \right] dt = \\ &= c_p \rho_{ice} A_{v,i} \int_0^{\Delta t} L_{ice} dT_{ice} + c_p \rho_{ice} A_{v,i} \int_0^{\Delta t} T_{ice} dL_{ice} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

442 In order to know  $Q_{ACC}$  it is needed to evaluate  $L_{ice}$  vs. time, in such a way that the two integrals may  
 443 be calculated. The calculation of  $L_{ice}$  is based on Eqs. (22) and (23), provided that  $J_w$  is known. Due  
 444 to the high conductivity of ice, the content in each vial was assumed, in this step, to be isothermal  
 445 and at a temperature equal to that measured by the thermocouple. So, it is possible to express the  
 446 sublimation flux as:

$$447 \quad J_w = KK (p_{w,i} - p_{w,c}) \quad (25)$$

448 as it is directly proportional to the difference between the vapor pressure at the interface of  
 449 sublimation,  $p_{w,i}$ , and that in the drying chamber,  $p_{w,c}$ , that is coincident with the total pressure in the

450 chamber,  $P_c$ , since the gas in the chamber is about 100% water vapor.  $KK$  takes into account all the  
 451 mass transfer resistances from the interface of sublimation to the drying chamber, mainly the stopper.  
 452 The water vapor pressure at the interface of sublimation depends on the temperature and can be  
 453 calculated by the Goff-Gratch relationship shown in Eq. (26):

$$454 \quad p_{w,i} = 10^{-9.09718\left(\frac{273.16}{T_i}-1\right)-3.56654\log_{10}\left(\frac{273.16}{T_i}\right)+0.876793\left(1-\frac{T_i}{273.16}\right)+\log_{10} 6.1071} \quad (26)$$

455 The sublimated mass, measured during the test, is found by integrating Eq. (26):

$$456 \quad m_{sub} = \int_0^{\Delta t} KK (p_{w,i} - p_{w,c}) dt \quad (27)$$

457  $KK$  is considered as a constant since the variations of temperature and of the sublimation flux are  
 458 negligible in the operating conditions considered in the present work. It can be evaluated from Eq.  
 459 (27) by considering the measured variations in mass (at the end of the gravimetric test) and integrating  
 460 the driving force over time, obtaining Eq. (27):

$$461 \quad KK = \frac{\overline{\Delta m_2}}{\int_0^{\Delta t} (p_{w,i} - p_{w,c}) dt} \quad (28)$$

462  $KK$  may be thus calculated at the end of the test, as all the variables and parameters needed in Eq.  
 463 (28) are either measured or known, and this allows calculating, at each time step  $J_w$ , through Eq. (25)  
 464 , and from  $J_w$  it becomes possible to calculate, at each time step,  $L_{ice}$  through Eqs. (22) and (23), and,  
 465 finally,  $Q_{ACC}$ , through Eq. (24). By this way,  $K_{12}^*$  may be expressed through Eq. (20) as a known  
 466 function of  $K_v^*$ .

467 The last step of the algorithm is the calculation of the temperature evolution in each vial of the central  
 468 layer during the gravimetric step through a mathematical model. The two differential equations to be  
 469 solved are the mass balance (Eq. (29)) and the energy balance (Eq. (30)):

$$470 \quad \frac{dL_{ice}}{dt} = - \frac{KK (p_{w,i} - p_{w,c})}{\rho_{ice} A_{v,i}} \quad (29)$$

471 
$$\rho_{ice} c_p A_{v,i} \left( L_{ice} \frac{dT_{ice}}{dt} + T_{ice} \frac{dL_{ice}}{dt} \right) = K_v^* (T_S - T_{ice}) + 3K_{12}^* (T_1 - T_{ice}) - \Delta H_s J_w \quad (30)$$

472 By substituting Eq. (29) in Eq. (30), the result becomes:

473 
$$\frac{dT_{ice}}{dt} = \frac{1}{\rho_{ice} c_p A_{v,i} L_{ice}} \left[ K_v^* (T_S - T_{ice}) + 3K_{12}^* (T_1 - T_{ice}) - \Delta H_s KK (p_{w,i} - p_{w,c}) + c_p T_{ice} KK (p_{w,i} - p_{w,c}) \right]$$

474 (31)

475 By using this approach only one parameter,  $K_v^*$ , remains unknown in Eq. (31). Therefore, it is  
 476 possible to find it using a “best-fit” procedure. In other words, the value of  $K_v$  (by explicating  
 477  $K_v^* = K_v A_{v,b}$ ) that minimizes the mean square deviation between measured and calculated ice  
 478 temperature was calculated. For this purpose, a MATLAB script was written using the function  
 479 “*fminsearch*”. This function required an initial estimate for  $K_v^*$  (the stationary value of  $K_v^*$  was used  
 480 in the present work as initial estimate calculated using the stationary energy balance by considering  
 481 the asymptotic value of the temperature profiles). However, it was derived that the result was  
 482 independent on the value used as the initial estimate of  $K_v^*$ , thus ensuring the robustness of the  
 483 algorithm. The differential equation (Eq. (31)) was solved using “*ode15s*” solver for each time  
 484 interval. As a result, the calculated ice temperature and the thickness of the dried cake as a function  
 485 of time were obtained and, obviously, the value of the heat transfer coefficient,  $K_v$ , in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup>  
 486 freeze-dryer.

487

### 488 2.3.3 $R_p$ Calculation

489 As a consequence of the sublimation of ice, a solid porous structure is obtained, called cake. The  
 490 water vapor must pass through the porous cake, leaves the dried layer and escapes from the vial. The  
 491 sublimation flux,  $J_w$ , is expressed as a function of the driving force as reported in Eq. (32):

492 
$$J_w = \frac{1}{R_p} (p_{w,i} - p_{w,c}) \quad (32)$$

493 The resistance of the dried product to vapor flow is defined as  $R_p$ . The mass transfer takes place under

494 rarefied gas conditions. Therefore, it must be taken into account that the fluid cannot be considered  
 495 as a continuous medium, where interactions between molecules predominate over interactions  
 496 between the molecules and the solid walls of the container. In this case, interactions between gas  
 497 molecules and the solid walls are predominant. Then, the sublimation flux, due to the Knudsen  
 498 diffusion, is given by Eq. (33):

$$499 \quad J_w = \frac{D_e}{L_{dried}} (c_{w,i} - c_{w,c}) \quad (33)$$

500 where  $c_{w,i}$  and  $c_{w,c}$  are, respectively, the water vapor concentrations at the interface of sublimation  
 501 and in the drying chamber and  $D_e$  is the effective diffusivity. Usually, eq. (33) is written as eq. (32),  
 502 by expressing the driving force in terms of difference of vapour pressure, and introducing the  
 503 resistance of the dried product,  $R_p$ . Using the approach presented in previous papers<sup>29</sup>, it is possible  
 504 to assess that  $R_p$  is a function of the dried layer thickness ( $L_{dried}$ ), and the following equation is the  
 505 reference one:

$$506 \quad R_p = R_{p,0} + \frac{AL_{dried}}{1 + BL_{dried}} \quad (34)$$

507 While  $R_{p,0}$  is a fitting parameter used to point out the existence of a top layer characterized by a  
 508 significantly higher resistance to vapor flow than in the rest of the cake, the two parameters  $A$  and  $B$   
 509 may be related to cake structure, and, in particular, to the distribution of pore size in the cake. A linear  
 510 dependence of mean pore radius ( $r_e$ ) on cake thickness (and tortuosity,  $\tau$ ) may be assumed<sup>29</sup>:

$$511 \quad \frac{r_e}{\tau} = a_0 + a_1 L_{dried}$$

512 and, thus, it is possible to get:

$$513 \quad A = \frac{RT_{dried}^{0.5}}{a_0 M_w K \varepsilon}, \quad B = \frac{a_1}{a_0} \quad (35)$$

514 where  $\varepsilon$  is the void fraction or porosity (difference between 1 and the percentage of solute),  $K$  is equal  
 515 to  $22.9 \frac{m}{s \cdot K^{0.5}}$ ,  $M_w$  is the molecular weight of water,  $R$  is the ideal gas constant and  $T_{dried}$  is the  
 516 temperature of the dried product, considered equal to  $T_i$ .<sup>29</sup>

517 To describe the evolution of the thickness of the dried cake (and, thus, also the drying time) and the  
 518 product temperature profiles over the time, a Matlab script was used, simulating the freeze-drying

519 process, by solving Eq. (36), mass balance for the dried layer, and Eq. (37), heat balance for the  
 520 frozen, layer:

$$521 \quad \frac{dL_{dried}}{dt} = - \frac{1}{\rho_{frozen} - \rho_{dried}} J_w \quad (36)$$

$$522 \quad T_B = T_S - \frac{1}{K_v} \left( \frac{1}{K_v} + \frac{L_{frozen}}{\lambda_{frozen}} \right)^{-1} (T_S - T_i) \quad (37)$$

523 where  $\rho_{frozen}$  and  $\rho_{dried}$  are, respectively, the density of the frozen product and that of the dried cake.

524 The parameter  $\lambda_{frozen}$  represents the thermal conductivity of the frozen product and it was equal to

525  $2.56 \frac{J}{m \cdot s \cdot K}$ . By combining eq. (1) and eq. (32) into the heat balance at the interface of sublimation:

$$526 \quad J_q A_{w,b} = \Delta H_S J_w A_{v,i} \quad (38)$$

527 the instantaneous resistance to vapor flow,  $R_p$ , was derived as:

$$528 \quad R_p = \frac{(p_{w,i} - p_{w,c}) A_{v,i} \Delta H_S}{K_v (T_S - T_B) A_{v,c}} \quad (39)$$

529 In order to obtain the instantaneous thickness of the dried cake, it is necessary to calculate the amount

530 of sublimated water from the beginning of the primary drying (indicated as 0) to the generic time

531 instant  $t^*$ :

$$532 \quad m_w^* = A_{v,i} \int_0^{t^*} J_w dt \quad (40)$$

533 The instant "0" was derived by looking for the condition:  $p_{w,i} > P_c$ . By considering the porosity of the

534 matrix, Eq. (23) becomes:

$$535 \quad L_{dried} = \frac{m_w^*}{\rho_{frozen} \varepsilon A_{v,i}} \quad (41)$$

536 By plotting  $R_p$  as a function of  $L_{dried}$ , instant by instant, the desired curve is obtained. As deeply

537 discussed in Section 2, it is possible to traceback to Eq. (34). The parameters  $a_0$  and  $a_1$  are function

538 of  $A$  and  $B$ , determined by minimizing the mean square deviation between experimental and

539 theoretical values using the non-linear GRG method implemented in the Excel solver.

540

### 541 **3. Results and Discussions**

#### 542 *3.1 Study of the heat transfer coefficient*

543 The first part of the study was focused on the development and validation of the model able to find  
544  $K_v$  starting from the experimental data obtained in the gravimetric test carried out in the small-scale  
545 freeze-dryer. So, as a first step we wanted to evaluate how close the values of  $K_v$  obtained in the  
546 small-scale freeze-dryer were to the ones obtained in a larger unit.

547 The experimental temperature profiles for the 2R vials, in MicroFD<sup>®</sup> and in REVO<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryers,  
548 are reported in Figure 4 for different values of chamber pressure during the sublimation step (6.7,  
549 13.3 and 26.7 Pa) of the gravimetric test. In the first column, the results obtained in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup>  
550 can be observed, while in the second column the ones in the REVO<sup>®</sup> device are given.

551 Three thermocouples (TP1, TP2 and TP1), measuring the temperature of the central vials, were used  
552 in the REVO<sup>®</sup> equipment. Instead, in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> device five thermocouples were used: TP3 and  
553 TP7 refers to the edge vials, while TP4, TP5 and TP6 to the central ones. Some signals were not  
554 reported here since they were considered unreliable, very different from the others. This could be due  
555 to a placement error, so the thermocouple was not in perfect contact with the bottom of the vial, or to  
556 the loss of contact between the thermocouple and the ice during the test. A close inspection of Figure  
557 4 indicates that, for each graph, the different signals of the thermocouples are very similar (at the  
558 same pressure value, but in the two different scales). The difference is about  $\pm 2^\circ\text{C}$ . Evidence for this  
559 is visible by comparing Fig. 4a and 4d, where it is possible to notice that the asymptotic product  
560 temperatures range from  $-41^\circ\text{C}$  to  $-39^\circ\text{C}$ . The same can be observed for the other two values of  
561 pressure: 13.3 and 26.7 Pa. Moreover, all these considerations are valid for the case of 6R vials, whose  
562 graphs are reported in Fig. S1 in the Supplementary Material. For the calculation of the heat transfer  
563 coefficient, a unique temperature profile for the external layer and one for the internal layer is  
564 required. Therefore, in the case of external layer the average temperature profile between the TP3 and  
565 TP7 was selected; while for the internal layer the average temperature profile among TP4, TP5 and

566 TP7 was used.

567 Figure 5 illustrates the heat transfer coefficient obtained as a function of pressure for both freeze-  
568 dryers and type of vials (2R or 6R). As it was expected, as chamber pressure increases, the heat  
569 transfer coefficient increases. In fact, the increase in pressure implies an increase in the thermal  
570 conductivity of the gas in the gap between the bottom of the vial and the shelf surface. Lines were  
571 found using Eq. (42):

$$572 \quad K_v = C + \frac{DP_c}{1 + EP_c} \quad (42)$$

573 The fitting parameters,  $C$ ,  $D$  and  $E$  were calculated by minimizing the mean square deviation between  
574 the experimental and the theoretical values.

575 Excellent results were achieved in terms of comparison of  $K_v$  values for the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer  
576 and the REVO<sup>®</sup> one. In fact, as it is shown in Figure 5a and 5b, the two curves (the solid and the  
577 dashed line) resulted very close for both 2R and 6R vials type. This finding was evidence of the  
578 accuracy of the developed algorithm. The mean values of the heat transfer coefficient and the relative  
579 error was calculated and reported in Table 1. According to the data shown in Table 1, a relative  
580 maximum error of 7% was reached, in the worst case, that is the one at 13.3 Pa using 2R vials. It is  
581 considered as absolutely acceptable, considering that in gravimetric tests a standard deviation of  
582 around 10% is not unusual.

583 Table 1 shows also the values of  $K_v$  obtained for central vials, the ones of interest in this study,  
584 obtained just considering their weight loss, the heat of sublimation and the temperature difference  
585 between the shelf and the product, i.e. the usual approach that neglects the contribution of the lateral  
586 flux to the heat balance in the vial. It appears that this value ( $K_{v, MicroFD, bottom}$ ) is quite different from  
587 the value of  $K_{v, MicroFD}$  obtained through the previously described algorithm and, what is more  
588 important, from the value of  $K_{v, REVO}$ . This is another evidence of necessity of including the lateral  
589 heat flux in the heat balance for the gravimetric test carried out in MicroFD<sup>®</sup>. The values of weight  
590 loss at the basis of the calculations shown in Table 1 are given in the supplementary materials /Table

591 S1 and S2).

592 By exploiting the  $K_v$  values obtained with the Matlab algorithm in the first part of the study, all the  
593 heat fluxes were calculated and reported in Table 2. According to the data reported in Table 2, the  
594 heat fluxes of sublimation,  $\dot{Q}_{subl,int}$  and  $\dot{Q}_{subl,ext}$ , increases as the pressure increases for both kind of  
595 vials (2R or 6R). This finding was expected, since, as underlined before, the thermal conductivity of  
596 the gas increases and, thus, the heat flux to the product in the vial that, finally, results in ice  
597 sublimation. The same trend was found for the heat fluxes received from the product by the shelf,  
598  $\dot{Q}_{base,int}$  and  $\dot{Q}_{base,ext}$ . Moreover, for the 2R vials, the trend of inter-layer heat flux,  $\dot{Q}_{LAT}$ , is  
599 monotonically increasing with pressure, as it could be expected. No specific trend was found for the  
600 heat flux received by the external layer from the ring,  $\dot{Q}_{LyoSim}$ . For each layer, it was possible to relate  
601 each flow to the total heat flux. Specifically, for the internal layer the percentage of heat received by  
602 the surrounding vials and the one from the shelf was calculated, by considering only the sublimation  
603 term as heat output, by Eq. (43). For the external layer two different incoming flows were present in  
604 the system: the one coming from the shelf and the one from LyoSim<sup>®</sup>. The total amount of heat  
605 leaving the outer layer is given by the sum of the sublimation heat and the vial-to-vial term, as  
606 reported in Eq. (44). Therefore, the following percentages could be calculated:

$$\% lat = \frac{\dot{Q}_{LAT}}{\dot{Q}_{subl,int}}, \quad \% base, int = \frac{\dot{Q}_{base,int}}{\dot{Q}_{subl,int}} \quad (43)$$

$$\% LyoSim = \frac{\dot{Q}_{LyoSim}}{\dot{Q}_{subl,ext} + \dot{Q}_{LAT}}, \quad \% base, ext = \frac{\dot{Q}_{base,ext}}{\dot{Q}_{subl,ext} + \dot{Q}_{LAT}} \quad (44)$$

607 Figure 6 provides a clear visualization of the obtained results. It demonstrates that most of the  
608 sublimation heat of the inner layer is provided by the shelf and less than 10%, for all three pressure  
609 values, is supplied by the surrounding vials. As an example, by focusing at 6.7 Pa, the percentage  
610 provided by the shelf is equal to 99% against the 1% provided by the surrounding vials. The maximum  
611 value for this term is reached at the highest pressure value, 26.7 Pa, where they are respectively equal  
612 to 91% and 9%. Therefore, the increasing trend for the vial-to-vial heat flux, noticed in Table 2, is

613 here confirmed and clearly visible. Instead, the overall heat entering the outer layer comes equally  
614 from the shelf and the LyoSim<sup>®</sup> for all the three different values of pressure. As a matter of fact, by  
615 focusing for example at 13.3 Pa, the percentage of heat provided by LyoSim<sup>®</sup> resulted equal to  
616 42.11% against the 57.89% provided by the shelf. The trends for the 6R vials arrangement are  
617 reported in Figure S2 of the Supplementary Material. In Figure S3 the trends of the heat fluxes as a  
618 function of pressure are also reported.

619 In conclusion, the main achievements of the study are the followings:

- 620 - A vial-to-vial heat term must be introduced in the mathematical model to take into account  
621 the heat contribution from the edge vials as LyoSim<sup>®</sup> temperature is not optimized to get a  
622 uniform batch (aiming to reduce the experimental effort). Thanks to this term, it was possible  
623 to distinguish between the heat due to the exchange with the shelf and that exchanged with  
624 the other vials and/or the ring.
- 625 - The developed algorithm is able to accurately estimate  $K_v$  in a pilot-scale freeze-dryer starting  
626 from the experimental data of the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer. In fact, the obtained values in the  
627 MicroFD<sup>®</sup> were close to the ones obtained in a larger freeze-dryer, thus allowing for the  
628 reduction of the experimental effort, essential in the current methods to reach the optimal  
629 value for the offset temperature. Therefore, coupling of MicroFD<sup>®</sup> experimental tests with a  
630 mathematical model could be a suitable solution to facilitate and speed up the design of a  
631 freeze-drying cycle for a larger scale unit.

632

### 633 *3.2 Study of the resistance of the dried cake to vapor flow*

634 To design a freeze-drying cycle it is extremely important to know the drying time and the maximum  
635 product temperature. Therefore, beside  $K_v$ , the value of  $R_p$  is necessary to enable mathematical  
636 simulation of the process. The freezing conditions affect the porosity of the matrix, thus the  $R_p$  value,  
637 as they are responsible for the number and the size of ice crystals.<sup>30</sup> For a given product, and if the  
638 freezing conditions are the same in both the small-scale and large-scale freeze-dryer, and the same

639 filling conditions are used, it is expected that the same values of  $R_p$  are obtained. Therefore, it is  
640 reasonable to expect that the type of vial (2R or 6R) does not affect the  $R_p$  vs  $L_{dried}$  curve. The vapor  
641 flow resistance depends only on the thickness of the dried layer through the Eq. (36). The parameters  
642  $R_{p,0}$ ,  $A$  and  $B$  can be found by minimizing the error between the experimental values and the  
643 theoretical ones. The parameter  $R_p$  was found through experimental tests directly exploiting the  
644 product temperature profiles and using the  $K_v$  value found by the algorithm (the one obtained with  
645 the gravimetric test in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup>). As described in Section 2, all the experimental tests were  
646 carried out at 13.3 Pa and by setting  $T_S$  to  $-10^\circ\text{C}$  during the primary stage. The LyoSim<sup>®</sup> offset was  
647 set to  $-3^\circ\text{C}$  with respect to the mean product temperature, on the basis of previous studies, although  
648 different values can be used.

649 The mass transfer experimental parameters obtained for the 13.3 Pa pressure are reported in Table 3.  
650 The experimental curves relating  $r_e/\tau$  as a function of the thickness of the dried cake are reported in  
651 Figure 7. The three curves are similar, taking also into account the uncertainty of the approach, as it  
652 was expected according to the data reported in Table 3, but there is a discrepancy among them. It is  
653 therefore important to deepen the study focusing on the influence of this difference on the main  
654 features of the freeze-drying process (product temperature and drying time).

655 Therefore, the aim of this part of the study was to investigate the influence of the  $R_p$  parameters on  
656 product temperature profiles and the duration of the primary drying. For this purpose, it is possible to  
657 focus on a specific curve, for example the one of the 2R vials in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> (dash-dot line in Fig.  
658 7) by considering the  $R_p$  parameter as the same for all the curves. In other words, the experimental  
659 parameters derived for 2R vials (reported in Table 3) were used for the simulation of what occurs in  
660 6R vials using a Matlab script that simulates the dynamic of the freeze-drying process. For each  
661 simulation, the previously determined  $K_v$  parameter by gravimetric tests was used according to the  
662 case (type of vial and equipment). The product temperature profiles and the time required to complete  
663 the primary drying were calculated and compared with the experimental values found for 6R vials,  
664 both in MicroFD<sup>®</sup> and REVO<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryers. In such a way, it was possible to assess the reliability

665 of the model parameters. Specifically, the influence of the small initial difference in  $R_p$  values  
666 (between 2R and 6R vials) on the freeze-drying process was evaluated.

667 Figure 8 summarizes the results obtained in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> and REVO<sup>®</sup> devices for a 5% w/w sucrose  
668 solution processed in the same operating conditions but in different type of vials (2R and 6R). The  
669 experimental ratio between the Pirani and the Baratron sensor signals can be used to assess the drying  
670 time, as reported in Fig. 8a. As a result of simulation, instead, it was possible to use the trend of the  
671 dried cake thickness as a function of time: the drying time was reached when the thickness of the  
672 frozen layer was equal to 0, as shown in Fig. 8b. The experimental identification of the ending point  
673 using the pressure ratio is really difficult as it refers to the concentration of the water vapor in the  
674 dryer chamber and not to the amount of ice in the vial, although, obviously, the presence of ice in the  
675 vial and, thus, the sublimation flux affect the composition in the chamber. In Fig. 8a, a constant trend  
676 is observed during the primary drying. When ice sublimation is completed, the curve decreases  
677 rapidly until it reaches an asymptotic limit value. The starting point in the curve is almost 1.7, since  
678 the Pirani vacuum gauge measures the thermal conductivity of the gas in the drying chamber, so it  
679 reads about 60% higher than the Baratron manometer. In fact, the thermal conductivity of water vapor  
680 is almost 1.6 times the thermal conductivity of nitrogen. When the gas composition inside the  
681 chamber is changing from water vapor to nitrogen, index of sublimation occurred, the ratio  
682 Pirani/Baratron starts to decrease. The point at which this decrease begins is called “onset”, while the  
683 point where the lower asymptote is reached is the “offset”. It was reported that onset, offset and mid  
684 points may be representative of drying time.<sup>23</sup> In this framework, model calculation of drying time  
685 (i.e. the point when frozen layer thickness approaches zero) may be considered validated it is between  
686 the onset and the offset, as it occurs in this case. By considering the onset point, for the 2R vials  
687 (black solid line), the experimental drying time is about 721 minutes, while the calculated one is 705  
688 minutes. The relative error is lower than 5% (2.2% to be precise). For the 6R vials in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup>  
689 freeze-dryer (light gray line), the experimental drying time is 1006 minutes, while the calculated one  
690 is 1038 minutes, leading to a relative error lower than 5% (3.2% to be precise). Lastly, for the 6R

691 vials in the REVO<sup>®</sup> device (dark grey line), the values are respectively equal to 903 and 979 minutes,  
692 leading to a relative error lower than 10% (8.4% to be precise). In the evaluation of the results, it is  
693 important to stress that the experimental drying time values are subjected to a non-negligible  
694 uncertainty, since they are determined graphically, and the curves are very noisy.

695 Figure 9 illustrates the product temperature profiles in three different situations by considering the  
696 value of pressure equal to 13.3 Pa. The solid black line represents the experimental profile evaluated  
697 in the REVO<sup>®</sup> equipment using the 6R vials arrangement. The dashed black line represents the  
698 calculated temperature profile through mathematical simulation of the process by using the  
699 experimental  $R_p$  value derived for the 6R vials in MicroFD<sup>®</sup> (see Table 3 for the values). The last  
700 curve, the grey one, instead, represents the calculated temperature profile through mathematical  
701 simulation of the process by using the experimental  $R_p$  value derived for the 2R vials MicroFD<sup>®</sup>  
702 (values reported in Table 3). Again, the purpose is always the same: to test the reliability of the model  
703 parameters ( $K_v$  and  $R_p$ ) obtained in MicroFD<sup>®</sup>.

704 As it is clearly visible in Fig. 9, the three curves are almost overlapping, demonstrating that the  
705 differences in fitted parameters ( $R_{p,0}$ ,  $A$  and  $B$ ) do not have a large impact on modelling results. In  
706 fact, the trends obtained differ by approximately 1°C, that is the uncertainty of a T-type thermocouple.

707 As it was expected, the type of vial does not influence the  $R_p$  value. In fact, the product temperature  
708 trend is pretty the same whether we use experimental  $R_p$  value found for 2R vials or 6R vials to  
709 simulate the process dynamic. This was a great achievement, since it is possible to use the MicroFD<sup>®</sup>,  
710 for a given product, to obtain the model parameters ( $K_v$  and  $R_p$ ) of a larger freeze-dryer, saving time  
711 and materials. Moreover, it is also possible to correctly and accurately simulate the dynamics of a  
712 larger-equipment, so the REVO<sup>®</sup> device, using the model parameters found in the Micro-FD<sup>®</sup>. Figure  
713 S4 of the Supplementary Materials provides further validation.

714 This result was largely expected. In fact, resistance of the dried cake is dependent on the size of the  
715 pores that, in turn, is dependent on the size of the ice crystals. Being freezing a stochastic phenomenon  
716 in both freeze-dryers (no controlled nucleation has been used either in MicroFD<sup>®</sup> or in larger units,

717 at industrial scale, freezing is almost always carried out in an uncontrolled way), the structure of the  
718 dried cake is not expected to be different, obviously in case no shrinkage or collapse occurs (but this  
719 is the target of the step of process design/optimization). Surely the way of heat transfer from the  
720 freeze-dryer to the product in the vial is different and, thus, the product temperature and the drying  
721 time, but  $R_p$  should not be affected by the equipment used, and results shown in Figure 9 agree with  
722 this.

723 It has to be highlighted that when using MicroFD<sup>®</sup> for process development the optimal approach is  
724 to use here the same type of vial that will then used in the larger unit, thus minimizing scale-up issues  
725 in the step of process transfer. Anyway, in case this is not possible, either because a “special” type of  
726 vial is planned to be used and, thus, the LyoSim<sup>®</sup> ring is not readily available, or the type of vial (and  
727 manufacturer) is not yet identified, then MicroFD<sup>®</sup> may in any case be used to evaluate  $R_p$  vs.  $L_{dried}$ ,  
728 as cake resistance is not a function of vial size and type, but just of product structure.

729

#### 730 **4. Conclusions**

731 In the present paper a novel model-based approach for the design of the primary drying stage starting  
732 from the experimental data of a small-scale freeze-dryer (MicroFD<sup>®</sup>) was shown. The main aim was  
733 to investigate if the small-scale freeze-dryer could be used for process investigation and development,  
734 facilitating and speeding up the scale-up procedures. Here, an effective procedure for scale-up has  
735 been proposed, saving time and material with respect to the current methods.

736 We demonstrated that it is possible to couple the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> with a mathematical model to accurately  
737 calculate  $K_v$  through gravimetric tests. The obtained values resulted very similar to the one obtained  
738 in the larger freeze-dryer (REVO<sup>®</sup>). Moreover, the use of the algorithm, by including the vial-to-vial  
739 heat term, allows for a reduction in the experimental effort required to do the tests. In fact, it allows  
740 to overcome the problem of finding the optimal ring temperature to achieve homogeneous conditions  
741 in the batch. Moreover, it is necessary to stress the importance of the inter-layer heat term to take into  
742 account the presence of the ring and better simulate the dynamics of the central vials in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup>.

743 In the second part of the study, a very good agreement was reached for  $R_p$ . We demonstrated that it  
744 is possible to study a given formulation, in a certain type of vial (2R or 6R in the present case), in the  
745 MicroFD<sup>®</sup> to simulate and predict its behavior (in terms of drying time and temperature profile) in a  
746 larger-scale freeze-dryer (REVO<sup>®</sup>). An evidence for this was given by the comparison of the  
747 experimental and calculated product temperature profiles. According to the results obtained, it is  
748 indifferent to use 2R or 6R vials to study the evolution of product temperature. This is a valuable  
749 result, since the  $R_p$  parameters for 6R vials can be used to simulate the process of the 2R vials in the  
750 REVO<sup>®</sup> equipment (using the proper  $K_v$  value found by gravimetric test). Again, the presented  
751 strategy allows for the development of freeze-drying cycles, representative of larger scales, on the  
752 MicroFD<sup>®</sup>, leading to save time and materials.

753 To summarize, the steps to be followed for obtaining efficient results are here reported:

- 754 1) Do the gravimetric test in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> equipment to calculate  $K_v$  using the mathematical  
755 algorithm proposed in this paper. Since  $K_v$  does not depend on the product, you can do this step  
756 using only water;
- 757 2) Do another test in the same equipment, the MicroFD<sup>®</sup>, using the product of interest, to calculate  
758 the experimental curve  $R_p$  vs  $L_{dried}$ , using the same filling procedure and the same freezing  
759 protocol that will be used in the larger scale. In this test it is required to measure the product  
760 temperature profile, and to operate at the same pressure and with the same type of vial used in the  
761 previous step as it is required to know  $K_v$ ;
- 762 3) Use the  $K_v$  found at step 1) and  $R_p$  found at step 2) to simulate the process dynamics in a different  
763 unit, so calculating the product temperature profiles and the time required to complete the primary  
764 drying.

765 At this point, a test may be carried out in the larger unit for validation purposes. It is always necessary  
766 to carry out at least one test in the larger unit, quite often indicated as “engineering run”, to validate  
767 the cycle developed at smaller scale. In some cases, in fact, it may be observed a difference even in the  
768 value of  $K_v$  for the central vial, due to differences in the roughness of the shelf surface, or in the

769 performance of the heating system. This situation is not very common, but it may occur, and, in this  
770 case, the traditional approach, based on the thermal characterization of the large freeze-dryer and on  
771 the optimization of the temperature of the heating ring is unavoidable if a true replication of the  
772 heating conditions in the two units is desired. In this case, the results obtained following the algorithm  
773 proposed in this paper have to be regarded as a first guess approach.

774

#### 775 **Acknowledgments**

776 The authors would like to acknowledge Millrock Technology Inc., for the financial support and the  
777 useful suggestions for the use of the device. Valuable contribution of Andrea Lupano (Politecnico di  
778 Torino) to the experimental investigation is gratefully acknowledged.

779

#### 780 **Declaration of interest: Role of the funding source**

781 Millrock Technology Inc. has supported the study by loaning the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> used in this study to the  
782 research group of the Politecnico di Torino and by helping the researchers to solve practical issues  
783 related to the experimental investigation.

784 **References**

- 785 1. Wang, B.S. & Pikal, M. J. *Stabilization of lyophilized pharmaceuticals by process*  
786 *optimization: Challenges and opportunities*. Am. Pharm. Rev. 2012; 82-89.
- 787 2. Fissore, D. *Freeze Drying of Pharmaceuticals*. Encyclopedia of Pharmaceutical Science and  
788 Technology. Taylor and Francis: New York, 2013; 1723-1737. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1081/E-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1081/E-EPT4-120050278)  
789 [EPT4-120050278](http://dx.doi.org/10.1081/E-EPT4-120050278)
- 790 3. Bellows, R.J. & King, C.J. *Freeze-drying of aqueous solutions: maximum allowable*  
791 *operating temperature*. Cryobiology. 1972; 9(6): 559-561. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0011-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0011-2240(72)90179-4)  
792 [2240\(72\)90179-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0011-2240(72)90179-4)
- 793 4. Barresi, A. A.; Ghio, S.; Fissore, D.; & Pisano, R. *Freeze drying of pharmaceutical excipients*  
794 *close to collapse temperature: Influence of the process conditions on process time and product*  
795 *quality*. Dry. Technol. 2009; 27(6): 805–816. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07373930902901646>
- 796 5. Rathore, A.S. & Winkle, H. *Quality by design for biopharmaceuticals*. Nat. Biotechnol. 2009;  
797 1: 26-34. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt0109-26>
- 798 6. Giordano, A., Barresi, A.A. & Fissore D. *On the use of mathematical models to build the*  
799 *design space for the primary drying phase of a pharmaceutical lyophilization process*. J.  
800 Pharm. Sci. 2011;100(1): 311-324. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jps.22264>
- 801 7. Fissore, D., Pisano, R., & Barresi, A.A. *Advanced approach to build the design space for the*  
802 *primary drying of a pharmaceutical freeze-drying process*. J. Pharm. Sci. 2011;  
803 100(11):4922-4933. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jps.22668>
- 804 8. Koganti, V.R, Shalaev, E.Y., Berry, M.R., Osterberg, T., Youssef, M., Hiebert, D.N., Kanka,  
805 F.A., Nolan, M., Barrett, R., Scalzo, G., Fitzpatrick, G., Fitzgibbon, N., Luthra, S., & Zhang,  
806 L. *Investigation of design space for freeze-drying: Use of modeling for primary drying*  
807 *segment of a freeze-drying cycle*. AAPS PharmSciTech. 2011;12(3):854-861.  
808 <https://doi.org/10.1208/s12249-011-9645-7>
- 809 9. Fissore, D., Gallo, G., Ruggiero, A.E. & Thomson T.N. *On the use of a micro freeze-dryer*

- 810 *for the investigation of the primary drying stage of a freeze-drying process.* Eur. J. Pharm.  
811 Biopharm. 2019; 141: 121-129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpb.2019.05.019>
- 812 10. Fissore, D. & Barresi, A. A. *Scale-up and process transfer of freeze-drying recipes.* Dry.  
813 Technol. 2011; 29(14): 1673-1684. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07373937.2011.597059>
- 814 11. Pisano, R., Fissore, D., & Barresi, A.A. *Heat transfer in freeze-drying apparatus*, in: M. A.  
815 Dos Santos Bernardes (Ed.), Heat Transfer; Intech, Rijeka, Croatia, 2011; 91-114.  
816 <https://doi.org/10.1016/10.5772/23799>
- 817 12. Pikal, M.J., Bogner, R.H., Mudhivarthi, V., Sharma, P., & Sane, P. *Freeze-drying process*  
818 *development and scale-up: scale-up of edge vial vs. center vial heat transfer coefficients*, Kv.  
819 J. Pharm. Res. 2016; 105:3363–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xphs.2016.07.027>
- 820 13. Moino, C., Bourlés, E., Pisano, R., & Scutellà, B. *In-line monitoring of the freeze-drying*  
821 *process by means of heat flux sensors.* Ind. Eng. Chem. Res. 2020; 60:9637-9645.  
822 <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.iecr.1c00536>
- 823 14. Scutellà, B., Plana-Fattori, A., Passot, S., Bourlès, E., Fonseca, F., Flick, D., & Trelea, I.C.  
824 *3D mathematical modeling to understand atypical heat transfer observed in vial freeze-*  
825 *drying.* Appl. Therm. Eng. 2017; 12: 226-236.  
826 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2017.07.096>
- 827 15. Thompson, T.N. & Fissore, D., *Use of a micro freeze-dryer for developing a freeze-drying*  
828 *process.* 2019. in “Freeze Drying of Pharmaceutical Products”, (D. Fissore, R. Pisano and A.  
829 Barresi, Eds.) Chap. 7. CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group, pp. 131-143. [ISBN: 978-0429-  
830 02207-4]
- 831 16. Matejčíková, A. Tichý, E. & Rajniakac P. Experimental investigation of inhomogeneities of  
832 primary drying during lyophilization: Impact of the vials packing density. J. Drug. Dev. Sci.  
833 Tech. 2022;74: 103550. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jddst.2022.103550>
- 834 17. Elhers, S., Schroeder, R. & Friess W. *Trouble with the neighbor during freeze-drying: Rivalry*  
835 *about energy.* J. Pharm. Sci. 2021; 110(3): 1219-1226.

- 836 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xphs.2020.10.024>
- 837 18. Scutellà, B., Passot, S. Bourlés, E., Fonseca, F. & Trélea, I.C. *How vial geometry variability*  
838 *influences heat transfer and product temperature during freeze-drying*. J. Pharm. Sci. 2016;  
839 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2017.07.096>
- 840 19. Obeidat, W.M., Bogner, R., Mudhivarthi, V., Sharma, P., & Sane, P. *Development of a mini-*  
841 *freeze dryer for material-sparing laboratory processing with representative temperature*  
842 *history*. AAPS PharmSciTech. 2018; 29:599-609. [https://doi.org/10.1208/s12249-017-0871-](https://doi.org/10.1208/s12249-017-0871-5)  
843 [5](https://doi.org/10.1208/s12249-017-0871-5)
- 844 20. Thompson, T.N., Wang, Q., & Reiter, C. *Developing transferable freeze-drying protocols*  
845 *using accuflux and a MicroFD*. Presentation given at Peptalk 2017, San Diego, USA.  
846 Available at: <https://pharmahub.org/groups/lyo/tools>. Accessed November 2022.
- 847 21. Goldman, J.M., Chen, X., Register, J.T., Nesarikar, V., Iyer, L., Wu, Y., Mugheirbi, N. &  
848 Rowe J. *Representative scale-down lyophilization cycle development using a seven-vial*  
849 *freeze-dryer (MicroFD®)*. J. Pharm. Sci. 2019; 108(4): 486-1495.  
850 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xphs.2018.11.018>
- 851 22. Fissore, D., Harguindeguy, M., Velez Ramirez, D. & Thompson, T.N. *Development of freeze-*  
852 *drying cycles for pharmaceutical products using a micro freeze-dryer*. J. Pharm. Sci. 2020;  
853 109: 797-806. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xphs.2019.10.053>
- 854 23. Patel, S.M., Doen, T. & Pikal, J.M. *Determination of end point of primary drying in freeze-*  
855 *drying process control*. AAPS PharmSciTech. 2010; 11: 73-84.  
856 <https://doi.org/10.1021/10.1208/s12249-009-9362-7>
- 857 24. Sadikoglu, H.; & Liapis, A.I. *Mathematical modelling of the primary and secondary drying*  
858 *stages of bulk solution freeze-drying in trays: Parameter estimation and model discrimination*  
859 *by comparison of theoretical results with experimental data*. Dry. Technol. 1997; 15: 791–  
860 810. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07373939708917262>
- 861 25. Gan, K.H.; Crosser, O.K.; Liapis, A.I.; & Bruttini, R. *Lyophilisation in vials on trays: Effects*

- 862 *of tray side*. Dry. Technol. 2005; 23: 341–363. <https://doi.org/10.1081/DRT-200047671>
- 863 26. Hottot, A.; Peczalski, R.; Vessot, S.; & Andrieu, J. *Freeze-drying of pharmaceutical proteins*  
864 *in vials: Modeling of freezing and sublimation steps*. Dry. Technol. 2006; 24, 561–570.  
865 <https://doi.org/10.1080/07373930600626388>
- 866 27. Velardi, S.A. & Barresi, A.A. *Development of simplified models for the freeze-drying process*  
867 *and investigation of the optimal operating conditions*. Chem. Eng. Res. Des. 2008; 86(1):9-  
868 22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CHERD.2007.10.007>
- 869 28. Fissore, D., Pisano, R., & Barresi, A. *Using mathematical modeling and prior knowledge for*  
870 *QbD in freeze-drying processes*. In: Jameel F, Hershenson F, Khan MA, Martin-Moe S, eds.  
871 *Quality by Design for Biopharmaceutical Drug Product Development*. New York: Springer.  
872 2015; 565-593. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-2316-8\\_23](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-2316-8_23)
- 873 29. Fissore, D., & Pisano, R. *Computer-aided framework for the design of freeze-drying cycles:*  
874 *optimization of the operating conditions of the primary drying stage*. Processes, 2015; 3:406-  
875 421. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/pr3020406>
- 876 30. Geidobler, R. & Winter, G. *Controlled ice nucleation in the field of freeze-drying:*  
877 *fundamentals and technology review*. Eur. J. Pharm. Biopharm. 2013; 85(2): 214-222.  
878 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpb.2013.04.014>

**Table 1:** Values of the heat transfer coefficient  $K_v$  obtained through the gravimetric test in MicroFD<sup>®</sup> and in REVO<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer processing water in 2R and in 6R vials. The mean values of the heat transfer coefficient and the standard deviation (given as percentage of the mean value), for each case, are reported.


Pressure, Pa	6.7	13.3	26.7	6.7	13.3	26.7
Vial	6R	6R	6R	2R	2R	2R
$K_{v, \text{MicroFD}}, \text{ W m}^{-2}\text{K}^{-1}$	13.5	17.5	25.8	21.4	28.5	37.8
$K_{v, \text{MicroFD, bottom}}, \text{ W m}^{-2}\text{K}^{-1}$	17.1	24.4	33.2	23.4	33.4	44.9
$K_{v, \text{REVO}}, \text{ W m}^{-2}\text{K}^{-1}$	14.4	18.6	25.8	20.3	30.6	38.3
Standard deviation, % (MicroFD – MicroFD, bottom)	26.7	39.4	28.7	9.3	5.9	18.8
Standard deviation, % (MicroFD, bottom – REVO )	15.8	23.8	22.3	13.2	8.4	14.7
Standard deviation, % (MicroFD – REVO)	6.6	6.2	0.04	5.7	7.0	1.4

**Table 2:** Heat fluxes calculated for each gravimetric test carried out in the MicroFD® freeze-dryer. Results were obtained processing water in 2R and in 6R vials, at different values of chamber pressure.


Pressure, Pa	6.7	13.3	26.7	6.7	13.3	26.7
Vial	6R	6R	6R	2R	2R	2R
$\dot{Q}_{subl,int}$ , W	1.22	1.46	1.59	1.98	2.12	2.66
$\dot{Q}_{base,int}$ , W	0.96	1.04	1.24	1.96	1.99	2.42
$\dot{Q}_{LAT}$ , W	0.26	0.42	0.35	0.02	0.13	0.24
$\dot{Q}_{subl,ext}$ , W	2.94	3.29	3.64	2.67	2.82	3.43
$\dot{Q}_{base,ext}$ , W	1.57	2.04	2.07	1.71	1.71	2.24
$\dot{Q}_{LyoSim}$ , W	1.62	1.68	1.92	0.98	1.24	1.42

**Table 3:** Summary of mass transfer parameters. Results were obtained processing a 5% w/w aqueous sucrose solution, in 2R and in 6R vials, in the MicroFD® and REVO® freeze-dryers.


Equipment	MicroFD®	MicroFD®	REVO®
Vial	2R	6R	6R
$R_{p,0}$ , m s <sup>-1</sup>	0	0	0
$A$ , s <sup>-1</sup>	$1.65 \cdot 10^9$	$2.52 \cdot 10^9$	$4.62 \cdot 10^8$
$B$ , m <sup>-1</sup>	$2.02 \cdot 10^4$	$3.76 \cdot 10^4$	$3.61 \cdot 10^3$




**Figure 1:** Schematic arrangement of vials and thermocouples for the four configurations used in this study: (a) vials 6R in MicroFD<sup>®</sup>, (b) vials 2R in MicroFD<sup>®</sup>, (c) vials 6R in REVO<sup>®</sup> and (d) vials 2R in REVO<sup>®</sup>. White circles identify empty vials, black circles identify vials filled with water (or product, depending on the aim of the test), not weighed in the gravimetric test, grey circles identify vials filled with water (or product) and weighed in the gravimetric test. Vials where a thermocouple was inserted are indicated by a label.




**Figure 2:** Schematization of the heat fluxes in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer by simplifying the system considering only two layers. The external layer, directly in contact with the ring, is reported as “Layer 1”, while the internal layer as “Layer 2”.




**Figure 3:** Zoom of the arrangement of 6R vials in MicroFD®.




**Figure 4:** Comparison between the temperature profiles measured in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> and in the REVO<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryers for different values of chamber pressure during the sublimation step. Graphs (a), (b) and (c) refer to tests carried out in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> device, while graphs (d), (e) and (f) refer to tests carried out in the REVO<sup>®</sup> equipment. Results were obtained processing water in 2R vials at the following pressures: (a), (d): 6.7 Pa, (b), (e): 13.3 Pa, and (c), (f): 26.7 Pa. The temperature of the shelf was equal to -10°C and the ring temperature offset was set to 0°C in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer.




**Figure 5:** Values of the heat transfer coefficient as a function of chamber pressure for: (a) 2R vials and (b) 6R vials. Results were obtained processing water, in 2R and in 6R vials, in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> (solid line) and REVO<sup>®</sup> (dashed line) freeze-dryers. Symbols identify values obtained through the gravimetric tests, while lines correspond to the curves calculated by minimizing the mean square difference between the experimental and theoretical  $K_v$  values (with Eq. 46).




**Figure 6:** Values of the heat fluxes to the vials in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer, expressed as percentage of the total flux, obtained processing water in 2R vials.



**Figure 7:** Values of the ratio  $r_e/\tau$  as a function of the thickness of the dried layer for a 5% w/w aqueous sucrose solution processed in 6R and in 2R vials at 13.3 Pa in a MicroFD<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer and in the REVO<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer.



**Figure 8:** Graph (a): Comparison between the ratio Pirani/Baratron pressure measurements obtained in three tests carried out in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> and in the REVO<sup>®</sup> equipment using 2R (black line) and 6R vials (dark grey and light grey lines). Graph (b): Comparison between the height of the dried cake calculated by the process simulation for the three tests. In all the tests a 5% w/w aqueous sucrose solution was processed at 13.3 Pa. The temperature of the shelf was equal to -10°C and the ring temperature offset was set to -3°C in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer.




**Figure 9:** Product temperature in the primary drying stage of a freeze-drying cycle of a 5% w/w aqueous sucrose solution in 6R vials in the REVO® equipment (black line) at 13.3 Pa. The temperature of the shelf was equal to -10°C and the ring temperature offset was set to -3°C in the MicroFD® freeze-dryer. The values obtained through mathematical simulation of the process using the mass transfer parameters calculated for 2R vials in MicroFD® (grey line) and for 6R vials in MicroFD® (dashed line) are also shown. The  $K_v$  values found with the optimization algorithm in the first part of the study were used for the mathematical simulations.

**Table S1:** Weight loss (mean value and standard deviation) in each gravimetric test carried in MicroFD® freeze-dryer.


<b>Pressure, Pa</b>	<b>Vial type</b>	<b>Mean weight loss in vials of layer 1, g</b>	<b>Mean weight loss in vials of layer 2, g</b>	<b>Standard deviation of the weight loss in vials of layer 1, %</b>	<b>D Standard deviation of the weight loss in vials of layer 2, %</b>
6.7	2R	0.6942	0.5077	7.94	7.79
13.3	2R	0.6366	0.4541	8.42	10.12
26.7	2R	0.7480	0.5491	9.19	5.93
6.7	6R	1.0652	0.7603	8.71	2.82
13.3	6R	1.2027	0.888	7.2	4.3
26.7	6R	1.2785	0.9556	7.17	1.48

**Table S2:** Weight loss (mean value and standard deviation) in each gravimetric test carried in REVO freeze-dryer.


<b>Pressure, Pa</b>	<b>Vial type</b>	<b>Mean weight loss, g</b>	<b>Standard deviation of the weight loss in vials, %</b>
6.7	2R	0.3837	6.06
13.3	2R	0.4510	7.54
26.7	2R	0.4682	7.81
6.7	6R	0.6158	12.19
13.3	6R	0.6802	6.77
26.7	6R	0.5624	5.06




**Figure S1:** Comparison between the temperature profiles measured in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> and in the REVO<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryers for different values of chamber pressure during the sublimation step. Graphs (a), (b) and (c) refer to tests carried out in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> device, while graphs (d), (e) and (f) refer to tests carried out in the REVO<sup>®</sup> equipment. Results were obtained processing water in 6R vials at the following pressures: (a), (d): 6.7 Pa, (b), (e): 13.3 Pa, and (c), (f): 26.7 Pa. The temperature of the shelf was equal to -10°C and the ring temperature offset was set to 0°C in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer.



**Figure S2:** Values of the heat fluxes to the vials in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer, expressed as percentage of the total flux, obtained processing water in 6R vials.



**Figure S3:** Comparison between the values of the heat fluxes to the vials in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer as a function of chamber pressure for (a) 2R vials and (b) 6R vials. Results were obtained by processing water in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer for three values of chamber pressure: 6.7, 13.3 and 26.7 Pa. The temperature of the shelf was equal to -10°C and the ring temperature offset was set to 0°C.



**Figure S4:** Product temperature profiles measured by means of a thermocouple in a vial during the primary drying stage of a 5% w/w aqueous sucrose solution in 6R vials in the REVO<sup>®</sup> equipment (stretch point black line) and in 2R vials in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> (dashed black line) at 13.3 Pa. The temperature of the shelf was equal to -10°C and the ring temperature offset was set to -3°C in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> freeze-dryer. Values are compared with those obtained by process simulation using the experimental mass transfer parameters calculated for 2R vials in MicroFD<sup>®</sup> (grey line) and by simulating the behavior of the 2R vials using all the experimental parameters obtained in the MicroFD<sup>®</sup> (thick black line). The calculated trend in the 2R vials using the  $K_v$  value found in the first part of the study in the REVO<sup>®</sup> equipment is also shown for comparison (black line).