Pharmaceutical Nanotechnology in Cancer Therapy

Aniruddha Rajesh Iyer [1*], Priyanka Madhavi Narayanan [2], Rohit Subramanian Kulkarni [3]
[1] PhD, Department of Pharmaceutical Nanotechnology, National Institute of Pharmaceutical Education and Research (NIPER), Mohali, India.
[2] PhD, Centre for Advanced Drug Delivery Systems, Institute of Chemical Technology, Mumbai, India.
[3] PhD, Department of Pharmaceutics, Manipal College of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Manipal Academy of Higher Education, Manipal, India.

* Corresponding Author: **Aniruddha Rajesh Iyer**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 3107-393X
Volume: 01
Issue: 05
September- October 2024
Received: 28-07-2024
Accepted: 30-08-2024
Published: 01-10-2024
Page No: 106-122

Abstract
Conventional cancer therapies, including chemotherapy, radiotherapy, and surgical interventions, continue to face significant limitations related to poor selectivity, systemic toxicity, drug resistance, and inadequate tumor penetration. These challenges have prompted the exploration of pharmaceutical nanotechnology as a transformative approach to enhance therapeutic efficacy while minimizing adverse effects. This article aims to provide a comprehensive overview of nanotechnology-based strategies in cancer treatment, emphasizing their potential to revolutionize oncological care. Nanoparticle drug delivery systems, encompassing liposomes, polymeric nanoparticles, dendrimers, and inorganic nanocarriers, have emerged as versatile platforms capable of improving pharmacokinetic profiles and achieving controlled drug release. Passive targeting through the enhanced permeability and retention effect and active targeting via ligand-receptor interactions represent critical mechanisms for selective tumor accumulation. Additionally, tumor microenvironment-responsive systems that exploit acidic pH, elevated glutathione levels, and hypoxic conditions enable stimulus-triggered drug release at target sites. Combination therapies integrating multiple therapeutic modalities through nanotechnology platforms have demonstrated synergistic antitumor effects in preclinical models. Clinical evidence suggests that nanotechnology-based formulations substantially reduce systemic toxicity and improve treatment outcomes compared to conventional formulations. Despite these advances, clinical translation faces hurdles including scalability, reproducibility, regulatory approval pathways, and long-term safety evaluation. Future developments must address these challenges through standardized characterization protocols, improved understanding of nano-bio interactions, and innovative design strategies to realize the full potential of pharmaceutical nanotechnology in personalized cancer therapy.

DOI:

Keywords: Pharmaceutical Nanotechnology, Cancer Therapy, Nanoparticles, Targeted Drug Delivery, Tumor Targeting, Translational Oncology

1. Introduction

Cancer remains one of the leading causes of morbidity and mortality worldwide, with millions of new cases diagnosed annually and substantial economic and social burdens imposed on healthcare systems [1]. Despite remarkable advances in cancer biology, early detection methods, and therapeutic interventions over recent decades, the management of advanced and metastatic malignancies continues to present formidable challenges [2]. Conventional treatment modalities, predominantly consisting of cytotoxic chemotherapy, radiation therapy, and surgical resection, have achieved significant success in specific cancer types but

are fundamentally limited by their inability to distinguish malignant cells from healthy tissues [3]. This lack of selectivity results in severe systemic toxicity, dose-limiting side effects, and compromised quality of life for patients undergoing treatment [4]. The inherent characteristics of solid tumors, including heterogeneous vasculature, elevated interstitial fluid pressure, dense extracellular matrix, and the presence of hypoxic regions, further impede the effective delivery of therapeutic agents to cancer cells [5]. Additionally, the development of multidrug resistance through overexpression of efflux pumps, enhanced DNA repair mechanisms, and activation of survival pathways represents a major obstacle to successful chemotherapy outcomes [6]. These biological barriers necessitate innovative strategies that can overcome tumor-associated physiological constraints while simultaneously enhancing drug accumulation at target sites and minimizing off-target effects [7].

Pharmaceutical nanotechnology has emerged as a promising interdisciplinary field at the intersection of materials science, pharmaceutical sciences, and biomedical engineering, offering novel solutions to the limitations of conventional cancer therapies [8]. Nanocarrier systems, typically ranging from one to several hundred nanometers in size, possess unique physicochemical properties that enable them to interact with biological systems at the molecular and cellular levels [9]. The application of nanotechnology principles to cancer drug delivery has revolutionized therapeutic paradigms by facilitating controlled drug release, improving pharmacokinetic profiles, enhancing tumor accumulation through passive and active targeting mechanisms, and enabling combination therapies within single platforms [10].

The rationale for employing nanotechnology in oncology is multifaceted and encompasses several critical advantages over traditional drug formulations. Nanoparticles can encapsulate or conjugate poorly water-soluble anticancer agents, thereby improving their bioavailability and therapeutic index [11]. The enhanced permeability and retention effect, a phenomenon arising from the abnormal tumor vasculature and impaired lymphatic drainage in solid tumors, allows nanocarriers to preferentially accumulate in tumor tissues compared to normal organs [12]. Surface modification of nanoparticles with targeting ligands, antibodies, or peptides enables active targeting of cancer cell-specific receptors, further enhancing selective drug delivery [13]. Moreover, stimulus-responsive nanocarrier systems can be engineered to release their therapeutic payloads in response to specific tumor microenvironment cues, including acidic pH, redox potential, enzymatic activity, or hypoxia [14].

This article provides a comprehensive examination of pharmaceutical nanotechnology applications in cancer therapy, discussing the fundamental principles underlying nanocarrier design, classification of nanosystems, targeting strategies, preclinical evaluation methodologies, clinical translation efforts, safety considerations, regulatory challenges, and future perspectives. By synthesizing current knowledge and identifying critical gaps in the field, this review aims to inform researchers, clinicians, and pharmaceutical scientists about the transformative potential of nanotechnology-driven approaches in improving cancer treatment outcomes and patient survival.

2. Overview of Cancer Therapeutics and Need for Nanotechnology

Traditional cancer treatment approaches have relied predominantly on surgery, radiotherapy, and systemic chemotherapy, either as monotherapies or in combination [15]. While surgical resection remains the primary curative option for localized tumors, its applicability is limited to accessible lesions and is often insufficient for preventing disease recurrence or treating metastatic disease [16]. Radiation therapy exploits the differential sensitivity of rapidly dividing cancer cells to ionizing radiation but is constrained by dose-limiting toxicity to surrounding normal tissues and the development of radioresistance [17]. Chemotherapy, employing cytotoxic agents that interfere with DNA replication, cell division, or essential metabolic processes, has been the cornerstone of systemic cancer treatment for decades [18].

Despite their widespread use, conventional chemotherapeutic agents suffer from numerous pharmacological and clinical limitations that compromise their therapeutic efficacy. Most anticancer drugs exhibit poor aqueous solubility, rapid clearance from systemic circulation, non-specific biodistribution, and inadequate penetration into solid tumor masses [19]. The lack of tumor selectivity results in significant accumulation of drugs in healthy organs, particularly those with high blood flow such as the liver, kidneys, heart, and bone marrow, leading to severe adverse effects including myelosuppression, cardiotoxicity, nephrotoxicity, and neurotoxicity [20]. These dose-limiting toxicities frequently necessitate treatment interruptions or dose reductions, ultimately compromising the therapeutic outcome and patient survival rates [21].

The phenomenon of multidrug resistance represents another critical obstacle in cancer chemotherapy, arising through multiple molecular mechanisms that collectively diminish intracellular drug concentrations or prevent drug-induced apoptosis [22]. Overexpression of ATP-binding cassette transporters, particularly P-glycoprotein, mediates the active efflux of chemotherapeutic agents from cancer cells, thereby reducing their cytotoxic effects [23]. Additional resistance mechanisms include enhanced detoxification through glutathione-S-transferases, increased DNA repair capacity, alterations in drug targets, activation of anti-apoptotic pathways, and epithelial-mesenchymal transition [24]. The development of resistance can occur intrinsically or be acquired during treatment, and represents a major cause of therapeutic failure in both hematological malignancies and solid tumors [25].

The unique pathophysiological characteristics of solid tumors pose additional barriers to effective drug delivery. Tumor vasculature is characterized by structural abnormalities including irregular branching patterns, excessive vessel tortuosity, incomplete endothelial lining, and lack of functional pericytes, resulting in heterogeneous blood flow and the formation of hypoxic regions [26]. Elevated interstitial fluid pressure within tumors, arising from vascular hyperpermeability, compromised lymphatic drainage, and dense extracellular matrix, creates an outward convective force that opposes the penetration of macromolecules and nanoparticles from blood vessels into tumor parenchyma [27]. The dense extracellular matrix, composed of collagen,

hyaluronic acid, and other glycoproteins, acts as a physical barrier that impedes the diffusion of therapeutic agents, particularly in desmoplastic tumors such as pancreatic adenocarcinoma [28].

These multifaceted challenges have motivated the development of pharmaceutical nanotechnology as a rational strategy to overcome the limitations of conventional cancer therapeutics. Nanosized drug carriers offer distinct advantages arising from their unique physicochemical properties, including tunable size, large surface area to volume ratio, ease of surface functionalization, capacity for loading multiple therapeutic and diagnostic agents, and ability to protect encapsulated drugs from enzymatic degradation [29]. The nanoscale dimensions of these carriers enable them to exploit the enhanced permeability and retention effect for passive tumor targeting while avoiding rapid renal clearance and uptake by the reticuloendothelial system [30].

Furthermore, nanocarrier systems can be engineered to respond to specific stimuli present in the tumor microenvironment, enabling spatiotemporal control over drug release [31]. The acidic extracellular pH of tumors, elevated intracellular glutathione concentrations, overexpression of specific enzymes, and hypoxic conditions can be harnessed as triggers for stimulus-responsive drug delivery [32]. Surface modification with targeting ligands facilitates active targeting through receptor-mediated endocytosis, enhancing cellular uptake and intracellular drug accumulation [33]. The versatility of nanotechnology platforms also permits the co-delivery of multiple therapeutic agents, chemosensitizers, or gene therapeutics within a single nanocarrier, enabling combination therapy approaches that can overcome drug resistance and achieve synergistic antitumor effects [34].

The clinical need for improved cancer therapeutics with enhanced efficacy and reduced toxicity has therefore driven extensive research into nanotechnology-based drug delivery systems. The subsequent sections of this article examine the diverse types of nanocarriers developed for cancer therapy, their mechanisms of tumor targeting, preclinical and clinical evidence supporting their use, and the translational challenges that must be addressed to realize their full clinical potential.

3. Nanocarrier Systems in Cancer Drug Delivery

Pharmaceutical nanotechnology encompasses a diverse array of nanocarrier platforms that have been developed for cancer drug delivery, each possessing distinct structural characteristics, physicochemical properties, and therapeutic applications [35]. The selection of appropriate nanocarrier systems depends on multiple factors including the properties of the therapeutic payload, desired pharmacokinetic profile, target tumor type, route of administration, and safety considerations [36]. Contemporary nanocarriers can be broadly classified into organic, inorganic, and hybrid systems based on their compositional materials, with each category offering unique advantages and limitations for oncological applications.

Liposomes represent the most extensively studied and clinically successful class of nanocarriers, consisting of self-assembled bilayer vesicles composed of phospholipids and cholesterol that form aqueous compartments capable of encapsulating both hydrophilic and hydrophobic drugs [37]. The biocompatibility, biodegradability, and versatility of liposomes have made them attractive candidates for cancer drug delivery, with several liposomal formulations having received regulatory approval for clinical use [38]. Conventional liposomes typically exhibit rapid clearance from circulation due to opsonization and uptake by macrophages of the reticuloendothelial system, prompting the development of sterically stabilized or PEGylated liposomes that incorporate polyethylene glycol chains on their surface to prolong circulation time [39]. Long-circulating liposomes demonstrate enhanced tumor accumulation through the enhanced permeability and retention effect and have been successfully employed to deliver doxorubicin, daunorubicin, and other anthracycline antibiotics [40].

Polymeric nanoparticles constitute another major category of nanocarriers, fabricated from biodegradable or biocompatible synthetic polymers such as poly (lactic-co-glycolic acid), poly (lactic acid), poly(ε-caprolactone), and chitosan, or from natural polymers including albumin and gelatin [41]. These systems offer advantages including sustained drug release, protection of labile drugs from degradation, ease of surface modification, and versatility in size and morphology control [42]. Polymeric micelles, formed by self-assembly of amphiphilic block copolymers in aqueous media, create hydrophobic cores suitable for encapsulating poorly water-soluble anticancer agents while maintaining colloidal stability through hydrophilic corona shells [43]. Albumin-bound nanoparticles exploit the natural tumor-homing properties of albumin through binding to albumin receptors overexpressed on tumor vasculature and cancer cells, exemplified by the clinical success of nab-paclitaxel [44].

Dendrimers are highly branched, monodisperse, synthetic macromolecules with well-defined structures and multiple functional groups that enable drug conjugation or encapsulation within internal cavities [45]. The precisely controlled architecture of dendrimers allows for predictable pharmacokinetic behavior and the potential for multivalent targeting through surface modification with multiple ligand molecules [46]. Despite their attractive properties, dendrimer-based systems face challenges related to potential toxicity, limited drug loading capacity, and premature drug release, which have restricted their clinical translation [47].

Inorganic nanoparticles, including gold nanoparticles, silica nanoparticles, iron oxide nanoparticles, and quantum dots, have gained attention for cancer theranostic applications due to their unique optical, magnetic, or photophysical properties [48]. Gold nanoparticles can be synthesized in various shapes and sizes, exhibit tunable surface plasmon resonance properties, and can be functionalized with drugs, targeting ligands, or imaging agents [49]. Mesoporous silica nanoparticles possess high surface area, large pore volume, tunable pore size, and excellent biocompatibility, making them suitable for high drug loading and controlled release applications [50]. Magnetic nanoparticles based on iron oxide enable magnetic resonance imaging contrast enhancement and the potential for magnetic field-guided drug targeting or hyperthermia therapy [51]. However, concerns regarding the long-term biodegradability, potential accumulation in organs, and toxicity of inorganic materials have necessitated extensive safety evaluation [52].

Carbon-based nanomaterials, including carbon nanotubes, graphene, graphene oxide, and fullerenes, represent an emerging class of nanocarriers with unique structural and electronic properties [53]. These materials exhibit high drug loading capacity, the ability to penetrate cellular membranes,

and potential for photothermal or photodynamic therapy applications [54]. Nevertheless, their clinical development has been hampered by concerns regarding biocompatibility, immunogenicity, and challenges in achieving uniform dispersion and functionalization [55].

Lipid-polymer hybrid nanoparticles combine the advantages of both liposomal and polymeric systems, consisting of a polymeric core surrounded by a lipid shell that provides enhanced stability, sustained release, and improved cellular uptake [56]. Similarly, other hybrid systems have been developed to integrate multiple functionalities, such as inorganic-organic hybrids that combine imaging capabilities with therapeutic functions for theranostic applications [57].

The physicochemical properties of nanocarriers, including size, shape, surface charge, and surface chemistry, profoundly influence their biological behavior and therapeutic efficacy [58]. Particle size governs biodistribution, tumor accumulation, cellular uptake mechanisms, and clearance pathways, with optimal sizes typically ranging from fifty to two hundred nanometers for effective tumor penetration and prolonged circulation [59]. Surface charge affects protein adsorption, immune recognition, and cellular interactions, with neutral or slightly negative charges generally preferred to minimize rapid clearance [60]. Surface modification with polyethylene glycol or other hydrophilic polymers reduces protein adsorption and opsonization, thereby extending circulation half-life and enhancing tumor accumulation [61]. The shape of nanoparticles, whether spherical, rod-like, or disc-shaped, influences their hydrodynamic behavior, cellular internalization, and margination toward vessel walls [62].

Drug loading strategies for nanocarriers include physical encapsulation, chemical conjugation, or electrostatic or hydrophobic interactions, each affecting drug release kinetics and therapeutic efficacy [63]. Physical encapsulation involves the incorporation of drugs within the nanocarrier matrix or aqueous compartments, providing protection from degradation and enabling sustained release [64]. Chemical conjugation through covalent bonding to the nanocarrier structure can enhance drug loading stability but may require cleavable linkers to enable intracellular drug release [65]. The drug loading efficiency and drug release profile are critical parameters that determine the therapeutic performance of nanocarrier systems [66].

The development of stimuli-responsive or smart nanocarriers represents an advanced approach to achieve controlled drug release specifically within tumor tissues [67]. These systems are designed to respond to endogenous stimuli present in the tumor microenvironment, including acidic pH, elevated glutathione levels, hypoxia, or overexpressed enzymes, or to external stimuli such as light, heat, ultrasound, or magnetic fields [68]. pH-sensitive nanocarriers exploit the acidic extracellular pH of tumors and the even lower pH within endosomes and lysosomes to trigger drug release through protonation, hydrolysis, or structural destabilization [69]. Redox-responsive systems incorporate disulfide bonds that undergo cleavage in the reducing environment of the cytoplasm, where glutathione concentrations are significantly elevated compared to extracellular fluids [70].

The selection and rational design of nanocarrier systems for specific cancer applications require comprehensive understanding of their structure-property-function relationships, manufacturing processes, scalability considerations, and regulatory requirements. Table 1 summarizes the major classifications of nanocarriers employed in cancer therapy along with their defining physicochemical characteristics.

Table 1: Classification of nanocarriers used in cancer therapy and their physicochemical characteristics

Nanocarrier Type	Composition	Size Range (nm)	Drug Loading Method	Key Characteristics	Representative Examples
Liposomes	Phospholipid bilayers, cholesterol	50-500	Encapsulation in aqueous core or lipid bilayer	Biocompatible, biodegradable, can encapsulate hydrophilic and hydrophobic drugs	Doxil, DaunoXome, Myocet
PEGylated Liposomes	Phospholipids with PEG coating	80-200	Encapsulation	Prolonged circulation time, enhanced tumor accumulation via EPR effect	Doxil, Lipodox, Onivyde
Polymeric Nanoparticles	PLGA, PLA, PCL, chitosan, albumin	10-300	Encapsulation or conjugation	Biodegradable, sustained release, versatile surface modification	Abraxane, Genexol-PM, Oncaspar
Polymeric Micelles	Amphiphilic block copolymers	10-100	Hydrophobic core encapsulation	Solubilize hydrophobic drugs, spontaneous assembly, small size	Genexol-PM, NK105, NC-6004
Dendrimers	Hyperbranched synthetic polymers	2-15	Internal encapsulation or surface conjugation	Monodisperse, multivalent, precise architecture	PAMAM-based systems, PEGylated dendrimers
Gold Nanoparticles	Metallic gold	1-150	Surface conjugation or adsorption	Tunable optical properties, photothermal potential, easy functionalization	Aurimune, NU-0129
Silica Nanoparticles	Mesoporous or non-porous silica	20-500	Pore loading or surface attachment	High surface area, controlled pore size, biocompatible	Cornell dots, mesoporous silica systems
Magnetic Nanoparticles	Iron oxide (magnetite, maghemite)	10-100	Surface conjugation or encapsulation	MRI contrast, magnetic targeting, hyperthermia capability	Feraheme, Nanotherm
Carbon Nanotubes	Single or multi-walled carbon structures	Diameter 1-50, length 100-10000	Surface conjugation or internal loading	High drug loading, cellular penetration, photothermal properties	Experimental platforms
Lipid-Polymer Hybrids	Polymeric core with lipid shell	50-200	Core encapsulation	Combined stability and biocompatibility, sustained release	Experimental platforms

4. Targeting Strategies and Tumor Microenvironment Considerations

The effective delivery of anticancer therapeutics to tumor tissues requires sophisticated targeting strategies that can overcome the biological barriers imposed by abnormal tumor physiology and achieve selective accumulation at target sites while minimizing exposure to healthy organs [71]. Contemporary approaches to tumor-targeted drug delivery through nanotechnology platforms encompass passive targeting, active targeting, and exploitation of tumor microenvironment characteristics to enable stimulus-responsive drug release [72]. The integration of multiple targeting mechanisms within nanocarrier systems represents an emerging strategy to maximize therapeutic efficacy and minimize systemic toxicity.

Passive targeting relies primarily on the enhanced permeability and retention effect, a phenomenon first described in the 1980s that arises from the unique pathophysiological characteristics of solid tumors [73]. Tumor angiogenesis, the formation of new blood vessels to support tumor growth, results in structurally and functionally abnormal vasculature characterized by fenestrations, irregular endothelial cell alignment, deficient pericyte coverage, and discontinuous basement membranes [74]. These vascular abnormalities create pore sizes ranging from one hundred to six hundred nanometers, substantially larger than the tight junctions of normal vasculature, allowing nanocarriers to extravasate into tumor interstitium [75]. Simultaneously, the lack of functional lymphatic drainage in tumors prevents efficient clearance of extravasated nanoparticles, leading to their preferential accumulation and retention within tumor tissues [76].

The magnitude of the enhanced permeability and retention effect varies considerably among different tumor types, individual patients, and even within different regions of the same tumor, depending on factors such as tumor growth rate, vascularization patterns, stromal content, and interstitial fluid pressure [77]. Rapidly growing tumors with high metabolic demands typically exhibit more pronounced vascular abnormalities and greater nanoparticle accumulation, while poorly vascularized or desmoplastic tumors may show limited enhanced permeability and retention effects. Recent investigations have questioned the universality and clinical relevance of the enhanced permeability and retention effect in human cancers, highlighting the need for patient stratification strategies and alternative targeting approaches.

To maximize passive tumor accumulation, nanocarriers must possess appropriate physicochemical properties including optimal size, prolonged circulation time, and minimal recognition by the immune system. Particle sizes between fifty and two hundred nanometers are generally considered optimal for balancing extravasation through tumor vasculature, tumor tissue penetration, and avoidance of renal clearance. Surface modification with hydrophilic polymers, particularly polyethylene glycol, creates a hydration layer that reduces protein adsorption, prevents opsonization, and delays recognition by macrophages, thereby extending circulation half-life from minutes to hours or days. However, the clinical application of PEGylated nanocarriers has revealed challenges including accelerated blood clearance upon repeated administration due to anti-PEG antibody formation and potential interference with cellular uptake. Active targeting strategies employ molecular recognition mechanisms to enhance nanocarrier binding and internalization by cancer cells through attachment of targeting ligands to the nanoparticle surface. These ligands, including antibodies, antibody fragments, peptides, aptamers, or small molecules, are selected for their high affinity and specificity toward receptors that are overexpressed on cancer cell membranes. Common molecular targets for active targeting include folate receptors, transferrin receptors, epidermal growth factor receptors, human epidermal growth factor receptor 2, integrins, glycoproteins, and tumor-associated antigens. Upon binding to their cognate receptors, ligand-conjugated nanocarriers undergo receptor-mediated endocytosis, facilitating intracellular drug delivery and enhancing therapeutic efficacy.

Folate receptor-targeted nanocarriers have been extensively investigated due to the substantial overexpression of folate receptors in numerous cancer types including ovarian, breast, lung, and colorectal cancers, while exhibiting limited expression in most normal tissues. Conjugation of folic acid or folate derivatives to nanocarrier surfaces enables specific recognition and internalization by folate receptor-positive cancer cells. Similarly, transferrin receptor targeting exploits the elevated expression of transferrin receptors on rapidly proliferating cancer cells to enhance nanoparticle uptake through receptor-mediated endocytosis.

Antibody-based targeting represents a powerful approach for achieving highly specific cancer cell recognition, with monoclonal antibodies or antibody fragments such as Fab or single-chain variable fragments providing advantages in terms of targeting specificity and reduced immunogenicity. Trastuzumab-conjugated nanocarriers have demonstrated enhanced efficacy against human epidermal growth factor receptor 2-positive breast cancers, while cetuximab-targeted systems show promise for epidermal growth factor receptor-overexpressing tumors. Peptide-based targeting ligands, including arginine-glycine-aspartic acid peptides that bind to integrins overexpressed on tumor neovasculature and cancer cells, offer advantages of small size, ease of synthesis, and low immunogenicity.

The tumor microenvironment exhibits several distinctive biochemical and physiological characteristics that can be exploited for stimulus-responsive drug delivery. Solid tumors typically display extracellular acidosis with pH values ranging from six point five to seven point zero compared to physiological pH of seven point four, arising from elevated glycolytic metabolism and inadequate perfusion. Intracellular compartments including endosomes and lysosomes exhibit even lower pH values of five point zero to six point five, providing opportunities for pH-triggered drug release following endocytosis. pH-sensitive nanocarriers incorporate acid-labile linkages, protonatable groups, or pH-dependent structural transitions that enable drug release specifically in acidic tumor environments.

The reducing intracellular environment, characterized by elevated glutathione concentrations up to one thousand-fold higher than extracellular levels, represents another exploitable feature of cancer cells. Redox-responsive nanocarriers containing disulfide bonds or other reduction-sensitive linkages undergo cleavage in the cytoplasmic reducing environment, triggering drug release following cellular internalization. Enzyme-responsive systems exploit the overexpression of specific proteases, esterases, or glycosidases in tumor tissues to achieve selective drug activation or release through enzymatic cleavage of peptide, ester, or glycosidic bonds.

Hypoxia, resulting from inadequate oxygen delivery due to abnormal vasculature and rapid tumor cell proliferation, is a hallmark feature of solid tumors that contributes to treatment resistance and disease progression. Hypoxia-responsive nanocarriers incorporate nitroimidazole derivatives or azobenzene groups that undergo bioreductive transformation specifically under hypoxic conditions, enabling selective drug release in oxygen-depleted tumor regions. Matrix metalloproteinase-responsive systems take advantage of the elevated expression of these enzymes in tumor microenvironments to achieve protease-triggered drug release or nanoparticle structural changes.

The dense extracellular matrix present in many solid tumors, particularly in pancreatic, breast, and prostate cancers, creates physical barriers that impede nanoparticle penetration into tumor parenchyma. Strategies to overcome these barriers include the incorporation of matrix-degrading enzymes such as hyaluronidase or collagenase within nanocarrier formulations, size-shrinkable nanoparticles that undergo environmentally triggered size reduction to enhance tissue penetration, or combination with adjuvant therapies that modulate tumor stroma.

The heterogeneous nature of tumor microenvironments, both between different tumor types and within individual tumors, necessitates personalized approaches to nanoparticle design and targeting strategy selection. Emerging concepts include the targeting of tumor-associated stromal cells, including cancer-associated fibroblasts, tumor-associated acrophages, and pericytes, which play critical roles in tumor progression and treatment resistance. Additionally, targeting tumor vasculature through ligands specific for endothelial markers such as vascular endothelial growth factor receptors or vascular cell adhesion molecules represents an alternative strategy to disrupt tumor blood supply.

Table 2 provides a comprehensive overview of targeting mechanisms employed in nanotechnology-based cancer drug delivery, highlighting the diversity of approaches available to enhance tumor selectivity and therapeutic efficacy.

Table 2: Targeting mechanisms employed in nanotechnology-based cancer drug delivery

Targeting Strategy	Mechanism	Target Receptors or Stimuli	Nanocarrier Examples	Advantages	Limitations
Passive Targeting (EPR Effect)	Extravasation through fenestrated tumor vasculature, impaired lymphatic drainage	Tumor vascular permeability, retention	PEGylated liposomes, albumin nanoparticles, polymeric micelles	Simple design, no ligand required, applicable to multiple tumor types	Variable EPR effect among tumors, heterogeneous accumulation, limited in poorly vascularized tumors
Folate Receptor Targeting	Receptor-mediated endocytosis	Folate receptors alpha, beta, gamma	Folate-conjugated liposomes, polymeric nanoparticles	High receptor specificity, overexpressed in many cancers, inexpensive ligand	Limited to folate receptor-positive tumors, potential competition with dietary folate
Transferrin Receptor Targeting	Receptor-mediated endocytosis	Transferrin receptors	Transferrin-conjugated nanoparticles, antibody-targeted systems	High expression in proliferating cells, efficient internalization	Expressed on some normal tissues, large protein ligand
Antibody-Based Targeting	Specific antigen recognition, receptor-mediated endocytosis	HER2, EGFR, CD20, PSMA, mucins	Trastuzumab-liposomes, cetuximab-nanoparticles, immunoliposomes	High specificity, versatile targets, established antibody production	High cost, immunogenicity risk, large size may limit penetration
Peptide-Based Targeting	Integrin binding, receptor recognition	Integrins (αvβ3, α5β1), neuropilin receptors	RGD-peptide nanoparticles, iRGD-conjugated systems	Low immunogenicity, small size enhances penetration, easy synthesis	May have lower affinity than antibodies, potential peptide degradation
Aptamer-Based Targeting	Nucleic acid recognition of target proteins	Nucleolin, PSMA, mucins, growth factor receptors	Aptamer-conjugated nanoparticles, AS1411-based systems	High specificity, low immunogenicity, ease of modification	Nuclease degradation, potential off-target effects
pH-Responsive Release	Protonation, hydrolysis, conformational changes	Acidic tumor microenvironment, endosomal pH	pH-sensitive liposomes, acid-labile polymer conjugates	Selective release in tumor tissue, triggered intracellular release	Modest pH differences may limit responsiveness, premature release risk
Redox-Responsive Release	Disulfide bond cleavage	Elevated intracellular glutathione	Disulfide-crosslinked micelles, redox-sensitive nanoparticles	Specific cytoplasmic drug release, stable in circulation	Requires cellular internalization, potential premature reduction
Enzyme-Responsive Release	Proteolytic cleavage, enzymatic degradation	Matrix metalloproteinases, cathepsins, esterases	MMP-sensitive peptide linkers, enzyme-degradable polymers	Tumor-specific enzyme overexpression, precise release control	Enzyme expression variability, potential off-target enzyme activity
Hypoxia-Responsive Release	Bioreductive activation	Hypoxic tumor microenvironment	Nitroimidazole-conjugated systems, azobenzene-containing nanocarriers	Targets resistant hypoxic regions, selective activation	Limited to hypoxic tumors, complex synthesis
Dual or Multi-Modal Targeting	Combination of multiple targeting mechanisms	Multiple receptors and stimuli	Folate-transferrin dual-targeted nanoparticles, pH and redox dual-responsive systems	Enhanced specificity and efficacy, overcome tumor heterogeneity	Increased complexity, potential manufacturing challenges

5. Preclinical Evaluation and Translational Challenges

The translation of nanotechnology-based cancer therapeutics from laboratory research to clinical application requires rigorous preclinical evaluation to establish efficacy, safety, and pharmacological profiles before human testing can be initiated. Comprehensive preclinical assessment encompasses *in vitro* cellular studies, *in vivo* animal model investigations, pharmacokinetic and biodistribution analyses, toxicology evaluations, and manufacturability assessments. Despite the tremendous promise demonstrated by nanocarrier

systems in experimental settings, substantial challenges remain in translating these technologies from bench to bedside, with numerous candidate formulations failing to advance through the development pipeline. *In vitro* studies constitute the initial stage of preclinical evaluation, employing cancer cell lines to assess nanoparticle cytotoxicity, cellular uptake mechanisms, intracellular drug release, and effects on cell viability, proliferation, and apoptosis. Two-dimensional cell culture models, while providing valuable screening platforms, fail to recapitulate the complex three-dimensional architecture, cell-cell interactions, and microenvironmental gradients present in actual tumors. Three-dimensional cell culture systems, including multicellular tumor spheroids and organoids, more accurately mimic *in vivo* tumor characteristics and enable evaluation of nanoparticle penetration, distribution, and therapeutic efficacy under physiologically relevant conditions. Co-culture models incorporating cancer cells, stromal fibroblasts, endothelial cells, and immune cells provide insights into the complex interactions between nanocarriers and the tumor microenvironment. *In vivo* animal models remain indispensable for evaluating the therapeutic efficacy, pharmacokinetics, biodistribution, and safety profiles of nanocarrier-based therapeutics prior to clinical translation. Subcutaneous xenograft models, generated by implanting human cancer cell lines into immunodeficient mice, represent the most commonly employed preclinical tumor models due to their simplicity, reproducibility, and ability to support human cancer cell growth. However, these models exhibit significant limitations including artificial tumor microenvironment, lack of spontaneous metastasis, absence of immune system interactions, and ectopic tumor location that does not reflect the native organ microenvironment. Orthotopic xenograft models, in which cancer cells are implanted into the organ of tumor origin, more accurately replicate the natural tumor microenvironment and metastatic behavior but require surgical expertise and more complex monitoring. Genetically engineered mouse models that spontaneously develop tumors through activation of oncogenes or inactivation of tumor suppressor genes provide the most physiologically relevant preclinical platforms, faithfully recapitulating tumor initiation, progression, heterogeneity, and immune interactions. However, the prolonged time required for tumor development, genetic and phenotypic variability, and differences between mouse and human biology limit their throughput and translational predictability. Patient-derived xenograft models, established by implanting fresh patient tumor tissue into immunocompromised mice, preserve the genetic and histological characteristics of the original human tumors and offer superior predictive value for clinical outcomes.

Pharmacokinetic studies in animal models are essential for characterizing the absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion profiles of nanocarrier formulations, providing critical information about circulation half-life, volume of distribution, clearance mechanisms, and drug release kinetics. Biodistribution studies employing radiolabeling, fluorescence imaging, or elemental analysis techniques reveal the *in vivo* fate of nanocarriers and their accumulation in tumors versus normal organs, guiding optimization of nanoparticle properties for enhanced tumor targeting. Despite extensive preclinical optimization based on animal studies, significant discrepancies frequently emerge between animal and human pharmacokinetics due to species differences in metabolism, immune responses, and tumor characteristics. Toxicology assessment represents a critical component of preclinical evaluation, encompassing acute toxicity studies to determine maximum tolerated dose, repeated-dose toxicity studies to identify organ-specific toxicities, and specialized evaluations of immunotoxicity, genotoxicity, and reproductive toxicity. Nanoparticle-specific toxicity considerations include complement activation-related pseudoallergy, immune system modulation, oxidative stress induction, and potential accumulation in reticuloendothelial organs. The unique properties of nanomaterials, including their high surface area, prolonged persistence, and potential for cellular uptake, necessitate comprehensive long-term safety evaluation beyond conventional small molecule drug requirements.

One of the most significant translational challenges facing nanotechnology-based cancer therapeutics is the substantial gap between preclinical efficacy in animal models and clinical outcomes in human patients. This translational failure can be attributed to multiple factors including fundamental differences between mouse and human tumor biology, artificial nature of transplanted tumor models, absence of relevant immune system interactions in xenograft models, and failure to recapitulate the heterogeneous and complex nature of human cancers. The enhanced permeability and retention effect, which forms the basis for passive tumor targeting, exhibits considerably greater magnitude and consistency in experimental animal tumors compared to human cancers, leading to overestimation of nanoparticle tumor accumulation in clinical settings.

Manufacturing and scalability challenges present additional hurdles to clinical translation, as laboratory-scale nanoparticle synthesis methods often prove difficult or impossible to reproduce under good manufacturing practice conditions required for clinical production. Batch-to-batch variability in nanoparticle physicochemical properties, including size distribution, drug loading, and surface characteristics, can significantly impact biological performance and therapeutic outcomes. The development of robust, reproducible, and scalable manufacturing processes that maintain consistent product quality is essential for regulatory approval and commercial viability.

Comprehensive physicochemical characterization of nanocarrier formulations is required throughout development to ensure product quality, stability, and performance. Critical quality attributes that must be controlled include particle size distribution, surface charge, morphology, drug loading and encapsulation efficiency, drug release kinetics, chemical composition, surface chemistry, and colloidal stability under physiological conditions. Standardized characterization protocols and consensus guidelines are needed to facilitate comparison between studies, ensure reproducibility, and support regulatory submissions.

The regulatory pathway for nanotechnology-based therapeutics remains complex and evolving, with guidance documents from regulatory agencies addressing the unique considerations for nanomedicine evaluation. Nanocarrier-based formulations are generally regulated as drug-device combination products, requiring comprehensive documentation of manufacturing processes, physicochemical characterization, quality control procedures, stability data, preclinical efficacy and safety results, and proposed clinical trial protocols. The absence of established correlations

between *in vitro* characteristics and *in vivo* performance complicates the establishment of specifications and acceptance criteria.

Intellectual property considerations and the complex patent landscape surrounding nanotechnology platforms can create barriers to clinical development and commercialization. Many fundamental nanotechnology approaches are covered by broad patents, potentially limiting freedom to operate for subsequent developers. The high costs associated with nanomedicine development, including sophisticated manufacturing facilities, extensive characterization requirements, and prolonged development timelines, represent significant financial barriers that disproportionately affect academic institutions and small biotechnology companies.

Addressing these translational challenges requires multidisciplinary collaboration among materials scientists, pharmaceutical scientists, oncologists, regulatory specialists, and industry partners. Initiatives to develop more clinically relevant preclinical models, establish standardized characterization methods, identify predictive biomarkers for patient selection, and create regulatory frameworks specifically adapted to nanomedicine characteristics are essential for advancing the field. The implementation of quality-by-design principles throughout nanocarrier development, from initial formulation design through manufacturing scale-up, can help ensure consistent product quality and facilitate regulatory approval.

6. Clinical Applications of Nanotechnology-Based Cancer Therapies

The clinical development of nanotechnology-based cancer therapeutics has progressed substantially over the past three decades, resulting in the regulatory approval and clinical adoption of several nanomedicine formulations that have demonstrated significant improvements in therapeutic index compared to conventional drug formulations. These approved products, predominantly liposomal and albumin-bound formulations, have established clinical proof-of-concept for nanomedicine approaches while informing the development of next-generation systems currently under investigation.

Doxil, also known as Caelyx in Europe, represents the first FDA-approved nanomedicine and remains one of the most successful nanotechnology-based cancer therapeutics. This PEGylated liposomal formulation of doxorubicin exploits the enhanced permeability and retention effect to achieve preferential tumor accumulation while substantially reducing cardiotoxicity, the major dose-limiting toxicity of conventional doxorubicin. Clinical trials demonstrated that Doxil maintains comparable or superior antitumor efficacy to free doxorubicin in ovarian cancer, AIDS-related Kaposi sarcoma, and multiple myeloma while exhibiting markedly reduced incidence of cardiac adverse events. However, Doxil administration is associated with unique toxicities including palmar-plantar erythrodysesthesia, attributed to prolonged drug exposure in skin capillaries.

Abraxane, an albumin-bound paclitaxel nanoparticle formulation, received FDA approval for metastatic breast cancer, non-small cell lung cancer, and pancreatic adenocarcinoma based on clinical trials demonstrating superior response rates and progression-free survival compared to conventional solvent-based paclitaxel. The albumin nanoparticle technology eliminates the need for toxic solvent Cremophor EL, thereby avoiding associated hypersensitivity reactions and enabling higher paclitaxel doses. Mechanistic studies suggest that albumin-mediated transcytosis across endothelial cells via gp60 receptor binding and accumulation in tumors through SPARC protein interactions contribute to enhanced therapeutic efficacy. Other approved liposomal formulations include DaunoXome for AIDS-related Kaposi sarcoma, Myocet for metastatic breast cancer, DepoCyt for lymphomatous meningitis, Marqibo for acute lymphoblastic leukemia, and Onivyde for metastatic pancreatic cancer. Onivyde, a liposomal irinotecan formulation, demonstrated significantly improved overall survival when combined with 5-fluorouracil and leucovorin in patients with gemcitabine-refractory metastatic pancreatic adenocarcinoma, leading to its approval and incorporation into treatment guidelines.

The clinical development pipeline includes numerous investigational nanotechnology-based therapeutics undergoing evaluation in phase I, II, and III clinical trials across diverse cancer types. Polymeric micelle formulations of paclitaxel, including Genexol-PM approved in South Korea and NK105 under investigation in Japan, have demonstrated improved solubility profiles and promising antitumor activity in breast cancer, lung cancer, and other solid tumors. BIND-014, a targeted polymeric nanoparticle conjugated with prostate-specific membrane antigen-targeting ligands and loaded with docetaxel, showed evidence of tumor accumulation through imaging studies but ultimately discontinued development due to insufficient clinical efficacy.

Liposomal annamycin, a liposomal anthracycline designed to overcome multidrug resistance, has shown encouraging results in acute myeloid leukemia patients refractory to conventional anthracyclines. MM-302, a HER2-targeted liposomal doxorubicin formulation, underwent phase II evaluation in HER2-positive metastatic breast cancer but failed to demonstrate superiority over conventional therapy combinations. These clinical setbacks highlight the challenges in translating enhanced preclinical efficacy into clinical benefit and underscore the need for improved patient selection strategies and combination therapy approaches. Combination nanomedicine approaches, incorporating multiple therapeutic agents within single nanocarrier platforms or combining nanomedicines with conventional therapies, represent a major area of clinical investigation. CPX-351, a liposomal formulation containing a fixed ratio of cytarabine and daunorubicin, received FDA approval for newly diagnosed therapy-related acute myeloid leukemia and acute myeloid leukemia with myelodysplasia-related changes based on superior overall survival compared to standard combination chemotherapy. This success demonstrates the potential for ratiometric drug delivery through nanotechnology platforms to optimize drug synergy and improve clinical outcomes.

The integration of nanotechnology with immunotherapy represents an emerging frontier in cancer treatment, with nanocarriers being explored for delivery of immune checkpoint inhibitors, cancer vaccines, adoptive cell therapy components, and immunomodulatory agents. Nanoparticle-based cancer vaccines, including RNA-loaded lipid nanoparticles and peptide-loaded polymeric nanoparticles, are under clinical investigation for melanoma, lung cancer, and other malignancies. Early clinical data suggest that nanoparticle vaccine platforms can elicit robust immune

responses and demonstrate preliminary evidence of clinical activity.

Theranostic nanomedicine approaches, combining therapeutic and diagnostic functionalities within single platforms, enable real-time monitoring of drug delivery, assessment of treatment response, and personalized therapy optimization. Cornell dots, ultrasmall fluorescent silica nanoparticles conjugated with tumor-targeting peptides and radiolabels, have undergone first-in-human clinical trials for intraoperative imaging and sentinel lymph node mapping in melanoma and head and neck cancer patients. While primarily employed for diagnostic purposes in initial trials, these platforms establish precedent for clinical translation of inorganic nanoparticle systems.

Despite these advances, clinical adoption of nanotechnology-based cancer therapeutics remains limited compared to the extensive preclinical literature and number of investigational products. Analysis of clinical trial outcomes reveals that many nanocarrier formulations fail to demonstrate sufficient efficacy advantages over conventional therapies to justify their increased complexity and cost. This efficacy gap can be attributed to multiple factors including overreliance on the enhanced permeability and retention effect, inadequate tumor penetration, heterogeneous patient responses, suboptimal dosing strategies, and lack of predictive biomarkers for patient selection.

The development of companion diagnostics to identify patients most likely to benefit from specific nanomedicine formulations represents a critical need for improving clinical outcomes. Imaging-based assessment of tumor vascular permeability, measurement of target receptor expression levels, evaluation of tumor microenvironment characteristics, and pharmacokinetic profiling could enable personalized nanomedicine approaches. Similarly, pharmacodynamic biomarkers that correlate with nanoparticle tumor accumulation and therapeutic response would facilitate dose optimization and early identification of non-responders.

The cost-effectiveness of nanotechnology-based cancer therapeutics requires careful consideration given their substantially higher acquisition costs compared to generic conventional formulations. While reduced toxicity-related hospitalizations, supportive care requirements, and dose modifications can offset some costs, comprehensive health economic analyses are needed to demonstrate overall value. Payer willingness to reimburse nanomedicines depends on demonstrating clear clinical benefit and favorable cost-effectiveness ratios.

Table 3 summarizes approved and selected investigational nanotechnology-based cancer therapeutics, highlighting their composition, approved indications or trial phase, and key clinical findings.

Table 3: Approved and investigational nanotechnology-based cancer therapeutics

Product Name	Nanocarrier Type	Active Agent	Approval Status or Trial Phase	Indications	Key Clinical Findings	Unique Features
Doxil/Caelyx	PEGylated liposome	Doxorubicin	FDA approved (1995)	Ovarian cancer, AIDS-related Kaposi sarcoma, multiple myeloma	Reduced cardiotoxicity, comparable efficacy to free doxorubicin, palmar-plantar erythrodysesthesia	First approved nanomedicine, prolonged circulation
Abraxane	Albumin nanoparticle	Paclitaxel	FDA approved (2005)	Metastatic breast cancer, NSCLC, pancreatic cancer	Improved response rates, no Cremophor hypersensitivity, higher dose delivery	Albumin-mediated tumor targeting
DaunoXome	Liposome	Daunorubicin	FDA approved (1996)	AIDS-related Kaposi sarcoma	Reduced cardiotoxicity compared to free drug	Non-PEGylated liposome
Myocet	Liposome	Doxorubicin	EMA approved (2000)	Metastatic breast cancer	Reduced cardiac toxicity when combined with cyclophosphamide	Non-PEGylated liposome
Onivyde	PEGylated liposome	Irinotecan	FDA approved (2015)	Metastatic pancreatic cancer	Improved overall survival in combination with 5-FU/leucovorin	First approved liposomal topoisomerase inhibitor
Marqibo	Liposome	Vincristine	FDA approved (2012)	Relapsed Philadelphia chromosome-negative ALL	Activity in heavily pretreated patients	Non-PEGylated liposome, reduced neurotoxicity
DepoCyt	Liposome	Cytarabine	FDA approved (1999)	Lymphomatous meningitis	Sustained drug release in cerebrospinal fluid	Multivesicular liposome for intrathecal use
CPX-351 (Vyxeos)	Liposome	Cytarabine and daunorubicin (5:1 ratio)	FDA approved (2017)	Therapy-related AML, AML with myelodysplasia-related changes	Superior overall survival compared to standard therapy	Synergistic fixed-ratio combination
Genexol-PM	Polymeric micelle	Paclitaxel	Approved in South Korea	Breast cancer, NSCLC, ovarian cancer	No Cremophor hypersensitivity, high response rates	mPEG-PDLLA block copolymer micelle
NK105	Polymeric micelle	Paclitaxel	Phase III (Japan)	Gastric cancer, breast cancer	Favorable safety profile, encouraging response rates	PEG-polyaspartate micelle
BIND-014	PSMA-targeted polymeric nanoparticle	Docetaxel	Development discontinued	Prostate cancer, NSCLC	Tumor accumulation demonstrated, insufficient efficacy	First targeted polymeric nanoparticle in trials

MM-302	HER2-targeted liposome	Doxorubicin	Phase II completed	HER2-positive metastatic breast cancer	Did not meet efficacy endpoints in combination with trastuzumab	Antibody-targeted liposome
SGT-53	Liposome	p53 gene	Phase II	Various solid tumors	Well tolerated, preliminary evidence of tumor response	Gene therapy nanoparticle
Liposomal annamycin	Liposome	Annamycin	Phase I/II	Refractory AML, ALL	Activity in anthracycline-resistant leukemia	Designed to overcome MDR
CRLX101	Cyclodextrin polymeric nanoparticle	Camptothecin	Phase II	Ovarian cancer, NSCLC	Prolonged drug release, encouraging efficacy signals	Conjugate with sustained release
Lipoplatin	Liposome	Cisplatin	Phase III (Europe)	NSCLC, pancreatic cancer	Reduced nephrotoxicity, encouraging efficacy	Alternative to free cisplatin
Cornell dots (C dots)	Ultrasmall silica nanoparticle	Diagnostic radionuclide	Phase I completed	Melanoma, head and neck cancer	Safe for intraoperative imaging and lymph node mapping	Theranostic platform, first silica nanoparticle in humans
NBTXR3 (Hensify)	Hafnium oxide nanoparticle	None (radiosensitizer)	EMA approved (2019), Phase III ongoing	Locally advanced soft tissue sarcoma	Improved response when combined with radiotherapy	Physical mode of action, inorganic nanoparticle

7. Safety, Toxicity, and Regulatory Considerations

The clinical translation of nanotechnology-based cancer therapeutics necessitates comprehensive evaluation of their safety profiles, potential toxicities, and interactions with biological systems that may differ substantially from conventional small molecule drugs. The unique physicochemical properties of nanocarriers, including their nanoscale dimensions, high surface area to volume ratio, surface chemistry, and potential for cellular internalization, introduce novel toxicological considerations that require specialized assessment methodologies. Understanding the safety and toxicity profiles of nanomedicines is essential for regulatory approval, clinical implementation, and long-term patient safety.

Nanoparticle interactions with biological systems begin immediately upon administration, with rapid adsorption of plasma proteins onto nanoparticle surfaces forming a protein corona that determines subsequent biological fate, cellular uptake, immune recognition, and biodistribution. The composition and structure of the protein corona depend on nanoparticle physicochemical properties including size, surface charge, hydrophobicity, and surface chemistry, as well as the biological environment encountered. Protein corona formation can alter nanoparticle targeting properties, trigger immune responses, and influence toxicity profiles, representing a critical consideration in nanocarrier design. Immunotoxicity represents a major safety concern for nanotechnology-based therapeutics, encompassing both immunostimulatory effects that may lead to hypersensitivity reactions and immunosuppressive effects that could increase infection risk or impair vaccine responses. Complement activation-related pseudoallergy, characterized by symptoms resembling allergic reactions but mediated through complement system activation rather than IgE antibodies, has been observed with several liposomal formulations. These reactions typically occur upon first exposure, present with cardiopulmonary symptoms, and can range from mild to severe, necessitating careful monitoring during initial administrations.

The phenomenon of accelerated blood clearance, observed with PEGylated liposomes upon repeated administration, results from the generation of anti-PEG IgM antibodies following initial exposure. These antibodies bind to subsequently administered PEGylated nanocarriers, enhancing their clearance and reducing tumor accumulation, thereby compromising therapeutic efficacy. The increasing prevalence of pre-existing anti-PEG antibodies in the general population, attributed to widespread PEG use in consumer products and pharmaceuticals, raises concerns about unpredictable pharmacokinetic behavior and potential hypersensitivity reactions.

Hepatic and splenic accumulation represents a common biodistribution pattern for many nanocarrier systems due to uptake by resident macrophages of the reticuloendothelial system. While this accumulation is generally well-tolerated and reversible, concerns exist regarding potential long-term effects of nanoparticle deposition, particularly for non-biodegradable materials. Hepatotoxicity manifesting as elevated transaminases, hyperbilirubinemia, or hepatic dysfunction has been reported with certain nanoformulations and requires monitoring during clinical trials. Cardiovascular toxicity considerations for nanomedicines include direct cardiac effects, vascular damage, thrombosis risk, and effects on blood pressure. While liposomal anthracyclines demonstrate substantially reduced cardiotoxicity compared to free drug formulations, careful cardiovascular monitoring remains necessary. Nanoparticle-induced endothelial dysfunction, characterized by impaired nitric oxide production, increased oxidative stress, and inflammatory responses, has been observed with certain inorganic nanoparticles and warrants investigation for clinical formulations.

Renal toxicity represents a concern particularly for metal-based nanoparticles and small nanocarriers that may undergo glomerular filtration. Nephrotoxicity can manifest as proteinuria, elevated serum creatinine, tubular damage, or glomerular dysfunction. The reduced nephrotoxicity of liposomal platinum compounds compared to free cisplatin demonstrates that appropriate nanocarrier design can mitigate organ-specific toxicities.

Pulmonary toxicity may occur following systemic administration or particularly after inhalation of nanoparticle aerosols, with potential effects including inflammation, fibrosis, or granuloma formation. The lungs represent a major site of metastatic disease for many cancers, and nanoparticle accumulation in pulmonary tissue requires careful toxicological assessment. Inhalable nanoparticle formulations for local lung cancer treatment must undergo specialized pulmonary toxicity evaluation. Genotoxicity and carcinogenicity assessment is required for

nanocarriers, particularly those containing metal components or non-biodegradable materials. While organic biodegradable nanocarriers generally exhibit favorable genotoxicity profiles, concerns exist regarding potential DNA damage from oxidative stress, direct particle-DNA interactions, or impurities. Long-term carcinogenicity studies, although resource-intensive, may be necessary for nanocarriers with prolonged tissue retention.

Reproductive and developmental toxicity evaluation is essential for nanomedicines, as nanoparticles may cross the placental barrier or accumulate in reproductive organs. While cancer therapeutics are generally contraindicated during pregnancy, comprehensive reproductive toxicity data inform contraception requirements, fertility preservation counseling, and risk assessment for inadvertent exposure. Hematological toxicity, including myelosuppression, anemia, thrombocytopenia, and coagulation abnormalities, represents a common adverse effect of cancer therapeutics including nanomedicine formulations. While nanocarrier encapsulation may reduce bone marrow exposure to cytotoxic agents, monitoring of blood counts remains essential during treatment.

The regulatory framework for nanotechnology-based therapeutics has evolved over the past two decades, with regulatory agencies including the FDA, EMA, and others issuing guidance documents addressing nanomedicine-specific considerations. Regulatory evaluation focuses on product characterization, manufacturing quality control, preclinical safety and efficacy data, clinical trial design, and risk-benefit assessment. The absence of nanoparticle-specific regulations means that nanomedicines are generally evaluated under existing pharmaceutical regulatory frameworks while incorporating additional considerations for their unique properties.

Critical quality attributes requiring rigorous characterization and control include particle size distribution and polydispersity, surface charge and surface chemistry, morphology, drug loading and encapsulation efficiency, drug release kinetics, chemical composition and purity, colloidal stability, sterility and endotoxin levels, and batch-to-batch consistency. The development of standardized characterization methods and reference materials represents an ongoing priority for the nanomedicine field. Manufacturing process development for nanomedicines requires implementation of current good manufacturing practice principles, quality-by-design approaches, and robust process controls to ensure consistent product quality. The complexity of nanocarrier synthesis, involving multiple steps, specialized equipment, and sensitive process parameters, presents scalability challenges that must be addressed during development. Process analytical technology tools enable real-time monitoring and control of critical process parameters, facilitating consistent manufacturing. Stability testing under International Council for Harmonisation guidelines is required to establish shelf life and storage conditions, with particular attention to physical stability parameters unique to nanocarriers including aggregation, drug leakage, and changes in particle size distribution. Accelerated stability studies at elevated temperatures provide preliminary stability data, while long-term stability studies under recommended storage conditions establish final product shelf life.

Post-marketing surveillance and pharmacovigilance are essential for detecting rare adverse events, long-term toxicities, or safety signals that may not have been apparent during clinical trials. The limited number of approved nanomedicines and relatively small patient populations treated to date mean that long-term safety data remains incomplete for many nanocarrier platforms. Continued monitoring and reporting of adverse events contribute to the evolving understanding of nanomedicine safety profiles. Environmental health and safety considerations for nanomaterial manufacturing, handling, and disposal represent additional concerns requiring appropriate safeguards. Occupational exposure limits, containment strategies, personal protective equipment requirements, and waste disposal protocols must be established for nanomedicine production facilities.

8. Future Perspectives in Nanotechnology-Driven Cancer Treatment

The field of pharmaceutical nanotechnology for cancer therapy stands at a critical juncture, with substantial scientific advances and growing clinical experience providing foundation for next-generation systems while translational challenges and clinical trial outcomes inform future research directions. Emerging technologies, innovative design strategies, and improved understanding of nano-bio interactions promise to overcome current limitations and realize the transformative potential of nanomedicine in oncology.

Personalized nanomedicine approaches that tailor nanocarrier design, drug selection, and dosing strategies to individual patient characteristics represent a major future direction. Patient stratification based on tumor vascular permeability, target receptor expression, tumor microenvironment features, pharmacogenomic profiles, and immune status could enable identification of individuals most likely to benefit from specific nanomedicine formulations. Companion diagnostics employing imaging techniques, liquid biopsies, or molecular profiling would facilitate personalized treatment selection and real-time monitoring of therapeutic response.

Artificial intelligence and machine learning methodologies are increasingly being applied to nanomedicine development, enabling prediction of nanoparticle biological behavior from physicochemical properties, optimization of formulation parameters, identification of novel targeting ligands, and analysis of complex structure-activity relationships. Computational modeling of nanoparticle-cell interactions, biodistribution patterns, and tumor penetration can guide rational nanocarrier design and reduce reliance on empirical optimization. High-throughput screening platforms combined with machine learning algorithms accelerate identification of promising nanocarrier candidates for specific applications.

Next-generation targeting strategies moving beyond the enhanced permeability and retention effect include normalization of tumor vasculature to enhance nanoparticle extravasation, modulation of tumor microenvironment barriers, sequential targeting approaches, and exploitation of biological transport pathways. Vascular normalization strategies employing anti-angiogenic agents or vascular disrupting agents transiently improve tumor perfusion and enhance nanoparticle delivery when appropriately timed. Size-shrinkable or tumor-penetrating nanoparticles that undergo environmentally triggered size reduction enable deep tumor penetration beyond perivascular regions.

The integration of nanotechnology with immunotherapy represents a particularly promising avenue, with nanocarriers enabling co-delivery of tumor antigens and immunostimulatory adjuvants for cancer vaccination, targeted delivery of immune checkpoint inhibitors to tumor microenvironments, enhancement of adoptive cell therapy through nanoparticle-mediated T cell engineering, and modulation of tumor-associated macrophages to promote antitumor immunity. Nanoparticle-based vaccine platforms can protect antigens from degradation, facilitate uptake by antigen-presenting cells, and provide controlled release of immunostimulatory signals. Early clinical trials of nanoparticle cancer vaccines have demonstrated immunological responses and preliminary efficacy, supporting continued development.

Gene therapy and RNA therapeutics delivered via nanocarriers offer opportunities to address undruggable targets, modulate drug resistance mechanisms, and provide personalized cancer treatments. Lipid nanoparticles, building on the success of mRNA COVID-19 vaccines, are being explored for delivery of therapeutic mRNA, siRNA for gene silencing, or CRISPR-Cas9 components for gene editing in cancer cells. Challenges including cellular internalization, endosomal escape, and targeted delivery to specific cell types within tumors require continued innovation.

Combination nanomedicine platforms incorporating multiple therapeutic agents with distinct mechanisms of action enable rational drug combination strategies, control of drug release stoichiometry, and potential for synergistic effects. Co-encapsulation of chemotherapeutic agents with chemosensitizers, apoptosis inducers, or inhibitors of resistance mechanisms in single nanocarriers has demonstrated enhanced efficacy in preclinical models. The clinical success of CPX-351, delivering synergistic ratios of cytarabine and daunorubicin, validates this approach and encourages development of additional combination nanomedicines.

Theranostic nanoplatforms integrating therapeutic and diagnostic functionalities enable real-time visualization of drug delivery, assessment of target engagement, monitoring of treatment response, and image-guided therapy. Multimodal imaging capabilities combining magnetic resonance, optical, photoacoustic, or nuclear imaging modalities provide comprehensive information about nanoparticle biodistribution and tumor response. Clinical translation of theranostic nanomedicines requires addressing regulatory complexity, cost considerations, and integration with clinical imaging workflows.

Bioinspired and biomimetic nanocarriers that harness biological components or mimic natural structures offer advantages including improved biocompatibility, immune evasion, enhanced circulation, and active biological functions. Cell membrane-coated nanoparticles, incorporating natural cell membranes from red blood cells, platelets, cancer cells, or immune cells onto synthetic nanoparticle cores, inherit biological properties of source cells including prolonged circulation and tumor homing. Exosome-based drug delivery systems exploit natural extracellular vesicles for cargo delivery, potentially offering superior biocompatibility and cellular uptake. Stimuli-responsive nanocarriers that respond to external triggers including light, ultrasound, magnetic fields, or alternating electric fields enable spatiotemporal control of drug release and activation. Photodynamic and photothermal therapies employing nanoparticles that convert light energy to reactive oxygen species or heat provide minimally invasive treatment options for accessible tumors. Ultrasound-responsive nanocarriers can be triggered to release drugs specifically at tumor sites targeted by focused ultrasound, enhancing tumor specificity.

The development of reversibly crosslinked or stimuli-responsive nanocarriers that undergo structural transformations in response to multiple sequential stimuli represents an advanced strategy for precise drug delivery control. These sophisticated systems can navigate biological barriers, accumulate in tumors, penetrate tumor tissues, enter cancer cells, and release drugs in specific intracellular compartments through orchestrated response to environmental cues.

Addressing manufacturing and scalability challenges through development of continuous manufacturing processes, microfluidic synthesis platforms, and quality-by-design approaches will facilitate clinical translation and commercialization. Continuous manufacturing offers advantages including improved process control, reduced batch-to-batch variability, decreased production costs, and enhanced scalability compared to traditional batch processes. Microfluidic devices enable precise control of nanoparticle synthesis parameters and production of highly uniform nanocarriers.

Standardization efforts to establish consensus protocols for nanocarrier characterization, biological evaluation, and reporting of preclinical and clinical data would improve reproducibility and facilitate comparison between studies. International collaborations and initiatives including the Nanotechnology Characterization Laboratory, European Technology Platform on Nanomedicine, and others work toward developing standardized methods and reference materials.

Regulatory science advances, including development of nanoparticle-specific guidance documents, establishment of surrogate endpoints correlating with clinical outcomes, and creation of abbreviated regulatory pathways for follow-on nanomedicines, would accelerate clinical translation. Improved understanding of nanomedicine pharmacology, toxicology, and clinical efficacy will inform evolution of regulatory frameworks.

Cost reduction strategies including development of generic or biosimilar nanomedicines, optimization of manufacturing processes, and demonstration of health economic value will improve access and adoption. As key patents on early nanomedicine platforms expire, opportunities emerge for generic nanomedicine development, though establishing equivalence for complex nanoformulations presents technical and regulatory challenges.

Educational initiatives to train scientists, clinicians, regulatory personnel, and healthcare providers in nanomedicine principles, applications, and considerations will build necessary expertise for field advancement. Interdisciplinary training programs integrating materials science, pharmaceutical sciences, medicine, and regulatory science prepare the next generation of nanomedicine researchers and practitioners.

Table 4 summarizes the advantages, limitations, and clinical challenges associated with pharmaceutical nanotechnology applications in oncology, providing perspective on current state and future needs of the field.

Table 4: Advantages, limitations, and clinical challenges of pharmaceutical nanotechnology in oncology

Aspect	Advantages	Limitations	Clinical Challenges
Drug Delivery	Improved solubility of hydrophobic drugs, controlled and sustained release, protection from degradation, high drug loading capacity	Potential for premature drug leakage, complex formulation development, limited loading for some drugs	Achieving consistent drug release profiles *in vivo*, patient-to-patient variability in pharmacokinetics
Tumor Targeting	Passive targeting via EPR effect, active targeting through ligand-receptor interactions, potential for dual or multi-modal targeting	Variable and heterogeneous EPR effect in human tumors, limited tumor penetration, interference of protein corona with targeting	Identifying patients with favorable tumor vascular permeability, overcoming stromal barriers, developing predictive biomarkers
Biodistribution	Prolonged circulation time, reduced accumulation in healthy tissues, ability to cross biological barriers	Accumulation in RES organs (liver, spleen), potential for off-target effects, size-dependent clearance pathways	Managing hepatic and splenic accumulation, achieving adequate tumor-to-normal tissue ratios, monitoring long-term biodistribution
Therapeutic Efficacy	Enhanced antitumor activity in preclinical models, synergistic effects in combination formulations, potential to overcome drug resistance	Translation gap between preclinical and clinical efficacy, heterogeneous patient responses, limited improvement over conventional therapy in some trials	Demonstrating clinically meaningful efficacy improvement, selecting appropriate patient populations, optimizing dosing regimens
Safety and Toxicity	Reduced systemic toxicity for encapsulated drugs, decreased organ-specific toxicities (e.g., cardiotoxicity of anthracyclines)	Unique nanoparticle-associated toxicities (CARPA, ABC phenomenon), immunogenicity concerns, potential long-term effects	Comprehensive toxicity assessment, managing infusion-related reactions, long-term safety monitoring, evaluating environmental impact
Manufacturing	Versatile platform technology, potential for multi-drug loading, surface modification flexibility	Complex manufacturing processes, scalability challenges, batch-to-batch variability, specialized equipment required	Establishing robust GMP processes, ensuring product consistency, achieving cost-effective production, technology transfer to commercial scale
Characterization	Multiple analytical techniques available, growing standardization efforts	Requirement for specialized characterization methods, lack of universal standards, complexity of *in vivo* characterization	Developing clinically relevant characterization methods, establishing quality control specifications, correlating *in vitro* with *in vivo* performance
Regulatory Pathway	Existing frameworks applicable to nanomedicines, growing regulatory guidance	Complex regulatory requirements, case-by-case evaluation, evolving guidelines, lack of clear equivalence criteria for generics	Navigating regulatory approval process, demonstrating pharmaceutical equivalence for follow-on products, addressing nanotoxicology concerns
Clinical Translation	Proof-of-concept established by approved products, growing clinical experience	High development costs, prolonged development timelines, translational failure rate, limited correlation with preclinical results	Securing funding for clinical development, designing informative clinical trials, developing companion diagnostics, demonstrating cost-effectiveness
Personalization	Potential for tailored formulations, compatibility with biomarker-driven approaches, theranostic capabilities	Limited understanding of predictive factors, absence of validated biomarkers, increased complexity and cost	Identifying patients most likely to benefit, integrating with precision oncology platforms, establishing clinical decision algorithms
Combination Therapy	Ability to co-deliver multiple agents, control of drug ratios, enhanced synergy	Increased formulation complexity, potential for drug-drug interactions, regulatory complexity for combination products	Selecting optimal drug combinations, determining appropriate dosing ratios, conducting combination clinical trials
Immunotherapy Integration	Enhanced delivery of immunotherapeutic agents, vaccine platform capability, potential for immune modulation	Limited understanding of nano-immune interactions, risk of immunotoxicity, complex immune response evaluation	Optimizing nanoparticle design for immune applications, avoiding excessive immune stimulation, demonstrating immunological and clinical efficacy

9. Conclusion

Pharmaceutical nanotechnology has emerged as a transformative approach in cancer therapy, offering innovative solutions to longstanding challenges in drug delivery, tumor targeting, and treatment optimization. The unique physicochemical properties of nanocarrier systems enable improved pharmacokinetic profiles, enhanced tumor accumulation through passive and active targeting mechanisms, controlled drug release in response to tumor microenvironment stimuli, and integration of multiple therapeutic modalities within single platforms. Clinical evidence from approved nanomedicines including liposomal doxorubicin, albumin-bound paclitaxel, and liposomal irinotecan demonstrates substantial improvements in therapeutic index compared to conventional formulations, validating the nanomedicine concept and establishing proof-of-principle for continued development.

Despite these successes, significant challenges remain in translating the promise of nanotechnology-based cancer therapeutics from preclinical studies to widespread clinical impact. The variable magnitude of the enhanced permeability and retention effect in human cancers, limited tumor penetration, heterogeneous patient responses, complex manufacturing requirements, regulatory hurdles, and cost considerations represent obstacles that must be systematically addressed. Recent clinical trial outcomes, including several high-profile failures of investigational nanomedicines, highlight the need for improved preclinical

models, patient selection strategies, and mechanistic understanding of nanoparticle behavior in complex tumor microenvironments.

The future of pharmaceutical nanotechnology in oncology lies in the development of intelligent, multifunctional nanocarrier systems that integrate sophisticated targeting strategies, stimulus-responsive drug release, theranostic capabilities, and compatibility with emerging cancer treatment modalities including immunotherapy and gene therapy. Personalized nanomedicine approaches guided by patient-specific biomarkers and companion diagnostics promise to optimize treatment selection and improve clinical outcomes. Artificial intelligence and computational modeling methodologies will accelerate rational nanocarrier design and reduce development timelines. Standardization of characterization methods, manufacturing processes, and evaluation protocols will enhance reproducibility and facilitate regulatory approval.

The convergence of nanotechnology with immunotherapy represents a particularly promising frontier, with nanocarriers enabling precise delivery of cancer vaccines, immune checkpoint inhibitors, and immunomodulatory agents to achieve enhanced antitumor immune responses. Integration of multiple therapeutic agents within single nanocarrier platforms offers opportunities for rational combination therapy approaches that can overcome drug resistance and achieve synergistic effects. Biomimetic nanocarriers that harness biological components or mimic natural structures provide advantages in biocompatibility, immune evasion, and active targeting functionalities.

Realizing the full potential of pharmaceutical nanotechnology in cancer treatment requires sustained collaborative efforts among academic researchers, pharmaceutical industry, regulatory agencies, clinicians, and patient advocacy groups. Investment in fundamental research to elucidate nano-bio interactions, development of more predictive preclinical models, establishment of regulatory frameworks adapted to nanomedicine characteristics, and demonstration of health economic value will collectively advance the field. Educational initiatives to build interdisciplinary expertise in nanomedicine principles and applications are essential for training the next generation of scientists and clinicians.

As the field matures and learns from both successes and failures, pharmaceutical nanotechnology is poised to play an increasingly important role in precision oncology, contributing to improved survival outcomes, enhanced quality of life, and ultimately, more effective cancer treatments. The ongoing evolution of nanocarrier platforms, targeting strategies, and combination approaches, informed by clinical experience and guided by rigorous scientific principles, offers realistic hope for transforming cancer from a deadly disease into a manageable chronic condition for many patients. Continued innovation, rigorous evaluation, and commitment to addressing translational challenges will determine the ultimate impact of nanotechnology on the future of cancer therapy.

References

1. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Laversanne M, Soerjomataram I, Jemal A, Bray F. 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. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Wagle NS, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2023. CA Cancer J Clin. 2023;73(1):17-48.
3. DeVita VT, Chu E. A history of cancer chemotherapy. Cancer Res. 2008;68(21):8643-53.
4. Schirrmacher V. From chemotherapy to biological therapy: a review of novel concepts to reduce the side effects of systemic cancer treatment. Int J Oncol. 2019;54(2):407-19.
5. Jain RK. Normalization of tumor vasculature: an emerging concept in antiangiogenic therapy. Science. 2005;307(5706):58-62.
6. Gottesman MM, Fojo T, Bates SE. Multidrug resistance in cancer: role of ATP-dependent transporters. Nat Rev Cancer. 2002;2(1):48-58.
7. 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.
8. Shi J, Kantoff PW, Wooster R, Farokhzad OC. Cancer nanomedicine: progress, challenges and opportunities. Nat Rev Cancer. 2017;17(1):20-37.
9. 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.
10. Danhier F, Feron O, Préat V. To exploit the tumor microenvironment: passive and active tumor targeting of nanocarriers for anti-cancer drug delivery. J Control Release. 2010;148(2):135-46.
11. Barenholz Y. Doxil - the first FDA-approved nano-drug: lessons learned. J Control Release. 2012;160(2):117-34.
12. Maeda H, Wu J, Sawa T, Matsumura Y, Hori K. Tumor vascular permeability and the EPR effect in macromolecular therapeutics: a review. J Control Release. 2000;65(1-2):271-84.
13. 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.
14. Mura S, Nicolas J, Couvreur P. Stimuli-responsive nanocarriers for drug delivery. Nat Mater. 2013;12(11):991-1003.
15. Chabner BA, Roberts TG. Timeline: chemotherapy and the war on cancer. Nat Rev Cancer. 2005;5(1):65-72.
16. Fisher B, Anderson S, Bryant J, *et al*. Twenty-year follow-up of a randomized trial comparing total mastectomy, lumpectomy, and lumpectomy plus irradiation for the treatment of invasive breast cancer. N Engl J Med. 2002;347(16):1233-41.
17. Baskar R, Lee KA, Yeo R, Yeoh KW. Cancer and radiation therapy: current advances and future directions. Int J Med Sci. 2012;9(3):193-9.
18. Chabner BA, Longo DL. Cancer chemotherapy and biotherapy: principles and practice. 5th ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2011.
19. Weissig V, Pettinger TK, Murdock N. Nanopharmaceuticals (part 1): products on the market. Int J Nanomedicine. 2014;9:4357-73.
20. Octavia Y, Tocchetti CG, Gabrielson KL, Janssens S, Crijns HJ, Moens AL. Doxorubicin-induced cardiomyopathy: from molecular mechanisms to therapeutic strategies. J Mol Cell Cardiol. 2012;52(6):1213-25.

21. Schiller JH, Harrington D, Belani CP, *et al*. Comparison of four chemotherapy regimens for advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. N Engl J Med. 2002;346(2):92-8.
22. Holohan C, Van Schaeybroeck S, Longley DB, Johnston PG. Cancer drug resistance: an evolving paradigm. Nat Rev Cancer. 2013;13(10):714-26.
23. 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.
24. Wijdeven RH, Pang B, Assaraf YG, Neefjes J. Old drugs, novel ways out: drug resistance toward cytotoxic chemotherapeutics. Drug Resist Updat. 2016;28:65-81.
25. Vasan N, Baselga J, Hyman DM. A view on drug resistance in cancer. Nature. 2019;575(7782):299-309.
26. Jain RK. Normalizing tumor microenvironment to treat cancer: bench to bedside to biomarkers. J Clin Oncol. 2013;31(17):2205-18.
27. Stylianopoulos T, Jain RK. Combining two strategies to improve perfusion and drug delivery in solid tumors. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2013;110(46):18632-7.
28. Provenzano PP, Cuevas C, Chang AE, Goel VK, Von Hoff DD, Hingorani SR. Enzymatic targeting of the stroma ablates physical barriers to treatment of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. Cancer Cell. 2012;21(3):418-29.
29. 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.
30. Blanco E, Shen H, Ferrari M. Principles of nanoparticle design for overcoming biological barriers to drug delivery. Nat Biotechnol. 2015;33(9):941-51.
31. Karimi M, Ghasemi A, Sahandi Zangabad P, *et al*. Smart micro/nanoparticles in stimulus-responsive drug/gene delivery systems. Chem Soc Rev. 2016;45(5):1457-501.
32. Deirram N, Zhang C, Kermaniyan SS, Johnston APR, Such GK. pH-responsive polymer nanoparticles for drug delivery. Macromol Rapid Commun. 2019;40(10):e1800917.
33. Patra JK, Das G, Fraceto LF, *et al*. Nano based drug delivery systems: recent developments and future prospects. J Nanobiotechnology. 2018;16(1):71.
34. Hu Q, Sun W, Wang C, Gu Z. Recent advances of cocktail chemotherapy by combination drug delivery systems. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2016;98:19-34.
35. Anselmo AC, Mitragotri S. Nanoparticles in the clinic: an update. Bioeng Transl Med. 2019;4(3):e10143.
36. Bulbake U, Doppalapudi S, Kommineni N, Khan W. Liposomal formulations in clinical use: an updated review. Pharmaceutics. 2017;9(2):12.
37. Allen TM, Cullis PR. Liposomal drug delivery systems: from concept to clinical applications. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2013;65(1):36-48.
38. Chang HI, Yeh MK. Clinical development of liposome-based drugs: formulation, characterization, and therapeutic efficacy. Int J Nanomedicine. 2012;7:49-60.
39. Sercombe L, Veerati T, Moheimani F, Wu SY, Sood AK, Hua S. Advances and challenges of liposome assisted drug delivery. Front Pharmacol. 2015;6:286.
40. Gabizon A, Shmeeda H, Barenholz Y. Pharmacokinetics of pegylated liposomal doxorubicin: review of animal and human studies. Clin Pharmacokinet. 2003;42(5):419-36.
41. Kumari A, Yadav SK, Yadav SC. Biodegradable polymeric nanoparticles based drug delivery systems. Colloids Surf B Biointerfaces. 2010;75(1):1-18.
42. 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.
43. Cabral H, Miyata K, Osada K, Kataoka K. Block copolymer micelles in nanomedicine applications. Chem Rev. 2018;118(14):6844-92.
44. Desai N, Trieu V, Yao Z, *et al*. Increased antitumor activity, intratumor paclitaxel concentrations, and endothelial cell transport of cremophor-free, albumin-bound paclitaxel, ABI-007, compared with cremophor-based paclitaxel. Clin Cancer Res. 2006;12(4):1317-24.
45. Mignani S, El Kazzouli S, Bousmina M, Majoral JP. Expand classical drug administration ways by emerging routes using dendrimer drug delivery systems: a concise overview. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2013;65(10):1316-30.
46. Kannan RM, Nance E, Kannan S, Tomalia DA. Emerging concepts in dendrimer-based nanomedicine: from design principles to clinical applications. J Intern Med. 2014;276(6):579-617.
47. Kesharwani P, Jain K, Jain NK. Dendrimer as nanocarrier for drug delivery. Prog Polym Sci. 2014;39(2):268-307.
48. Singh P, Pandit S, Mokkapati V, Garg A, Ravikumar V, Mijakovic I. Gold nanoparticles in diagnostics and therapeutics for human cancer. Int J Mol Sci. 2018;19(7):1979.
49. Dreaden EC, Alkilany AM, Huang X, Murphy CJ, El-Sayed MA. The golden age: gold nanoparticles for biomedicine. Chem Soc Rev. 2012;41(7):2740-79.
50. Tang F, Li L, Chen D. Mesoporous silica nanoparticles: synthesis, biocompatibility and drug delivery. Adv Mater. 2012;24(12):1504-34.
51. Revia RA, Zhang M. Magnetite nanoparticles for cancer diagnosis, treatment, and treatment monitoring: recent advances. Mater Today. 2016;19(3):157-68.
52. Soenen SJ, Parak WJ, Rejman J, Manshian B. (Intra)cellular stability of inorganic nanoparticles: effects on cytotoxicity, particle functionality, and biomedical applications. Chem Rev. 2015;115(5):2109-35.
53. Sajid MI, Jamshaid U, Jamshaid T, Zafar N, Fessi H, Elaissari A. Carbon nanotubes from synthesis to *in vivo* biomedical applications. Int J Pharm. 2016;501(1-2):278-99.
54. Yang K, Feng L, Shi X, Liu Z. Nano-graphene in biomedicine: theranostic applications. Chem Soc Rev. 2013;42(2):530-47.
55. Liu Z, Tabakman S, Welsher K, Dai H. Carbon nanotubes in biology and medicine: *in vitro* and *in vivo* detection, imaging and drug delivery. Nano Res. 2009;2(2):85-120.
56. Hadinoto K, Sundaresan A, Cheow WS. Lipid-polymer hybrid nanoparticles as a new generation therapeutic delivery platform: a review. Eur J Pharm Biopharm. 2013;85(3 Pt A):427-43.
57. Park K, Lee S, Kang E, Kim K, Choi K, Kwon IC. New generation of multifunctional nanoparticles for cancer imaging and therapy. Adv Funct Mater. 2009;19(10):1553-66.

58. Albanese A, Tang PS, Chan WC. The effect of nanoparticle size, shape, and surface chemistry on biological systems. Annu Rev Biomed Eng. 2012;14:1-16.
59. Chithrani BD, Ghazani AA, Chan WC. Determining the size and shape dependence of gold nanoparticle uptake into mammalian cells. Nano Lett. 2006;6(4):662-8.
60. Arvizo RR, Miranda OR, Thompson MA, *et al*. Effect of nanoparticle surface charge at the plasma membrane and beyond. Nano Lett. 2010;10(7):2543-8.
61. Jokerst JV, Lobovkina T, Zare RN, Gambhir SS. Nanoparticle PEGylation for imaging and therapy. Nanomedicine. 2011;6(4):715-28.
62. Toy R, Peiris PM, Ghaghada KB, Karathanasis E. Shaping cancer nanomedicine: the effect of particle shape on the *in vivo* journey of nanoparticles. Nanomedicine. 2014;9(1):121-34.
63. Allen TM, Cullis PR. Drug delivery systems: entering the mainstream. Science. 2004;303(5665):1818-22.
64. Panyam J, Labhasetwar V. Biodegradable nanoparticles for drug and gene delivery to cells and tissue. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2003;55(3):329-47.
65. Duncan R. Polymer conjugates as anticancer nanomedicines. Nat Rev Cancer. 2006;6(9):688-701.
66. Tong R, Cheng J. Anticancer polymeric nanomedicines. Polym Rev. 2007;47(3):345-81.
67. Kataoka K, Harada A, Nagasaki Y. Block copolymer micelles for drug delivery: design, characterization and biological significance. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2012;64:37-48.
68. Ganta S, Devalapally H, Shahiwala A, Amiji M. A review of stimuli-responsive nanocarriers for drug and gene delivery. J Control Release. 2008;126(3):187-204.
69. Lee ES, Gao Z, Bae YH. Recent progress in tumor pH targeting nanotechnology. J Control Release. 2008;132(3):164-70.
70. Cheng R, Feng F, Meng F, Deng C, Feijen J, Zhong Z. Glutathione-responsive nano-vehicles as a promising platform for targeted intracellular drug and gene delivery. J Control Release. 2011;152(1):2-12.
71. Lammers T, Kiessling F, Hennink WE, Storm G. Drug targeting to tumors: principles, pitfalls and (pre-) clinical progress. J Control Release. 2012;161(2):175-87.
72. 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.
73. Matsumura Y, Maeda H. A new concept for macromolecular therapeutics in cancer chemotherapy: mechanism of tumoritropic accumulation of proteins and the antitumor agent smancs. Cancer Res. 1986;46(12 Pt 1):6387-92.
74. Carmeliet P, Jain RK. Angiogenesis in cancer and other diseases. Nature. 2000;407(6801):249-57.
75. Hobbs SK, Monsky WL, Yuan F, *et al*. Regulation of transport pathways in tumor vessels: role of tumor type and microenvironment. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1998;95(8):4607-12.
76. Padera TP, Stoll BR, Tooredman JB, Capen D, di Tomaso E, Jain RK. Pathology: cancer cells compress intratumour vessels. Nature. 2004;427(6976):695.
77. Nakamura Y, Mochida A, Choyke PL, Kobayashi H. Nanodrug delivery: is the enhanced permeability and retention effect sufficient for curing cancer? Bioconjug Chem. 2016;27(10):2225-38.