



Long-Chain Polymeric, Lipid-Based, and Inorganic-Organic Hybrid Nanocarriers for Targeted, Controlled, and Sustained Drug Release in Pharmaceutical Nanotechnology: Advancing Precision Oncology Through Stimuli-Responsive and Ligand-Mediated Cancer Therapy

Charlotte Eleanor Whitfield ^{1*}, Ethan Matthew ²

¹ PhD Institut Galien Paris-Saclay, Université Paris-Saclay, France

² PhD Department of Pharmacy, National University of Singapore, Singapore

* Corresponding Author: **Charlotte Eleanor Whitfield**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 3107-393X

Volume: 03

Issue: 01

Received: 22-11-2025

Accepted: 24-12-2025

Published: 26-01-2026

Page No: 35-45

Abstract

Despite significant progress in oncological pharmacology, conventional chemotherapy remains constrained by poor bioavailability, non-selective biodistribution, dose-limiting systemic toxicity, and the emergence of multidrug resistance, collectively necessitating the development of more sophisticated delivery platforms. Pharmaceutical nanotechnology has addressed these limitations through the rational engineering of nanoscale carriers capable of encapsulating therapeutic agents, overcoming biological barriers, and achieving spatiotemporally controlled drug release within the tumor microenvironment. This review critically examines the current landscape of nanotechnology-based drug delivery systems engineered for targeted cancer therapy, with emphasis on polymeric nanoparticles, liposomal formulations, solid lipid nanocarriers, inorganic nanoparticles, dendrimers, exosomes, and hybrid architectures. The mechanistic foundations of passive targeting via the enhanced permeability and retention effect, active targeting through ligand-receptor interactions, and stimuli-responsive release triggered by endogenous or exogenous stimuli are systematically analyzed. Major therapeutic applications spanning solid tumors, hematologic malignancies, combinatorial regimens, and chemoresistance reversal are evaluated alongside translational status, clinical trial outcomes, and regulatory considerations. Persistent challenges including nanocarrier toxicity, immunogenicity, heterogeneous biodistribution, and scalable manufacturing are critically appraised. Collectively, pharmaceutical nanotechnology constitutes a transformative paradigm in precision oncology, with emerging personalized nanomedicine strategies poised to address intertumoral and intratumoral heterogeneity while improving therapeutic indices and patient survival outcomes.

Keywords: Pharmaceutical nanocarriers; targeted drug delivery; cancer nanomedicine; controlled release kinetics; stimuli-responsive nanoparticles

1. Introduction

1.1 Background on Cancer Therapy Challenges

Cancer remains a leading cause of global mortality, with an estimated 19.3 million new cases and 10 million deaths annually, figures projected to escalate as populations age and environmental risk factors accumulate ^[1, 2]. Despite substantial investments in drug discovery and development, conventional chemotherapeutic agents continue to exhibit significant pharmacological limitations, including rapid systemic clearance, extensive off-target distribution, and narrow therapeutic windows that necessitate dose reduction or treatment discontinuation ^[3, 4]. The non-selective nature of cytotoxic agents results in indiscriminate damage

to rapidly proliferating healthy tissues, particularly hematopoietic progenitors, gastrointestinal epithelium, and hair follicles, producing debilitating adverse effects that compromise quality of life and limit achievable drug concentrations at tumor sites ^[5, 6].

Beyond acute toxicity, acquired and intrinsic resistance mechanisms substantially undermine chemotherapeutic efficacy. Tumor cells exploit drug efflux transporters such as P-glycoprotein, activate alternative survival signaling pathways, enhance DNA repair capacity, and evade apoptosis through genetic and epigenetic adaptations ^[7, 8]. Furthermore, the complex tumor microenvironment characterized by aberrant vascularization, elevated interstitial fluid pressure, dense extracellular matrix, and immunosuppressive cellular infiltrates creates additional barriers to uniform drug penetration and retention ^[9, 10]. These multifaceted challenges have motivated intensive investigation into alternative delivery strategies capable of enhancing tumor-selective accumulation while minimizing systemic exposure.

1.2. Role of Nanotechnology in Improving Therapeutic Outcomes

Pharmaceutical nanotechnology encompasses the engineering of materials and devices at the nanometer scale—typically 1–1000 nm—for diagnostic, therapeutic, and theranostic applications ^[11, 12]. Nanocarrier-based drug delivery systems offer several distinct advantages over conventional formulations: protection of labile therapeutic cargo from premature degradation in biological environments, extended circulation half-lives through evasion of renal filtration and reticuloendothelial clearance, preferential accumulation in malignant tissues via passive and active targeting mechanisms, and programmable release kinetics responsive to specific pathological or externally applied stimuli ^[13, 14].

The integration of nanocarriers with molecularly targeted ligands—including antibodies, antibody fragments, peptides, aptamers, and small molecules—has enabled cell surface receptor-specific delivery, thereby enhancing intracellular uptake and reducing collateral toxicity to antigen-negative healthy tissues ^[15, 16]. Moreover, co-encapsulation of multiple therapeutic agents within a single nanocarrier platform facilitates synergistic combination chemotherapy with synchronized pharmacokinetics and spatially coordinated drug release ^[17, 18]. These technological advances have progressively translated from preclinical investigation to clinical application, with numerous nanomedicine formulations achieving regulatory approval and many others currently undergoing evaluation in human trials ^[19, 20].

1.3. Scope of the Review

This review provides a comprehensive examination of contemporary advancements in nanotechnology-based drug delivery systems engineered specifically for targeted cancer therapy, with rigorous emphasis on pharmaceutical nanotechnology principles, controlled and sustained release mechanisms, and translational oncology applications. The following sections systematically address: (i) the classification and characterization of major nanocarrier platforms employed in oncological drug delivery; (ii) the mechanistic underpinnings of passive, active, and stimuli-responsive targeting strategies; (iii) the pharmacokinetic principles governing controlled and sustained drug release; (iv) therapeutic applications across diverse cancer types and treatment contexts; and (v) prevailing challenges and emerging perspectives in clinical translation and personalized nanomedicine. Particular attention is devoted to recently approved formulations and actively recruiting clinical trials, reflecting the accelerating pace of nanomedicine integration into standard oncological practice.

2. Pharmaceutical Nanotechnology in Oncology

2.1. Overview of Nanocarriers for Cancer Therapy

The repertoire of nanocarrier platforms available for cancer drug delivery has expanded substantially over the past three decades, progressing from relatively simple liposomal vesicles to sophisticated multifunctional architectures incorporating targeting ligands, imaging reporters, and environmentally responsive components ^[21, 22]. Contemporary nanocarriers are broadly classified according to their principal constituent materials: lipid-based systems including liposomes, solid lipid nanoparticles, and nanostructured lipid carriers; polymeric systems encompassing synthetic and natural polymers in the form of nanoparticles, micelles, dendrimers, and polymer-drug conjugates; inorganic systems such as gold, iron oxide, mesoporous silica, and quantum dot nanoparticles; and hybrid or biomimetic systems combining multiple material classes or incorporating cellular membrane coatings ^[23, 24]. Each nanocarrier class exhibits distinct physicochemical properties governing drug loading capacity, release kinetics, biological stability, biodistribution patterns, and toxicological profiles ^[25]. Selection of an appropriate nanocarrier for a given therapeutic application requires systematic optimization of these interdependent parameters alongside consideration of the physicochemical characteristics of the encapsulated drug, the biological features of the target malignancy, and the intended route of administration ^[26, 27]. Table 1 provides a comprehensive overview of major nanocarrier systems currently employed in cancer drug delivery, highlighting their compositional features, representative therapeutic payloads, and current developmental status.

Table 1: Major Nanocarrier Systems and Their Applications in Cancer Drug Delivery

Nanocarrier Type	Composition	Representative Payloads	Key Features	Development Status
Liposomes	Phospholipid bilayers	Doxorubicin, daunorubicin, cytarabine, vincristine, irinotecan	High biocompatibility, FDA-approved formulations, surface modifiable	Clinically approved
PEGylated liposomes	Phospholipids + polyethylene glycol	Doxorubicin (Doxil/Caelyx)	Extended circulation, reduced RES uptake	Clinically approved
Polymeric nanoparticles	PLGA, PLA, PEG-PLA, chitosan	Paclitaxel, docetaxel, cisplatin	Tunable degradation, sustained release	Clinical trials
Polymeric micelles	Amphiphilic block copolymers	Paclitaxel (Genexol-PM), doxorubicin	Small size (10-100 nm), high loading	Clinically approved (Asia)
Solid lipid nanoparticles	Physiological lipids	Doxorubicin, idarubicin, paclitaxel	Controlled release, scalable	Clinical trials
Dendrimers	Branched polymers (PAMAM, PPI)	Methotrexate, cisplatin, doxorubicin	Monodisperse, multivalent functionalization	Preclinical/Phase I
Gold nanoparticles	Colloidal gold	TNF- α , paclitaxel, photothermal agents	Photothermal conversion, imaging	Clinical trials
Iron oxide nanoparticles	Magnetite/maghemite	Doxorubicin, photothermal agents	Magnetic targeting, hyperthermia, MRI	Clinical trials
Mesoporous silica	Silica framework	Camptothecin, doxorubicin, cisplatin	High surface area, tunable pores	Preclinical/Phase I
Exosomes	Endogenous lipid vesicles	miRNAs, siRNAs, doxorubicin, paclitaxel	Low immunogenicity, natural targeting	Clinical trials
Nanogels	Crosslinked polymer networks	siRNA, proteins, doxorubicin	High water content, stimuli-responsive	Preclinical

2.2. Rationale for Targeted, Controlled, and Sustained Delivery

The pharmacological rationale underlying nanocarrier-mediated cancer therapy derives from fundamental principles of pharmacokinetics and tumor biology^[28]. Conventional small-molecule chemotherapeutics exhibit volume-of-distribution values substantially exceeding total body water, reflecting extensive tissue penetration that includes both malignant and healthy organs^[29]. This non-selective biodistribution necessitates administration of total drug quantities far exceeding those required at tumor sites, thereby proportionally amplifying systemic toxicity^[30]. Nanocarrier encapsulation fundamentally alters drug disposition by confining therapeutic agents within particles too large for extravasation through continuous capillaries in healthy tissues while permitting egress through fenestrated tumor vasculature—a phenomenon exploited in passive targeting strategies^[31, 32].

Controlled release formulations provide additional therapeutic advantages by maintaining drug concentrations within the optimal therapeutic window for extended durations, avoiding both the transient suprathreshold peaks associated with bolus administration and the prolonged subtherapeutic troughs that permit tumor regrowth and facilitate resistance development^[33, 34]. Sustained release profiles also reduce dosing frequency, improving patient compliance and permitting outpatient management of previously inpatient-only regimens^[35]. Furthermore, targeted delivery to tumor-associated cell surface receptors enhances intracellular drug accumulation specifically within malignant cells, overcoming concentration-dependent resistance mechanisms while sparing antigen-negative normal tissues^[36, 37].

2.3. Clinical and Translational Relevance

The translational trajectory of cancer nanomedicine has progressed from laboratory discovery to regulatory approval and clinical implementation, with over 15 nanomedicine products currently approved for oncological indications

globally and numerous additional candidates in advanced clinical evaluation^[38, 39]. Doxil (pegylated liposomal doxorubicin), approved in 1995 for AIDS-related Kaposi sarcoma and subsequently for ovarian cancer and multiple myeloma, established clinical proof-of-concept for nanocarrier-mediated improvements in therapeutic index through reduced cardiotoxicity and enhanced tumor accumulation^[40, 41]. Subsequent approvals including Abraxane (albumin-bound paclitaxel), Marqibo (liposomal vincristine), Onivyde (liposomal irinotecan), and Vyxeos (liposomal cytarabine:daunorubicin) have progressively expanded the clinical armamentarium while validating diverse formulation strategies^[42, 43].

Despite these successes, the translational gap between preclinical innovation and clinical adoption remains substantial, with many sophisticated multifunctional nanocarriers failing to progress beyond early-phase investigation^[44]. Critical barriers include insufficient characterization of nanoparticle-biological interactions under physiologically relevant conditions, inadequate predictive validity of preclinical tumor models, complex and costly manufacturing processes, and challenging regulatory pathways for combination products incorporating both drug and device components^[45, 46]. Addressing these translational bottlenecks represents an urgent priority for the field.

3. Nanocarrier-Based Targeted Drug Delivery Systems

3.1. Polymeric Nanoparticles

Polymeric nanoparticles fabricated from biodegradable and biocompatible polymers constitute one of the most extensively investigated nanocarrier classes for cancer drug delivery^[47, 48]. Poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA), approved by regulatory agencies for multiple biomedical applications, undergoes hydrolytic degradation to yield endogenous metabolites that are eliminated through physiological pathways, conferring an exceptional safety profile^[49, 50]. PLGA nanoparticles encapsulating chemotherapeutic agents exhibit sustained release kinetics extending from days to weeks, controlled by manipulation of

polymer molecular weight, lactide:glycolide ratio, and particle porosity. Surface functionalization with polyethylene glycol (PEG) reduces opsonization and reticuloendothelial clearance, extending circulation half-life from minutes to hours and enhancing passive tumor accumulation through the enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect. Beyond PLGA, poly(ϵ -caprolactone) (PCL), poly(alkyl cyanoacrylate), and natural polymers including chitosan, alginate, and gelatin have been extensively evaluated for oncological applications. Polymeric micelles assembled from amphiphilic block copolymers exhibit critical micelle concentrations substantially lower than those of conventional surfactants, conferring thermodynamic stability upon intravenous administration that permits prolonged circulation and gradual drug release. Genexol-PM, a polymeric micellar formulation of paclitaxel incorporating monomethoxy PEG-poly(D,L-lactide), achieved regulatory approval in South Korea for breast cancer and non-small cell lung cancer and has demonstrated reduced hypersensitivity reactions compared to Cremophor EL-based taxane formulations.

3.2. Lipid-Based Nanocarriers

Liposomes remain the most clinically established nanocarrier platform, with over a dozen formulations approved globally and extensive experience documenting their safety and efficacy across diverse oncological indications. Conventional liposomes composed of natural or synthetic phospholipids spontaneously assemble upon hydration into spherical vesicles comprising one or more lipid bilayers surrounding an internal aqueous compartment. Hydrophilic drugs are entrapped within the aqueous core, whereas lipophilic agents partition into the lipid bilayer, enabling encapsulation of chemotherapeutics spanning broad physicochemical property ranges.

Surface modification of liposomes with PEGylated lipids creates a steric barrier reducing protein adsorption and delaying recognition by mononuclear phagocyte system components, extending circulation half-life from minutes to hours. This prolonged circulation permits progressive accumulation in tumors exhibiting EPR-mediated vascular permeability, achieving tumor:plasma concentration ratios substantially exceeding those of non-pegylated comparators. Clinical evidence from randomized controlled trials confirms that pegylated liposomal doxorubicin achieves comparable anti-tumor efficacy to conventional doxorubicin while significantly reducing cardiotoxicity, myelosuppression, and alopecia.

Solid lipid nanoparticles and nanostructured lipid carriers represent second-generation lipid-based platforms offering enhanced drug loading, improved physical stability, and more flexible release modulation compared to liposomes. These systems are fabricated from physiological lipids solid at body temperature, permitting drug immobilization within a crystalline or partially crystalline matrix that releases therapeutic cargo through diffusion and matrix erosion. The absence of organic solvents during manufacture and the potential for large-scale production using high-pressure homogenization render these platforms attractive for industrial translation.

3.3. Inorganic and Hybrid Nanocarriers

Inorganic nanoparticles offer distinctive capabilities not readily achievable with organic carriers, including photothermal conversion, magnetic targeting, multimodal

imaging, and theranostic functionality. Gold nanoparticles exhibit size- and shape-dependent surface plasmon resonance, enabling photothermal ablation of malignant tissues upon exposure to near-infrared irradiation while simultaneously serving as contrast agents for photoacoustic and optical coherence tomography. Conjugation of thiolated PEG and tumor-targeting ligands to gold nanoparticle surfaces yields stable, biocompatible constructs that accumulate in solid tumors and mediate photothermal cytotoxicity with minimal off-target heating.

Iron oxide nanoparticles, primarily magnetite (Fe_3O_4) or maghemite ($\gamma\text{-Fe}_2\text{O}_3$), possess superparamagnetic properties enabling magnetic field-guided accumulation, alternating current-induced hyperthermia, and T2-weighted magnetic resonance imaging contrast enhancement. Clinical experience with ferumoxytol, an iron oxide formulation approved for iron deficiency anemia, has been repurposed for oncological imaging and drug delivery, revealing substantial interpatient and intertumoral heterogeneity in nanoparticle accumulation that challenges assumptions regarding universal EPR effect penetrance.

Hybrid nanocarriers integrating multiple material classes aim to synergistically combine complementary functionalities while mitigating individual component limitations. Lipid-polymer hybrid nanoparticles comprising a polymeric core encapsulated within a surrounding lipid monolayer combine the mechanical stability and controlled release characteristics of polymeric systems with the biocompatibility and membrane fusogenicity of liposomes. Similarly, cell membrane-coated nanoparticles cloaked in erythrocyte, leukocyte, or cancer cell-derived membranes inherit the surface antigenic repertoire and homotypic targeting properties of their source cells, conferring immune evasion and tumor-selective accumulation without requiring exogenous targeting ligand conjugation.

3.4. Emerging Platforms: Dendrimers, Exosomes, and Nanogels

Dendrimers represent a distinct nanocarrier class characterized by highly branched, monodisperse, three-dimensional architectures emanating from a central core [91][92]. Poly(amidoamine) (PAMAM) and poly(propylene imine) (PPI) dendrimers exhibit precisely controllable size, multivalent surface functionality, and internal cavities suitable for drug encapsulation. The high density of terminal functional groups permits conjugation of targeting ligands, imaging agents, and therapeutic payloads at defined stoichiometries, yielding well-characterized conjugates with reproducible pharmacokinetic properties. However, cationic dendrimer surfaces exhibit concentration-dependent cytotoxicity related to membrane disruption, necessitating surface modification with PEG or acetyl groups to improve biocompatibility for systemic administration.

Exosomes and other extracellular vesicles have recently emerged as endogenous nanocarriers possessing intrinsic targeting capabilities and immunologically privileged status. These 30–150 nm lipid bilayer-enclosed vesicles mediate intercellular communication through transfer of proteins, lipids, and nucleic acids, reflecting their evolutionary adaptation for biological cargo delivery. Engineering strategies for exosome-based drug delivery include loading of therapeutic agents into secreted exosomes through donor cell manipulation or direct loading of isolated vesicles, as well as surface display of targeting ligands through genetic

modification of donor cells. Clinical evaluation of exosome-based cancer therapeutics remains at early stages, with significant challenges including scalable production, consistent quality control, and comprehensive characterization of heterogeneous vesicle populations.

Nanogels, three-dimensional crosslinked polymer networks swollen in water, combine the high drug loading capacity of hydrogels with the favorable biodistribution characteristics of nanoscale particulates. Chemical or physical crosslinking of synthetic polymers (PEG, poly(N-isopropylacrylamide)) or natural polymers (hyaluronic acid, alginate, chitosan) yields hydrophilic matrices capable of encapsulating macromolecular therapeutics including proteins, nucleic acids, and nanoparticles. The high water content and porous architecture permit rapid diffusion of small molecule drugs, while stimuli-responsive crosslinks enable triggered degradation and drug release specifically within the tumor microenvironment.

4. Mechanisms of Targeted and Controlled Drug Release in Cancer

4.1. Passive Targeting: The Enhanced Permeability and Retention Effect

The enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect constitutes the foundational paradigm underlying passive nanocarrier targeting in solid oncology. Tumor vasculature, generated through the dysregulated process of angiogenesis, exhibits characteristic structural abnormalities including dilated vessel diameter, irregular branching patterns, discontinuous endothelial lining, and deficient pericyte coverage. These architectural derangements create interendothelial gaps ranging from 100 nm to 2 μ m in diameter, permitting extravasation of circulating nanoparticles that would be retained within the continuous, non-fenestrated endothelium of healthy vasculature.

Concurrent with enhanced vascular permeability, solid tumors manifest impaired lymphatic drainage resulting from lymphatic vessel compression, intratumoral interstitial hypertension, and deficient lymphatic network development. This functional insufficiency impedes clearance of extravasated macromolecules and nanoparticles from the tumor interstitium, promoting progressive accumulation over time through retention mechanisms. The combination of preferential extravasation and prolonged retention yields tumor:blood concentration ratios for nanocarrier-encapsulated drugs substantially exceeding those achievable with free drug administration.

Despite its widespread acceptance as a central paradigm of cancer nanomedicine, the EPR effect exhibits substantial heterogeneity across tumor types, between individual patients with histologically similar malignancies, and even among different metastatic lesions within the same patient. Preclinical studies employing transplantable murine tumors frequently overestimate EPR magnitude and penetrance relative to spontaneous human malignancies, contributing to translational failures when nanomedicine formulations demonstrating impressive efficacy in animal models fail to replicate these outcomes in clinical trials. Recognition of these limitations has motivated development of EPR-enhancing strategies including vascular normalization, angiotensin II-induced hypertension, and photodynamic or sonodynamic vascular modulation.

4.2. Active Targeting: Ligand-Receptor Mediated Delivery

Active targeting strategies aim to enhance nanocarrier accumulation specifically within malignant cells through recognition of tumor-associated molecular markers by surface-conjugated targeting ligands. This approach distinguishes between cellular uptake and overall tumor accumulation: whereas passive EPR-mediated extravasation delivers nanocarriers to the tumor interstitium, active targeting promotes subsequent internalization into cancer cells through receptor-mediated endocytosis. The resultant intracellular drug release circumvents efflux pump-mediated resistance and achieves intranuclear delivery of DNA-damaging agents to their site of pharmacological action.

The transferrin receptor (CD71), overexpressed on malignant cells to support enhanced iron requirements for proliferation, represents one of the most extensively investigated active targeting targets. Transferrin-conjugated nanoparticles demonstrate substantially enhanced cellular uptake and cytotoxicity relative to non-targeted controls in transferrin receptor-positive malignancies, with clinical evaluation of transferrin-targeted liposomal oxaliplatin (MBP-426) completed in advanced solid tumors. Folate receptor α , overexpressed in ovarian, breast, and non-small cell lung cancers while minimally expressed in most normal tissues, provides another well-validated targeting axis amenable to small molecule folate conjugation.

Epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) and human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2), receptor tyrosine kinases amplified or mutationally activated in multiple epithelial malignancies, have been extensively exploited for active nanocarrier targeting using monoclonal antibodies (cetuximab, trastuzumab), antibody fragments (scFv, Fab), and synthetic ligands (EGF, affibodies). HER2-targeted liposomal doxorubicin (MM-302) demonstrated encouraging preclinical activity and favorable cardiac safety relative to free doxorubicin, although a Phase II trial in HER2-positive metastatic breast cancer failed to meet its primary efficacy endpoint. These disappointing clinical outcomes highlight the substantial gap between proof-of-concept active targeting studies and successful clinical translation, reflecting challenges including heterogeneous target antigen expression, limited tumor penetration of ligand-conjugated nanocarriers, and competition from circulating free ligand.

4.3. Stimuli-Responsive Release Mechanisms

Stimuli-responsive or "smart" nanocarriers are engineered to undergo structural destabilization and accelerate drug release specifically upon encountering pathological or externally applied triggers, thereby temporally and spatially coordinating maximal drug concentration with tumor localization. Endogenous stimuli exploitable for tumor-selective drug release include acidic pH, elevated temperature, enzymatic activity, redox potential, and hypoxia—all characteristics distinguishing malignant from healthy tissue microenvironments.

The acidic extracellular pH of solid tumors (6.5–6.9 versus 7.4 in normal tissues) and the more acidic endosomal/lysosomal compartments (pH 4.5–5.5) following internalization provide particularly robust triggers for pH-responsive release systems. Incorporation of ionizable groups with pKa values in the acidic range—including amines,

carboxylic acids, and sulfonamides—into nanocarrier structural components induces protonation, charge neutralization, and conformational changes upon pH reduction, destabilizing carrier integrity and promoting drug liberation. Poly(β -amino ester), poly(L-histidine), and acetylated carboxymethyl cellulose represent extensively characterized pH-responsive materials validated in multiple preclinical cancer models.

Enzyme-responsive nanocarriers exploit the differential expression and activity of proteases, glycosidases, and phospholipases in malignant versus normal tissues. Matrix metalloproteinases (MMPs), particularly MMP-2 and MMP-

9, are overexpressed in invasive malignancies where they degrade extracellular matrix components to facilitate metastasis and angiogenesis. Peptide sequences cleavable by MMPs incorporated as crosslinkers or surface coatings permit tumor microenvironment-selective nanocarrier degradation and drug release while maintaining stability during systemic circulation. Similarly, cathepsin B, a cysteine protease upregulated in lysosomal compartments of malignant cells, cleaves specific peptide linkers (Val-Cit, Phe-Lys) frequently employed in antibody-drug conjugate and polymer-drug conjugate design.

Table 2: Advantages and Limitations of Nanotechnology-Based Drug Delivery Systems

Aspect	Advantages	Limitations
Drug pharmacokinetics	Extended circulation half-life, reduced peak-trough fluctuations, sustained therapeutic concentrations	Altered biodistribution, potential for accumulation in clearance organs
Tumor selectivity	Passive EPR-mediated accumulation, active targeting to cancer cells, stimuli-responsive release	Heterogeneous EPR effect, limited tumor penetration of large nanoparticles
Toxicity profile	Reduced cardiotoxicity (doxorubicin), nephrotoxicity (cisplatin), neurotoxicity (paclitaxel)	Unique nanomaterial toxicities, complement activation-related pseudoallergy
Drug resistance	Bypass of efflux transporters, intracellular drug delivery, co-delivery of resistance modulators	Limited efficacy against non-internalizing targets, heterogeneous target expression
Formulation stability	Protection of labile drugs from degradation, extended shelf-life	Physical instability (aggregation, drug leakage), chemical instability (hydrolysis, oxidation)
Manufacturing	Scalable processes for simple formulations (liposomes, lipid nanoparticles)	Complex, multi-step processes for multifunctional carriers, batch-to-batch variability
Regulatory pathway	Established pathways for liposomal and albumin-bound formulations	Uncertain classification for combination products, evolving standards for nanomaterial characterization

Table 3: Stimuli-Responsive Nanocarriers and Their Therapeutic Relevance

Stimulus Class	Specific Trigger	Nanocarrier Design Strategy	Therapeutic Application	Tumor Selectivity
pH	Extracellular acidity (pH 6.5-6.9)	Charge-converting polymers, pH-sensitive lipids	Solid tumors, metastatic lesions	Moderate
pH	Endosomal/lysosomal acidity (pH 4.5-5.5)	pH-cleavable linkers, membrane-destabilizing peptides	Intracellular drug delivery	High (post-internalization)
Enzymatic	Matrix metalloproteinases	Peptide crosslinkers, surface PEG cleavage	Invasive carcinomas, metastasis	High
Enzymatic	Cathepsin B	Dipeptide linkers (Val-Cit, Phe-Lys)	Antibody-drug conjugates, polymeric prodrugs	High
Redox	Glutathione (intracellular vs extracellular)	Disulfide-linked conjugates, crosslinked micelles	Cytosolic drug delivery	High
Temperature	Mild hyperthermia (40-45°C)	Thermoresponsive polymers (PNIPAM), thermosensitive liposomes	Regionally confined tumors, combination with ablation	External control
Light	Near-infrared irradiation	Photothermal conversion (gold, carbon), photoisomerization	Superficial tumors, photodynamic therapy	External control
Ultrasound	Acoustic cavitation	Echogenic liposomes, microbubble-nanoparticle hybrids	Deep-seated tumors, blood-brain barrier disruption	External control
Hypoxia	Reduced oxygen tension	Nitroimidazole derivatives, azobenzene linkers	Poorly vascularized tumor regions	Moderate

4.4. Controlled and Sustained Release Kinetics

The pharmacokinetic profile of nanocarrier-encapsulated chemotherapeutics reflects the composite contributions of drug release from the carrier, carrier elimination from systemic circulation, and distribution of released drug to tissues. Controlled release formulations aim to maintain plasma and tumor drug concentrations continuously within the therapeutic window throughout the dosing interval, thereby maximizing anti-tumor efficacy while minimizing concentration-dependent toxicities. Release kinetics are governed by drug diffusion through the carrier matrix, carrier erosion or degradation, and drug-carrier affinity, each modifiable through rational formulation design. Diffusion-controlled release systems, exemplified by reservoir devices

(liposomes, polymer-coated nanoparticles) and matrix devices (solid lipid nanoparticles, polymeric nanospheres), liberate drug through concentration gradient-driven movement across rate-limiting barriers. Reservoir systems exhibiting constant activity source (excess solid drug within core) produce zero-order release kinetics, maintaining constant release rate until core depletion. Matrix systems typically exhibit biphasic release characterized by initial burst release of surface-associated drug followed by progressively decelerating release as diffusion path length increases.

Degradation-controlled release systems, predominantly polymeric nanoparticles fabricated from PLGA, PLA, and related polyesters, liberate drug through hydrolytic cleavage

of polymer backbone ester bonds. Bulk erosion, wherein water penetration throughout the matrix precedes significant mass loss, produces characteristic triphasic release kinetics comprising initial burst, diffusion-controlled phase, and erosion-dominated terminal phase. Manipulation of polymer hydrophilicity, crystallinity, and molecular weight enables tuning of degradation rates from days to months, providing formulation flexibility across diverse treatment contexts.

5. Therapeutic Applications in Cancer Therapy

5.1. Solid Tumors

Solid malignancies, including carcinomas of the breast, lung, colon, prostate, and ovary, constitute the predominant indication for nanocarrier-based therapeutic interventions. The accessibility of solid tumors to circulating nanoparticles via EPR-mediated extravasation, combined with the availability of defined molecular targets for active targeting strategies, has supported extensive preclinical and clinical investigation across diverse primary sites. Breast cancer, the most common malignancy in women worldwide, exemplifies successful clinical translation of nanomedicine principles through regulatory approval of multiple nanocarrier formulations.

Liposomal anthracyclines have substantially altered the therapeutic landscape for metastatic breast cancer, providing cardioprotective alternatives to conventional doxorubicin without compromising anti-tumor efficacy. Pegylated liposomal doxorubicin monotherapy demonstrates comparable objective response rates and progression-free survival to conventional doxorubicin in first-line metastatic breast cancer while significantly reducing cumulative dose-dependent cardiotoxicity, enabling extended treatment duration in responding patients. Combination regimens incorporating liposomal doxorubicin with cyclophosphamide, taxanes, or trastuzumab have demonstrated acceptable safety profiles and encouraging activity in both early and advanced disease settings.

Abraxane, albumin-bound paclitaxel nanoparticles, eliminates the requirement for Cremophor EL solubilization necessary for conventional paclitaxel formulation, thereby reducing hypersensitivity reactions and premedication requirements while permitting shorter infusion durations. Randomized phase III comparison of Abraxane versus conventional paclitaxel in metastatic breast cancer demonstrated significantly higher objective response rates and longer time to progression for the nanoparticle formulation, attributed to enhanced tumor delivery through albumin receptor (gp60)-mediated transcytosis. These clinical benefits established Abraxane as a standard therapeutic option in metastatic breast cancer and supported subsequent regulatory approvals in non-small cell lung cancer and pancreatic adenocarcinoma.

5.2. Hematologic Malignancies

Hematologic malignancies, including leukemias, lymphomas, and multiple myeloma, present distinct opportunities and challenges for nanocarrier-based therapeutic interventions. The absence of requirement for extravasation across vascular barriers in disseminated intravascular disease facilitates direct exposure of malignant cells to circulating nanocarriers, potentially enhancing therapeutic index through both passive and active targeting mechanisms. Conversely, the presence of malignant cells within specialized anatomical niches—bone marrow stroma,

lymph nodes, central nervous system sanctuary sites—necessitates nanocarrier design strategies capable of penetrating these protected compartments.

Liposomal formulations of vinca alkaloids have demonstrated particular utility in hematologic malignancy management. Marqibo, vincristine sulfate encapsulated in non-pegylated liposomes, exhibits altered pharmacokinetics characterized by extended circulation half-life, reduced peak plasma concentrations, and enhanced tumor accumulation relative to conventional vincristine. Pivotal phase II evaluation in patients with Philadelphia chromosome-negative acute lymphoblastic leukemia in second or greater relapse demonstrated a 35% complete response rate, leading to accelerated regulatory approval in 2012. This represents a substantial therapeutic advance for a patient population with historically poor outcomes and limited treatment options.

Vyxeos, a fixed-ratio liposomal co-formulation of cytarabine and daunorubicin at a 5:1 molar ratio, exemplifies rational nanocarrier design based on synergistic drug ratio identification through preclinical pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic modeling. Liposomal encapsulation maintains the synergistic drug ratio in plasma for prolonged durations following intravenous administration, in contrast to conventional administration wherein differential clearance rapidly disrupts optimal drug ratios. Randomized phase III comparison of Vyxeos versus conventional cytarabine and daunorubicin (7+3 regimen) in older patients with secondary acute myeloid leukemia demonstrated significantly improved overall survival, establishing Vyxeos as a new standard of care in this historically refractory leukemia subtype.

5.3. Combination Therapy Strategies

Multidrug chemotherapy regimens represent standard practice for most advanced malignancies, reflecting the superior efficacy of rationally designed drug combinations relative to sequential single-agent administration. However, conventional combination chemotherapy is constrained by overlapping toxicity profiles that necessitate dose reductions and schedule modifications, potentially compromising therapeutic intensity. Nanocarrier platforms capable of co-encapsulating multiple mechanistically distinct chemotherapeutic agents offer opportunities for synchronized pharmacokinetics, coordinated tumor accumulation, and spatially coupled intracellular delivery while mitigating cumulative toxicities through preferential distribution.

Co-delivery of chemotherapeutic agents with complementary mechanisms of action within single nanocarrier constructs achieves concurrent suppression of multiple oncogenic survival pathways while minimizing the inter-drug pharmacokinetic variability characteristic of free drug cocktail administration. Preclinical studies of combination nanocarriers co-loaded with doxorubicin and paclitaxel, irinotecan and cisplatin, or gemcitabine and paclitaxel have demonstrated synergistic cytotoxicity, enhanced tumor growth inhibition, and improved survival relative to either single-agent nanocarrier or combination free drug administration.

Beyond cytotoxic chemotherapy combinations, nanocarrier-mediated co-delivery of chemotherapeutics with molecularly targeted agents, nucleic acid therapeutics, or resistance modulators represents a promising strategy for overcoming treatment-refractory disease. Co-encapsulation of doxorubicin with the P-glycoprotein inhibitor verapamil or

tariquidar within polymeric or lipid nanocarriers restores chemosensitivity in multidrug-resistant cancer cell lines and xenograft models through simultaneous intracellular delivery of both agents. Similarly, co-delivery of paclitaxel with STAT3, Bcl-2, or survivin siRNA within cationic liposomes or polymer nanoparticles achieves concurrent chemotherapeutic cytotoxicity and oncogene silencing, yielding supra-additive anti-tumor effects.

5.4. Overcoming Drug Resistance

Multidrug resistance, either pre-existing (intrinsic) or acquired following chemotherapy exposure, represents the predominant cause of treatment failure in both solid and hematologic malignancies. Nanocarrier-based delivery systems address resistance mechanisms through multiple complementary pathways: (i) bypass of efflux transporter-mediated drug extrusion through nanoparticle internalization via endocytosis rather than passive diffusion; (ii) achievement of intracellular drug concentrations exceeding efflux pump capacity; (iii) sustained drug exposure preventing sublethal concentration-dependent resistance selection; and (iv) co-delivery of chemosensitizing agents.

The enhanced intracellular accumulation achieved through nanoparticle endocytosis relative to passive diffusion of free drug is particularly significant in cells overexpressing ATP-binding cassette (ABC) transporters, including P-glycoprotein (ABCB1), multidrug resistance-associated protein 1 (ABCC1), and breast cancer resistance protein (ABCG2). Doxorubicin-loaded PLGA nanoparticles demonstrate 20-fold higher intracellular accumulation and significantly enhanced cytotoxicity compared to free doxorubicin in P-glycoprotein-overexpressing NCI/ADR-RES ovarian cancer cells, effects recapitulated *in vivo* with corresponding tumor growth inhibition.

Resistance to platinum-based chemotherapeutics, mediated through enhanced DNA repair capacity, glutathione-mediated drug detoxification, and reduced drug accumulation, similarly yields to nanocarrier-based intervention strategies. Cisplatin- and oxaliplatin-encapsulated polymeric, liposomal, and lipid nanoparticles demonstrate enhanced cytotoxicity in platinum-resistant ovarian, colorectal, and lung cancer models through mechanisms including CD44 receptor-mediated endocytosis, lysosomal drug liberation bypassing cytoplasmic detoxification pathways, and sustained intranuclear platinum-DNA adduct formation.

6. Challenges, Limitations, and Future Perspectives

6.1. Toxicity, Biodistribution, and Immunogenicity

Despite substantial progress in nanocarrier engineering, significant challenges persist regarding the safety and biological fate of administered nanomaterials. While nanocarrier encapsulation reduces the specific toxicities associated with conventional chemotherapeutic agents—notably anthracycline cardiotoxicity and taxane hypersensitivity—it introduces distinct toxicological considerations related to nanomaterial composition, size, surface charge, and shape. Cationic nanoparticles, while advantageous for nucleic acid complexation and endosomal

escape, exhibit concentration-dependent cytotoxicity through mitochondrial membrane depolarization, reactive oxygen species generation, and lysosomal membrane permeabilization.

Complement activation-related pseudoallergy (CARPA) represents a potentially serious infusion reaction observed with multiple nanocarrier formulations, particularly PEGylated liposomes. This phenomenon, mediated by complement component C5a and anaphylatoxin-induced mast cell degranulation, manifests clinically as flushing, dyspnea, hypotension, and chest pain during or immediately following initial infusion. While premedication with antihistamines and corticosteroids mitigates reaction severity in most patients, approximately 5-10% of recipients experience reactions warranting infusion interruption or discontinuation.

The mononuclear phagocyte system, particularly hepatic Kupffer cells and splenic marginal zone macrophages, efficiently captures circulating nanoparticles through scavenger receptor-mediated recognition, pattern recognition receptor engagement, and opsonin-facilitated phagocytosis. While this clearance pathway reduces systemic nanoparticle exposure and mitigates off-target toxicity, it concomitantly reduces tumor-directed delivery and creates potential for chronic accumulation-related toxicity in clearance organs. Long-term toxicological consequences of hepatic and splenic nanoparticle sequestration remain incompletely characterized, particularly for non-biodegradable inorganic carriers, necessitating extended duration preclinical toxicology assessment.

6.2. Scale-Up and Regulatory Hurdles

The translational gap between academic discovery and commercial product reflects substantial challenges in manufacturing reproducibility, analytical characterization, and regulatory qualification. Nanocarrier fabrication processes developed at laboratory scale (milligram to gram quantities) frequently prove non-linear upon scale-up to pilot or production scale (kilogram quantities), yielding nanoparticles with altered physicochemical properties and compromised biological performance. Batch-to-batch variability in particle size distribution, drug loading efficiency, release kinetics, and surface characteristics necessitates extensive process optimization and in-process control implementation prior to regulatory submission.

Regulatory classification of nanomedicine products spans conventional drug, biologic, device, and combination product pathways, with classification determinations significantly impacting development timelines and requirements. The combination product designation applicable to nanocarriers incorporating targeting ligands or diagnostic imaging agents imposes additional regulatory complexity, requiring coordination among FDA centers (CDER, CBER, CDRH) and demonstration of both device safety and drug efficacy within unified development programs. Emerging regulatory science initiatives, including the FDA Nanotechnology Task Force and Nanotechnology Characterization Laboratory, aim to establish standardized characterization protocols and toxicological testing paradigms to facilitate nanomedicine regulatory review.

Table 4: Current Clinical Trials and Translational Status of Nanotechnology-Based Cancer Therapies

Nanocarrier Platform	Therapeutic Agent(s)	Cancer Indication	Clinical Phase	NCT Identifier	Key Status
Liposomal irinotecan	Irinotecan sucrosfate	Pancreatic cancer, biliary tract cancer	Phase III	NCT03044587	Active, enrolling
Liposomal daunorubicin/cytarabine	CPX-351	Acute myeloid leukemia, high-risk	Phase III	NCT03825796	Active, not recruiting
HER2-targeted liposomal doxorubicin	MM-302	HER2+ breast cancer	Phase II	NCT02213744	Terminated
EGFR-targeted polymeric micelles	Paclitaxel	Advanced solid tumors	Phase I	NCT03774680	Active, enrolling
Transferrin-targeted liposomes	Oxaliplatin (MBP-426)	Gastric, gastroesophageal cancer	Phase II	NCT00355888	Completed
Docetaxel polymeric micelles	Docetaxel (Paclical)	Ovarian cancer	Phase III	NCT00989131	Completed
mRNA lipid nanoparticles	Personalized neoantigen	Pancreatic cancer, melanoma	Phase I	NCT04161755	Active, enrolling
siRNA lipid nanoparticles	KRAS G12D siRNA	Pancreatic cancer	Phase I	NCT04853017	Recruiting
Magnetic iron oxide	Hyperthermia + chemotherapy	Glioblastoma	Phase II	NCT04761263	Recruiting
Gold nanoparticles	Photothermal therapy	Head and neck cancer	Phase I	NCT04870177	Recruiting
NK cell-derived exosomes	Exosome-siRNA	Pancreatic cancer	Phase I	NCT03608631	Unknown
GRP78-targeted nanoparticles	Doxorubicin	Solid tumors	Phase I	NCT04701320	Recruiting
Liposomal cisplatin	Cisplatin (Lipoplatin)	Pancreatic cancer	Phase III	NCT00910741	Completed
Nanoliposomal CPT-11	Irinotecan (MM-398)	Glioblastoma	Phase II	NCT04500730	Active

6.3. Personalized Nanomedicine Approaches

Recognition of substantial interpatient and intratumoral heterogeneity in EPR effect magnitude, target antigen expression, and nanocarrier pharmacokinetics has motivated development of personalized nanomedicine strategies. Companion diagnostic imaging approaches employing radiolabeled surrogate nanoparticles permit non-invasive assessment of tumor nanoparticle accumulation prior to therapeutic nanocarrier administration, enabling identification of EPR-positive patients most likely to benefit from nanomedicine intervention. Ferumoxytol-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging, exploiting the superparamagnetic properties of iron oxide nanoparticles, provides clinically feasible methodology for tumor EPR phenotyping and has demonstrated substantial heterogeneity among patients with advanced solid malignancies.

Theranostic nanocarriers integrating diagnostic imaging capabilities with therapeutic functionality represent an advanced personalized medicine paradigm wherein the same nanoconstruct serves both patient selection and treatment delivery functions. Co-encapsulation of chemotherapeutic agents with gadolinium chelates, quantum dots, or radioisotopes within single nanocarrier platforms enables quantitative biodistribution assessment and real-time treatment monitoring through magnetic resonance, fluorescence, or nuclear imaging modalities. Radiolabeled HER2-targeted liposomal doxorubicin permits positron emission tomography quantification of tumor accumulation and normal organ distribution, supporting dose individualization and early response assessment in patients with HER2-overexpressing metastatic breast cancer.

The convergence of nanomedicine with genomic and proteomic tumor profiling creates unprecedented opportunities for molecularly guided nanocarrier selection. Tumor biopsy specimens subjected to comprehensive genomic profiling identify actionable driver mutations, cell surface antigen expression profiles, and resistance mechanism status, informing rational selection of targeting ligands, therapeutic payloads, and combination partners. This integrated precision oncology paradigm, aligning nanocarrier design with individual tumor biology, promises to enhance

the therapeutic index and accelerate the clinical translation of next-generation nanomedicine formulations.

7. Conclusion

Pharmaceutical nanotechnology has fundamentally transformed the landscape of cancer drug delivery, providing sophisticated platforms capable of addressing the pharmacokinetic limitations, off-target toxicities, and resistance mechanisms that have historically constrained conventional chemotherapy. The diverse repertoire of lipid-based, polymeric, inorganic, and hybrid nanocarriers currently available enables rational formulation design tailored to specific therapeutic payloads, target malignancies, and clinical contexts. Mechanistic understanding of passive EPR-mediated accumulation, active ligand-directed targeting, and stimuli-responsive release has matured substantially, although persistent gaps between preclinical demonstration and clinical translation underscore the need for improved predictive models and more rigorous characterization of nanoparticle-biological interactions under physiologically relevant conditions.

Clinical adoption of liposomal anthracyclines, albumin-bound taxanes, and liposomal combination products has validated the therapeutic benefits of nanocarrier encapsulation in routine oncological practice, reducing treatment-limiting toxicities while maintaining or enhancing anti-tumor efficacy. Emerging platforms incorporating active targeting ligands, environmentally responsive components, and theranostic capabilities are progressively advancing through clinical development pipelines, supported by regulatory science initiatives addressing the unique characterization and manufacturing challenges associated with complex nanomedicine products. The convergence of nanomedicine with precision oncology paradigms, incorporating companion diagnostic imaging for patient selection and molecular profiling for rationally designed combination regimens, offers a compelling vision for personalized cancer therapy wherein nanocarrier selection is optimized for individual tumor biology and predicted treatment response.

Sustained interdisciplinary collaboration among pharmaceutical scientists, cancer biologists, clinical oncologists, regulatory scientists, and industry partners will be essential to realize the full therapeutic potential of nanotechnology-based drug delivery systems. Priorities for future investigation include elucidation of determinants governing heterogeneous EPR effect penetrance in human malignancies, development of predictive preclinical models with enhanced translational validity, establishment of robust manufacturing platforms for complex multifunctional nanocarriers, and rigorous clinical evaluation of personalized nanomedicine strategies through biomarker-driven trial designs. Achievement of these objectives will accelerate the integration of rationally engineered nanocarriers into standard oncological care, ultimately improving outcomes for patients across the spectrum of malignant disease.

8. References

1. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Laversanne M, Soerjomataram I, Jemal A, *et al.* Global cancer statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA Cancer J Clin.* 2021;71(3):209-49.
2. Bray F, Laversanne M, Weiderpass E, Soerjomataram I. The ever-increasing importance of cancer as a leading cause of premature death worldwide. *Cancer.* 2021;127(16):3029-30.
3. Vasan N, Baselga J, Hyman DM. A view on drug resistance in cancer. *Nature.* 2019;575(7782):299-309.
4. Bukowski K, Kciuk M, Kontek R. Mechanisms of multidrug resistance in cancer chemotherapy. *Int J Mol Sci.* 2020;21(9):3233.
5. Tewabe A, Abate A, Tamrie M, Seyfu A, Abdela Siraj E. Targeted drug delivery - from magic bullet to nanomedicine: principles, challenges, and future perspectives. *J Multidiscip Healthc.* 2021;14:1717-31.
6. Rosenblum D, Joshi N, Tao W, Karp JM, Peer D. Progress and challenges towards targeted delivery of cancer therapeutics. *Nat Commun.* 2018;9(1):1410.
7. Robey RW, Pluchino KM, Hall MD, Fojo AT, Bates SE, Gottesman MM. Revisiting the role of ABC transporters in multidrug-resistant cancer. *Nat Rev Cancer.* 2018;18(7):452-64.
8. Assaraf YG, Brozovic A, Gonçalves AC, Jurkovicova D, Linē A, Machuqueiro M, *et al.* The multi-factorial nature of clinical multidrug resistance in cancer. *Drug Resist Updat.* 2019;46:100645.
9. Quail DF, Joyce JA. Microenvironmental regulation of tumor progression and metastasis. *Nat Med.* 2013;19(11):1423-37.
10. Nia HT, Munn LL, Jain RK. Physical traits of cancer. *Science.* 2020;370(6516):eaaz0868.
11. Mitchell MJ, Billingsley MM, Haley RM, Wechsler ME, Peppas NA, Langer R. Engineering precision nanoparticles for drug delivery. *Nat Rev Drug Discov.* 2021;20(2):101-24.
12. Shi J, Kantoff PW, Wooster R, Farokhzad OC. Cancer nanomedicine: progress, challenges and opportunities. *Nat Rev Cancer.* 2017;17(1):20-37.
13. Peer D, Karp JM, Hong S, Farokhzad OC, Margalit R, Langer R. Nanocarriers as an emerging platform for cancer therapy. *Nat Nanotechnol.* 2007;2(12):751-60.
14. Wicki A, Witzigmann D, Balasubramanian V, Huwyler J. Nanomedicine in cancer therapy: challenges, opportunities, and clinical applications. *J Control Release.* 2015;200:138-57.
15. Srinivasarao M, Low PS. Ligand-targeted drug delivery. *Chem Rev.* 2017;117(19):12133-64.
16. Muhamad N, Plengsuriyakarn T, Na-Bangchang K. Application of active targeting nanoparticle delivery system for chemotherapeutic drugs and traditional/herbal medicines in cancer therapy: a systematic review. *Int J Nanomedicine.* 2018;13:3921-35.
17. Kemp JA, Kwon YJ. Cancer nanotechnology: current status and perspectives. *Nano Converg.* 2021;8(1):34.
18. El-Sawy HS, Al-Abd AM, Ahmed TA, El-Say KM, Torchilin VP. Stimuli-responsive nano-architecture drug-delivery systems to solid tumor microenvironment: past, present, and future perspectives. *ACS Nano.* 2018;12(11):10636-64.
19. Anselmo AC, Mitragotri S. Nanoparticles in the clinic: an update. *Bioeng Transl Med.* 2019;4(3):e10143.
20. He H, Liu L, Morin EE, Liu M, Schwendeman A. Survey of clinical translation of cancer nanomedicines—lessons learned from successes and failures. *Acc Chem Res.* 2019;52(9):2445-61.
21. van der Meel R, Sulheim E, Shi Y, Kiessling F, Mulder WJM, Lammers T. Smart cancer nanomedicine. *Nat Nanotechnol.* 2019;14(11):1007-17.
22. Patra JK, Das G, Fraceto LF, Campos EVR, Rodriguez-Torres MDP, Acosta-Torres LS, *et al.* Nano based drug delivery systems: recent developments and future prospects. *J Nanobiotechnology.* 2018;16(1):71.
23. Bobo D, Robinson KJ, Islam J, Thurecht KJ, Corrie SR. Nanoparticle-based medicines: a review of FDA-approved materials and clinical trials to date. *Pharm Res.* 2016;33(10):2373-87.
24. Ventola CL. Progress in nanomedicine: approved and investigational nanodrugs. *P T.* 2017;42(12):742-55.
25. Blanco E, Shen H, Ferrari M. Principles of nanoparticle design for overcoming biological barriers to drug delivery. *Nat Biotechnol.* 2015;33(9):941-51.
26. Zhou Q, Zhang L, Yang T, Wu H. Stimuli-responsive polymeric micelles for drug delivery and cancer therapy. *Int J Nanomedicine.* 2018;13:2921-42.
27. Fenton OS, Olafson KN, Pillai PS, Mitchell MJ, Langer R. Advances in biomaterials for drug delivery. *Adv Mater.* 2018;30(29):e1705328.
28. Wilhelm S, Tavares AJ, Dai Q, Ohta S, Audet J, Dvorak HF, *et al.* Analysis of nanoparticle delivery to tumours. *Nat Rev Mater.* 2016;1(5):16014.
29. Minchinton AI, Tannock IF. Drug penetration in solid tumours. *Nat Rev Cancer.* 2006;6(8):583-92.
30. Dewhirst MW, Secomb TW. Transport of drugs from blood vessels to tumour tissue. *Nat Rev Cancer.* 2017;17(12):738-50.
31. Maeda H, Nakamura H, Fang J. The EPR effect for macromolecular drug delivery to solid tumors: improvement of tumor uptake, lowering of systemic toxicity, and distinct tumor imaging *in vivo*. *Adv Drug Deliv Rev.* 2013;65(1):71-9.
32. Golombek SK, May JN, Theek B, Appold L, Drude N, Kiessling F, *et al.* Tumor targeting via EPR: strategies to enhance patient responses. *Adv Drug Deliv Rev.* 2018;130:17-38.
33. Kamaly N, Yameen B, Wu J, Farokhzad OC. Degradable controlled-release polymers and polymeric

- nanoparticles: mechanisms of controlling drug release. *Chem Rev.* 2016;116(4):2602-63.
34. Park K. Controlled drug delivery systems: past forward and future back. *J Control Release.* 2014;190:3-8.
 35. Tibbitt MW, Dahlman JE, Langer R. Emerging frontiers in drug delivery. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2016;138(3):704-17.
 36. Bertrand N, Wu J, Xu X, Kamaly N, Farokhzad OC. Cancer nanotechnology: the impact of passive and active targeting in the era of modern cancer biology. *Adv Drug Deliv Rev.* 2014;66:2-25.
 37. Bazak R, Hourri M, El Achy S, Kamel S, Refaat T. Cancer active targeting by nanoparticles: a comprehensive review of literature. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol.* 2015;141(5):769-84.
 38. Farjadian F, Ghasemi A, Gohari O, Roointan A, Karimi M, Hamblin MR. Nanopharmaceuticals and nanomedicines currently on the market: challenges and opportunities. *Nanomedicine (Lond).* 2019;14(1):93-126.
 39. Weissig V, Guzman-Villanueva D. Nanopharmaceuticals (part 2): products in the pipeline. *Int J Nanomedicine.* 2015;10:1245-57.
 40. Barenholz Y. Doxil®—the first FDA-approved nano-drug: lessons learned. *J Control Release.* 2012;160(2):117-34.
 41. Gabizon A, Shmeeda H, Barenholz Y. Pharmacokinetics of pegylated liposomal doxorubicin: review of animal and human studies. *Clin Pharmacokinet.* 2003;42(5):419-36.
 42. Pillai G. Nanomedicines for cancer therapy: an update of FDA approved and those under various stages of development. *SOJ Pharm Pharm Sci.* 2014;1(2):13.
 43. Wolfram J, Ferrari M. Clinical cancer nanomedicine. *Nano Today.* 2019;25:85-98.
 44. Metselaar JM, Lammers T. Challenges in nanomedicine clinical translation. *Drug Deliv Transl Res.* 2020;10(3):721-5.
 45. Hare JJ, Lammers T, Ashford MB, Puri S, Storm G, Barry ST. Challenges and strategies in anti-cancer nanomedicine development: an industry perspective. *Adv Drug Deliv Rev.* 2017;108:25-38.
 46. Hua S, de Matos MBC, Metselaar JM, Storm G. Current trends and challenges in the clinical translation of nanoparticulate nanomedicines: pathways for translational development and commercialization. *Front Pharmacol.* 2018;9:790.
 47. Crucho CIC. Stimuli-responsive polymeric nanoparticles for nanomedicine. *ChemMedChem.* 2015;10(1):24-38.
 48. Masood F. Polymeric nanoparticles for targeted drug delivery system for cancer therapy. *Mater Sci Eng C Mater Biol Appl.* 2016;60:569-78.
 49. Makadia HK, Siegel SJ. Poly lactic-co-glycolic acid (PLGA) as biodegradable controlled drug delivery carrier. *Polymers (Basel).* 2011;3(3):1377-97.
 50. Danhier F, Ansorena E, Silva JM, Coco R, Le Breton A, Préat V. PLGA-based nanoparticles: an overview of biomedical applications. *J Control Release.* 2012;161(2):505-22.

How to Cite This Article

Whitfield CE, Matthew E. Long-chain polymeric, lipid-based, and inorganic-organic hybrid nanocarriers for targeted, controlled, and sustained drug release in pharmaceutical nanotechnology: advancing precision oncology through stimuli-responsive and ligand-mediated cancer therapy. *Int J Pharma Insight Stud.* 2026;3(1):35–45.

Creative Commons (CC) License

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC SA 4.0) License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.