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Figure S1: Amiodarone concentration in Donor (dissolution) and Receiver chambers: FaSSIF vs FeSSIF

Figure S2: Celecoxib concentration in Donor (dissolution) and Receiver chambers: FaSSIF vs FeSSIF
Figure S2: Celecoxib concentration in Donor (dissolution) and Receiver chambers: FaSSIF vs FeSSIF

Figure S3: Danazol concentration in Donor (dissolution) and Receiver chambers: FaSSIF vs FeSSIF

Figure S4: Griseofulvin concentration in Donor (dissolution) and Receiver chambers: FaSSIF vs FeSSIF

Figure S5: Isoniazid concentration in Receiver chamber: FaSSIF vs FeSSIF. Isoniazid was 100% dissolved in donor chamber within 30 seconds
Figure S6: Nefazodone concentration in Donor (dissolution) and Receiver chambers: FaSSIF vs FeSSIF

Figure S7: Zidovudine concentration in Donor (dissolution) and Receiver chambers: FaSSIF vs FeSSIF

Figure S8: Clopidogrel concentration in Donor (dissolution) and Receiver chambers: FaSSIF vs FeSSIF
Figure S9: Nifedipine concentration in Donor (dissolution) and Receiver chambers: FaSSIF vs FeSSIF

Figure S10: Fluoxetine HCl concentration in Donor (dissolution)