

Applications of Nanotechnology in Drug Delivery Systems: A Comprehensive Review

Anita A. Memon

Assistant Professor in Chemistry, College Education Department.

Email: anitasajjadrustamani@gmail.com

G. Zuhra Memon

Professor Dr. M.A. Kazi Institute of Chemistry, University of Sindh, Jamshoro.

Email: zuhra.memon@usindh.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

Nanotechnology has fundamentally transformed the landscape of pharmaceutical sciences by enabling the design and development of advanced drug delivery systems with unprecedented precision, efficiency, and therapeutic specificity. This comprehensive review critically examines the multifaceted applications of nanotechnology in modern drug delivery, systematically analyzing the physicochemical properties, mechanistic underpinnings, and clinical significance of major nanocarrier platforms including liposomes, polymeric nanoparticles, dendrimers, solid lipid nanoparticles (SLNs), metallic nanoparticles, and carbon nanotubes. The review traces the historical evolution of nanomedicine from its conceptual foundations in the 1950s to the emergence of clinically approved formulations and investigational next-generation systems. Central to the discussion is a comparative analysis of conventional drug delivery systems versus nanoformulations, highlighting improvements in bioavailability, pharmacokinetics, tissue targeting, and patient compliance. Key mechanisms—including passive targeting via the enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect, receptor-mediated active targeting, stimuli-responsive release, and theranostic integration—are elaborated with reference to recent experimental and clinical evidence. Specific attention is devoted to the expanding role of nanotechnology in oncology, antimicrobial therapy, central nervous system disorders, and chronic inflammatory conditions. Controlled and sustained drug release strategies are examined in the

context of reducing dosing frequency and systemic toxicity. The review further addresses critical challenges related to nanoparticle toxicity, immunogenicity, regulatory frameworks, and large-scale manufacturing. Research gaps are systematically identified, and a forward-looking discussion of emerging trends—including stimuli-responsive nanosystems, artificial intelligence-aided nanomedicine design, and mRNA nanoformulations—is provided. The paper aims to serve as a scholarly reference for researchers, clinicians, and pharmaceutical scientists working at the intersection of nanotechnology and biomedicine.

Keywords: Nanotechnology, drug delivery systems, nanoparticles, targeted therapy, nanomedicine, liposomes, polymeric nanoparticles, cancer therapy, controlled release, theranostics

1. Introduction

The global burden of chronic and infectious diseases has challenged pharmaceutical sciences to develop increasingly sophisticated therapeutic strategies. Conventional drug delivery approaches, while effective in many clinical contexts, are constrained by fundamental limitations including poor aqueous solubility of active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs), rapid systemic clearance, non-specific tissue distribution, and the inability to maintain therapeutic plasma concentrations over extended periods. These limitations not only compromise clinical outcomes but also contribute to off-target toxicities that reduce patient quality of life and adherence to therapy (Zhang et al., 2022).

Nanotechnology—defined broadly as the manipulation of matter at the nanometer scale (1–1000 nm)—has emerged as a transformative paradigm in biomedicine, offering solutions to many of the inherent constraints of conventional pharmacotherapy. By exploiting the unique physicochemical properties of materials at the nanoscale, including enhanced surface-area-to-volume ratios, quantum confinement effects, and tunable surface chemistry, researchers have engineered nanocarrier systems capable of encapsulating diverse drug classes, protecting them from physiological degradation, and delivering them to specific cellular or subcellular targets with high precision (Peer et al., 2007; Hare et al., 2017).

The intersection of nanotechnology and drug delivery has given rise to the field of

nanomedicine, which encompasses the design, characterization, and clinical application of nanoscale therapeutic platforms. From the early development of liposomal formulations in the 1960s to the clinical approval of albumin-bound paclitaxel (Abraxane®) and the recent success of lipid nanoparticle-based mRNA vaccines for COVID-19, the trajectory of nanomedicine reflects a sustained and accelerating integration of nanotechnology into clinical practice (Shi et al., 2017; Hou et al., 2021).

The significance of nanotechnology in drug delivery is perhaps most starkly illustrated in oncology. Conventional chemotherapeutic agents are characterized by narrow therapeutic indices, with doses sufficient to eradicate tumors often approaching systemic toxicity thresholds. Nanocarriers can passively accumulate within tumor tissues through the enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect—a consequence of the abnormal vasculature and impaired lymphatic drainage characteristic of solid tumors—thereby achieving local drug concentrations several-fold higher than those attainable with free drug administration (Maeda et al., 2020). Active targeting strategies employing ligand-functionalized nanoparticles further refine this selectivity to the cellular and molecular levels.

Beyond oncology, nanotechnology-based drug delivery systems have demonstrated remarkable promise in the management of infectious diseases, central nervous system disorders, inflammatory conditions, and metabolic diseases. The COVID-19 pandemic provided a particularly striking demonstration of nanomedicine's clinical potential, as lipid nanoparticle platforms developed over decades of research enabled the rapid formulation and deployment of mRNA vaccines that achieved extraordinary efficacy (Hou et al., 2021; Corbett et al., 2020).

This review provides a comprehensive, critically analytical overview of the current state of nanotechnology in drug delivery, examining the principal nanocarrier systems, delivery mechanisms, clinical applications, and translational challenges. It additionally identifies key research gaps and emerging directions that are likely to define the next decade of nanomedicine research. The paper is intended to serve as a scholarly reference for researchers, educators, and practitioners across the disciplines of pharmaceutical chemistry, nanomedicine, materials science, and

clinical pharmacology.

2. Historical Evolution of Nanotechnology in Medicine

The conceptual origins of nanotechnology as a scientific discipline are conventionally traced to Richard Feynman's celebrated 1959 lecture, 'There's Plenty of Room at the Bottom,' in which he articulated the theoretical possibility of manipulating individual atoms and molecules. However, it was Norio Taniguchi who formally coined the term 'nanotechnology' in 1974, defining it as the precision machining of materials at the nanometer level (Taniguchi, 1974). Eric Drexler subsequently expanded the theoretical framework in his 1986 monograph, *Engines of Creation*, which envisioned molecular-scale machines capable of performing complex tasks including drug delivery (Drexler, 1986).

The medicinal application of nanotechnology began with the pioneering work of Alec Bangham and colleagues in the early 1960s, who described the self-assembly of phospholipids into bilayer vesicles—structures now recognized as liposomes. Gregory Gregoriadis and colleagues subsequently demonstrated the encapsulation of biological molecules within liposomes and proposed their use as drug carriers in 1971, establishing a foundational proof of concept for lipid-based nanoformulations (Gregoriadis & Ryman, 1971). The development of PEGylated liposomes in the 1980s and 1990s, culminating in the 1995 FDA approval of Doxil (liposomal doxorubicin), marked the first clinical validation of a nanotechnology-based drug delivery system (Barenholz, 2012).

The 1980s and 1990s witnessed parallel advances in polymeric nanoparticle research, with the development of poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA) and other biodegradable polymers as drug encapsulation matrices. The emergence of dendrimer chemistry in the mid-1980s, pioneered by Donald Tomalia with the synthesis of polyamidoamine (PAMAM) dendrimers, introduced a new class of precisely architected macromolecules for drug conjugation and delivery (Tomalia et al., 1985). Simultaneously, the discovery of fullerenes (1985) and carbon nanotubes (1991) opened new avenues for carbon-based nanomaterial applications in medicine.

The 2000s saw the rapid expansion of gold nanoparticle research for both diagnostic

and therapeutic applications, the clinical development of albumin-bound nanoparticles (Abraxane approved in 2005), and growing interest in magnetic nanoparticles for magnetically guided drug delivery and hyperthermia. The decade also brought increased regulatory attention to nanomedicines, with the FDA issuing guidance documents on nanotechnology-related products (FDA, 2007).

The 2010s and beyond have been characterized by an explosion of research into stimuli-responsive systems, theranostic platforms, nucleic acid nanocarriers, and cell-membrane-coated nanoparticles. The clinical success of lipid nanoparticle-formulated siRNA (Onpattro, 2018) and mRNA vaccines (BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273, 2020) has validated the translation of nanomedicine from laboratory concept to life-saving clinical product. As of 2024–2025, more than 50 nanotechnology-based drug products have received regulatory approval globally, and hundreds more are in various stages of clinical investigation (Tran et al., 2023).

3. Drug Delivery Systems: Conceptual Framework and Clinical Importance

A drug delivery system (DDS) may be defined as a formulation or device that enables the administration of a pharmaceutical compound to the body in a manner that maximizes therapeutic efficacy, minimizes adverse effects, and optimizes patient convenience. The design of a DDS must address multiple interdependent parameters: solubility enhancement, stability preservation, controlled release kinetics, tissue targeting, cellular internalization, and intracellular trafficking to the site of pharmacological action (Langer, 1998).

Classical DDSs encompass oral tablets, injectable solutions, topical preparations, and transdermal patches. While these platforms have proven clinically effective across many therapeutic areas, they are fundamentally constrained by the pharmacokinetic properties of free drug molecules. Most small-molecule drugs exhibit rapid renal or hepatic clearance, poor tissue selectivity, and concentration-time profiles characterized by high peak levels associated with toxicity and subtherapeutic troughs between doses. Proteins, nucleic acids, and other biomacromolecular therapeutics present even greater delivery challenges, as they are susceptible to enzymatic degradation and typically unable to traverse cellular membranes without assistance (Allen & Cullis, 2004).

Nanotechnology-based DDSs overcome many of these limitations through several complementary mechanisms. Encapsulation within nanocarriers protects labile therapeutics from physiological degradation. Surface modification with hydrophilic polymers such as polyethylene glycol (PEG) confers 'stealth' properties that reduce opsonization and extend circulatory half-life. Size- and shape-dependent biodistribution enables preferential accumulation in diseased tissues. Responsive release mechanisms keyed to pathological stimuli—such as acidic pH in tumors, elevated glutathione in cancer cells, or local hyperthermia—enable drug release to be triggered specifically within target compartments (Mura et al., 2013).

Figure 1 (Suggested): Schematic representation of the conceptual framework of nanotechnology-based drug delivery systems, illustrating passive EPR-mediated tumor accumulation, receptor-mediated active targeting, and stimuli-responsive intracellular drug release. The figure should depict a nanocarrier with surface ligands approaching a tumor vasculature, with inset panels showing endosomal escape and drug release mechanisms.

4. Types of Nanoparticles Used in Drug Delivery

The diversity of nanocarrier systems currently under investigation or in clinical use reflects the remarkable ingenuity of nanomaterial science. Each platform class possesses distinctive structural features, physicochemical properties, and functional capabilities that render it suitable for specific therapeutic applications. The following sections provide a critical examination of the major nanocarrier categories.

4.1 Liposomes

Liposomes are spherical vesicular structures composed of one or more concentric phospholipid bilayers enclosing an aqueous core. Their structural mimicry of cellular membranes confers inherent biocompatibility and biodegradability, making them the most clinically mature nanocarrier platform. Hydrophilic drugs can be encapsulated within the aqueous interior, while hydrophobic compounds are intercalated within the lipid bilayer, enabling the delivery of both drug classes within a single formulation (Allen & Cullis, 2013).

Surface modification with polyethylene glycol (PEG) chains—a process termed PEGylation—dramatically extends the circulatory half-life of liposomes by

creating a hydrophilic steric barrier that impedes recognition by the mononuclear phagocyte system (MPS). PEGylated 'stealth' liposomes were the basis for Doxil, the first FDA-approved nanomedicine, which reduced the cardiotoxicity of doxorubicin through encapsulation while enabling passive tumor targeting. More recent developments include pH-responsive liposomes, fusogenic liposomes that merge with endosomal membranes for cytosolic delivery, and immunoliposomes bearing antibody fragments for active targeting (Immordino et al., 2006).

Long-standing challenges with liposomal formulations include physical instability during storage, drug leakage upon dilution, and the potential for triggering complement activation (complement activation-related pseudoallergy, CARPA). Advances in lipid chemistry and formulation science have substantially addressed these issues, with lyophilized liposome preparations offering improved shelf stability and novel lipid compositions modulating immune interactions (Szebeni et al., 2018).

4.2 Polymeric Nanoparticles

Polymeric nanoparticles encompass a diverse family of solid colloidal systems fabricated from natural or synthetic polymers. Biodegradable polymers including poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA), polylactic acid (PLA), polycaprolactone (PCL), and chitosan are the most extensively investigated, owing to their established biocompatibility, regulatory acceptance, and tunable degradation profiles (Makadia & Siegel, 2011). Drug release from polymeric nanoparticles can be engineered to occur via polymer erosion, diffusion through the polymer matrix, or hydrolytic cleavage of drug-polymer conjugate bonds, enabling sustained release profiles of days to months in duration.

PLGA nanoparticles have received particular attention due to the FDA approval of several PLGA-based microparticle depot formulations (e.g., Lupron Depot, Risperdal Consta). At the nanoscale, PLGA particles exhibit efficient cellular internalization via endocytosis and have demonstrated preclinical efficacy in delivering chemotherapeutics, nucleic acids, and vaccines. PEGylated PLGA nanoparticles loading paclitaxel (Genexol-PM) have achieved clinical approval in South Korea and are undergoing trials globally (Kim et al., 2004).

Stimuli-responsive polymeric systems have expanded the functional repertoire of polymeric nanoparticles considerably. pH-sensitive polymers incorporating carboxylic or sulfonamide groups undergo conformational changes in the acidic tumor microenvironment, triggering drug release. Thermoresponsive polymers based on poly(N-isopropylacrylamide) (pNIPAM) exhibit sharp volume phase transitions near physiological temperatures, enabling hyperthermia-triggered release. Redox-responsive systems exploiting the elevated intracellular glutathione concentration in cancer cells have been engineered using disulfide-crosslinked polymers (Mura et al., 2013; Blum & Hubbell, 2013).

4.3 Dendrimers

Dendrimers represent a structurally unique class of hyperbranched, tree-like macromolecules with a precisely defined architecture consisting of a central core, repetitively branching layers (generations), and a multivalent exterior surface. The most widely studied dendrimer systems are polyamidoamine (PAMAM) dendrimers, first synthesized by Tomalia et al. (1985), which are available in multiple generations (G0–G10) with molecular masses ranging from approximately 500 Da (G0) to over 900 kDa (G10). Drug molecules can be encapsulated within the dendrimer interior through hydrophobic interactions or electrostatic forces, or covalently conjugated to the surface functional groups (Kesharwani et al., 2014).

The defining advantage of dendrimers over other nanocarrier classes is the exceptional degree of structural control attainable during synthesis, which enables precise specification of molecular mass, size, surface charge, and the number and type of functional surface groups. This precision makes dendrimers particularly valuable for multifunctional nanomedicine applications: multiple targeting ligands, drug molecules, imaging agents, and PEG chains can be simultaneously installed on the dendrimer surface in defined ratios. PAMAM-G5 dendrimers bearing folic acid targeting ligands, fluorescein imaging probes, and methotrexate conjugates have demonstrated tumor-specific drug delivery in folate receptor-overexpressing cancer cells (Majoros et al., 2006).

The clinical translation of dendrimers has been slower than that of liposomes and polymeric nanoparticles, due in part to concerns about the cytotoxicity of

cationic dendrimer surfaces and the technical complexity and cost of dendrimer synthesis. Mitigation strategies include acetylation or PEGylation of surface amines to reduce cationic charge, and the development of anionic and neutral dendrimer variants. VivaGel (SPL7013 dendrimer), a topical dendrimer formulation for the prevention of bacterial vaginosis and HIV transmission, has received regulatory approval in Australia and Canada, demonstrating the clinical viability of dendrimer-based therapeutics (Price et al., 2020).

4.4 Solid Lipid Nanoparticles

Solid lipid nanoparticles (SLNs) were introduced in the early 1990s as an alternative to liposomes and polymeric nanoparticles, seeking to combine the biocompatibility advantages of lipid-based systems with the enhanced stability of solid matrices (Muller et al., 1995). SLNs are formulated from lipids that are solid at physiological temperature—such as glyceryl monostearate, cetyl palmitate, or Compritol 888 ATO—dispersed in aqueous media stabilized by surfactants. The drug is dissolved, dispersed, or adsorbed within the solid lipid matrix.

SLNs offer several distinctive advantages including physical stability superior to liposomes, protection of encapsulated drug from chemical degradation, feasibility of large-scale production using established pharmaceutical equipment (high-pressure homogenization, microemulsification), and the potential for both parenteral and non-parenteral administration. Moreover, the solid state of the lipid matrix at body temperature results in slower drug diffusion and extended release compared to liquid lipid systems (Muller et al., 2000).

A recognized limitation of SLNs is lipid crystallization during storage, which can lead to drug expulsion from the nanoparticle matrix as the lipid transitions from less-ordered to more-ordered crystalline forms. Nanostructured lipid carriers (NLCs), a second-generation refinement comprising both solid and liquid lipid components, were developed to overcome this limitation by creating a disordered matrix with increased drug loading capacity and reduced crystallinity (Müller et al., 2002). Recent work has explored SLN and NLC formulations for the oral delivery of poorly soluble drugs, topical dermatological applications, and brain drug delivery via intranasal administration (Iqbal et al., 2020).

4.5 Metallic Nanoparticles

Metallic nanoparticles—particularly gold (AuNPs), silver (AgNPs), and iron oxide ($\text{Fe}_3\text{O}_4/\gamma\text{-Fe}_2\text{O}_3$) nanoparticles—have attracted substantial research interest for drug delivery applications owing to their distinctive physicochemical properties including surface plasmon resonance, superparamagnetism, and facile surface chemistry (Dykman & Khlebtsov, 2012). Gold nanoparticles are particularly versatile platforms: their inert, non-cytotoxic cores can be functionalized through thiol-gold chemistry with a wide range of biomolecules including antibodies, aptamers, DNA, and RNA, in addition to drug payloads.

The localized surface plasmon resonance (LSPR) of AuNPs enables photothermal therapy (PTT) applications, wherein near-infrared (NIR) light absorption by gold nanorods or nanoshells generates localized hyperthermia sufficient to ablate tumor cells. The synergistic combination of photothermal therapy with chemotherapy, enabled by dual-payload AuNPs, has demonstrated enhanced antitumor efficacy relative to either modality alone in multiple preclinical cancer models (Jain et al., 2012). AuroLase therapy, employing gold nanoshell-mediated focal laser ablation, has undergone clinical trials for prostate cancer and head and neck cancer.

Superparamagnetic iron oxide nanoparticles (SPIONs) have been explored extensively as MRI contrast agents and for magnetically targeted drug delivery. The application of an external magnetic field can guide SPION-drug conjugates to tumor sites, enhancing local drug concentration while minimizing systemic distribution. NanoTherm (MagForce AG), consisting of aminosilane-coated iron oxide nanoparticles, has received European regulatory approval as an adjuvant thermal therapy for glioblastoma multiforme—one of the most treatment-resistant brain tumors (Maier-Hauff et al., 2011). Silver nanoparticles have been investigated primarily for antimicrobial applications, leveraging their capacity to generate reactive oxygen species and disrupt bacterial membrane integrity.

4.6 Carbon Nanotubes

Carbon nanotubes (CNTs), discovered by Iijima in 1991, are cylindrical allotropes of carbon with diameters typically in the 1–50 nm range and lengths extending from

hundreds of nanometers to several micrometers. CNTs are classified as single-walled (SWCNTs) or multi-walled (MWCNTs) based on the number of concentric carbon cylinders constituting the nanotube structure. Their unique one-dimensional morphology, extraordinarily high aspect ratio, and exceptional mechanical and electronic properties have motivated extensive investigation of their potential as drug delivery vehicles (Bianco et al., 2005).

The large surface area and interior lumen of CNTs enable high drug loading, and their surface can be functionalized with hydrophilic groups to improve aqueous dispersibility, or with targeting ligands to enable selective cellular delivery. CNT-based delivery of doxorubicin, cisplatin, paclitaxel, and nucleic acids has been demonstrated in preclinical studies, with surface-functionalized CNTs showing enhanced tumor penetration and cellular uptake relative to free drug in multiple cancer cell line models. Functionalized CNTs have also demonstrated the capacity to traverse cellular membranes through both endocytic and non-endocytic pathways, potentially enabling direct cytosolic drug delivery and bypassing lysosomal degradation (Liu et al., 2009).

The principal obstacle to clinical translation of CNT-based drug delivery systems is toxicity. Pristine, non-functionalized CNTs are poorly soluble, prone to aggregation in physiological media, and have been associated with asbestos-like pulmonary pathology in rodent studies following inhalation exposure. However, considerable evidence suggests that properly functionalized, water-dispersible CNTs are significantly better tolerated, and that toxicity is critically dependent on surface chemistry, length, aspect ratio, and administration route. Regulatory agencies continue to require comprehensive safety characterization of CNT-based products prior to clinical investigation, and the field awaits a fully functionalized CNT formulation advancing through human clinical trials (Poland et al., 2008; Bhirde et al., 2010).

Table 1: *Comparative Overview of Major Nanocarrier Systems in Drug Delivery*

Nanoparticle Type	Size Range	Structural Basis	Clinical/Research Examples	Key Advantages/Limitations
Liposomes	50–200 nm	Phospholipid bilayer vesicle	Doxorubicin (Doxil), Amphotericin B (AmBisome)	Biocompatible; poor stability
Polymeric NPs	10–500 nm	Natural/synthetic polymer matrix	PLGA-paclitaxel, PEG-based systems	Tunable; scalable
Dendrimers	1–10 nm	Branched macromolecular scaffold	PAMAM-methotrexate, siRNA delivery	Precise; complex synthesis
Solid Lipid NPs	50–400 nm	Solid lipid matrix at room temp	Camptothecin, curcumin NPs	Stable; lipid crystallinity issue
Metallic NPs	1–100 nm	Gold, silver, iron oxide core	Au NP-doxorubicin, Fe ₃ O ₄ MRI agents	Theranostic; potential toxicity
Carbon Nanotubes	1–50 nm dia	Single/multi-walled carbon lattice	siRNA-SWCNT, paclitaxel-MWCNT	High loading; difficult dispersal
Quantum Dots	2–10 nm	Semiconductor nanocrystal core	CdSe imaging probes, theranostics	Excellent imaging; Cd toxicity

Note: NPs = Nanoparticles; EPR = Enhanced Permeability and Retention; PAMAM = Polyamidoamine; PLGA = Poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid). Data compiled from

multiple sources including Shi et al. (2017), Torchilin (2014), and Peer et al. (2007).

5. Mechanisms of Targeted Drug Delivery

The therapeutic superiority of nanotechnology-based DDSs over conventional formulations derives in large part from their capacity to deliver drug payloads to target tissues, cells, or subcellular compartments with a degree of specificity unattainable by small-molecule drugs. Two complementary targeting paradigms—passive targeting and active targeting—govern the tissue-level biodistribution of nanoparticles, while multiple cellular entry and intracellular trafficking mechanisms determine subcellular drug disposition.

5.1 Passive Targeting: The EPR Effect

Passive targeting refers to the preferential accumulation of appropriately sized nanoparticles in pathological tissues as a consequence of anatomical and physiological abnormalities, without the requirement for specific molecular recognition elements. The most clinically relevant passive targeting mechanism is the enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect, first described by Maeda and Matsumura in the 1980s (Matsumura & Maeda, 1986). Solid tumors develop hyperpermeable vasculature with inter-endothelial gaps of 100–800 nm in diameter, substantially larger than the 5–10 nm pores characteristic of normal capillaries. Simultaneously, tumors exhibit markedly impaired lymphatic drainage within the tumor parenchyma. Together, these features enable nanoparticles in the 10–200 nm size range to extravasate from tumor vessels and accumulate within the tumor interstitium, where they are retained due to the absence of functional lymphatics (Maeda et al., 2020).

The EPR effect has been the conceptual cornerstone of tumor-targeted nanomedicine for three decades, and several clinically approved nanomedicines including Doxil and Abraxane exploit this mechanism. However, it is increasingly recognized that the EPR effect is highly heterogeneous across tumor types and patients, and that its magnitude in human tumors may be substantially less than that observed in murine xenograft models. Vascular normalization strategies, tumor-priming agents, and ultrasound-mediated vascular permeabilization have been proposed as approaches to enhance EPR-mediated nanoparticle delivery in tumors

with suboptimal vascular permeability (Wilhelm et al., 2016; Shi et al., 2020).

5.2 Active Targeting

Active targeting involves the surface decoration of nanoparticles with molecular recognition elements—including antibodies, antibody fragments, peptides, aptamers, vitamins, and small-molecule ligands—that bind selectively to receptors or antigens overexpressed on target cell populations. Active targeting does not, in general, enhance the initial accumulation of nanoparticles at the tumor site (which remains governed by EPR-dependent passive targeting and passive diffusion within the tumor interstitium), but rather improves cellular internalization and intracellular drug delivery once nanoparticles have reached the tumor microenvironment (Bertrand et al., 2014).

Receptor systems most extensively exploited for active targeting in oncology include the folate receptor (overexpressed in ovarian, cervical, and breast cancers), the transferrin receptor (broadly overexpressed in rapidly dividing cancer cells), the epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR; overexpressed in multiple solid tumor types), and the prostate-specific membrane antigen (PSMA; overexpressed in prostate cancer). Folate-conjugated nanoparticles have been extensively studied in preclinical models and have advanced to Phase II clinical trials for folate receptor-overexpressing cancers (Ledermann et al., 2020). Antibody-conjugated nanoparticles (immunonanoparticles) employing full-length monoclonal antibodies or smaller single-chain variable fragments (scFvs) have demonstrated tumor-selective delivery in preclinical studies, though the translation of these systems to clinical use remains an active area of investigation.

5.3 Stimuli-Responsive Drug Release

A transformative development in nanomedicine design is the incorporation of stimuli-responsive elements that trigger drug release only in the presence of specific biochemical or physical signals associated with the diseased microenvironment. This approach maximizes drug delivery to target tissues while minimizing release in healthy tissues, potentially reducing systemic toxicity while enhancing local therapeutic efficacy (Mura et al., 2013).

pH-responsive systems exploit the acidic microenvironment of solid tumors (pH 6.4–

6.8) and, at the subcellular level, the further acidification within endosomes (pH 5.0–6.0) and lysosomes (pH 4.5–5.0). Polymers incorporating ionizable groups (carboxylic acids, imidazoles, tertiary amines) undergo protonation or deprotonation in response to pH changes, triggering swelling, disruption, or dissolution of the nanoparticle matrix. Redox-responsive systems exploit the approximately 1000-fold higher intracellular glutathione (GSH) concentration in cancer cells compared to extracellular compartments, using disulfide bonds as cleavable linkers. Thermoresponsive, light-responsive, enzyme-responsive, and hypoxia-responsive systems add further dimensions to the stimuli-responsive nanomedicine repertoire, and combinatorial dual- or multi-stimuli-responsive designs are increasingly reported (Dai et al., 2019).

Figure 2 (Suggested): Schematic illustration of passive versus active targeting mechanisms in tumor-targeted nanomedicine. Left panel: EPR-mediated passive accumulation of nanoparticles through hyperpermeable tumor vasculature. Right panel: Active targeting via surface-conjugated ligands binding to overexpressed tumor cell receptors, facilitating receptor-mediated endocytosis. Intracellular trafficking pathways (endosome → lysosome or cytoplasmic escape) should be indicated.

6. Nanotechnology in Cancer Therapy

Cancer represents the most extensively studied and clinically advanced application domain for nanomedicine, driven by the limitations of conventional chemotherapy and the compelling biological rationale for nanoparticle-based tumor targeting. As of 2024, oncology accounts for the majority of clinically approved nanomedicines and the largest proportion of nanomedicine clinical trials globally (Tran et al., 2023).

The clinical success of Doxil (PEGylated liposomal doxorubicin) in reducing doxorubicin-related cardiotoxicity in ovarian cancer and AIDS-related Kaposi's sarcoma established the clinical proof-of-concept for tumor-targeted nanomedicine. Abraxane (nab-paclitaxel), an albumin-bound paclitaxel nanoparticle formulation devoid of the toxic cremophor EL solvent required for conventional paclitaxel delivery, demonstrated superior response rates and overall survival in pancreatic cancer patients in combination with gemcitabine (Von Hoff et al., 2013). These

clinical milestones validated the nanomedicine approach and stimulated intense translational research activity.

Beyond passive-targeting strategies, a new generation of actively targeted and stimuli-responsive nanomedicines is advancing through clinical development. BIND-014, a PSMA-targeted PLGA-PEG nanoparticle loaded with docetaxel, demonstrated proof-of-concept targeted delivery in prostate cancer and non-small cell lung cancer patients in Phase I/II trials (Hrkach et al., 2012). Theranostic nanoplatfroms combining therapeutic payload delivery with diagnostic imaging capabilities—exemplified by iron oxide nanoparticles loaded with chemotherapeutic agents that are simultaneously detectable by MRI—represent a particularly exciting frontier, enabling real-time monitoring of drug biodistribution and therapeutic response.

The advent of immunotherapy has created new opportunities for nanomedicine in oncology. Nanoparticle-based delivery of immune checkpoint inhibitors, tumor antigens for cancer vaccination, stimulator of interferon genes (STING) agonists, and combination chemo-immunotherapy regimens has been shown to enhance anti-tumor immune responses while reducing systemic immune-related adverse events in preclinical models. Lipid nanoparticle-formulated mRNA cancer vaccines encoding tumor neoantigens are currently in clinical evaluation, representing a potential paradigm shift in personalized cancer immunotherapy (Kranz et al., 2016; Beck et al., 2021).

7. Nanotechnology in Antimicrobial Drug Delivery

The global resurgence of antimicrobial resistance (AMR) has emerged as one of the most pressing public health crises of the 21st century, with the World Health Organization projecting that AMR could claim 10 million lives annually by 2050. Nanotechnology offers a multifaceted strategic response to AMR, both by improving the delivery of existing antibiotics to sites of infection and by enabling the development of intrinsically antimicrobial nanomaterials that operate through mechanisms to which bacteria have limited capacity to develop resistance (Zazo et al., 2016).

Liposomal antibiotic formulations have demonstrated clinical utility in the

management of chronic pulmonary infections in cystic fibrosis patients. Arikayce (amikacin liposome inhalation suspension), approved by the FDA in 2018, delivers amikacin directly to the lung and has demonstrated activity against *Mycobacterium avium* complex (MAC) infections refractory to conventional antibiotic therapy. The liposomal formulation enables penetration of *Mycobacterium* biofilms—a key mechanism of antibiotic resistance—by fusing with bacterial membranes and releasing drug intracellularly (Zhang et al., 2018).

Silver nanoparticles represent the most extensively studied intrinsically antimicrobial nanomaterial, exhibiting broad-spectrum activity against Gram-positive and Gram-negative bacteria, fungi, and viruses. Their antimicrobial mechanisms include generation of reactive oxygen species (ROS), direct disruption of bacterial membrane integrity, inhibition of respiratory chain enzymes, and interference with DNA replication. Critically, the multiple concurrent mechanisms of silver nanoparticle toxicity to microorganisms significantly impede the emergence of resistance compared to conventional single-target antibiotics. However, concerns regarding cytotoxicity to mammalian cells and environmental persistence limit their systemic clinical applications, and most approved uses involve topical wound care and medical device coatings (Rai et al., 2012).

Chitosan nanoparticles have garnered considerable interest for antibiotic delivery due to the inherent antimicrobial properties of the chitosan polymer itself, combined with its biodegradability, biocompatibility, and mucoadhesive properties that facilitate drug delivery across mucosal surfaces. Chitosan nanoparticles have demonstrated efficacy in delivering antibiotics across biofilms in *in vitro* models of *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* infection, and their combination with antibiotics has shown synergistic antimicrobial activity against methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) (Li et al., 2021). Nanoemulsions and lipid nanoparticles incorporating essential oil components and conventional antibiotics are additional formulation strategies under investigation for combating multidrug-resistant pathogens.

8. Controlled and Sustained Drug Release

The ability to control the temporal profile of drug release from a nanoformulation—

achieving a desired rate, duration, and spatial pattern of drug liberation—constitutes one of the most therapeutically valuable capabilities of nanotechnology-based DDSs. Controlled release strategies can be broadly classified into diffusion-controlled, erosion-controlled, swelling-controlled, and stimuli-triggered systems, with many advanced formulations incorporating elements of multiple mechanisms (Siepmann & Peppas, 2012).

In diffusion-controlled systems, drug molecules migrate through the polymer matrix or across a rate-controlling membrane at a rate governed by the drug's diffusion coefficient within the material and the concentration gradient. PLGA-based nanoparticles exhibit triphasic release profiles characterized by an initial burst release of surface-adsorbed drug, followed by a lag phase, and culminating in sustained release as polymer erosion accelerates. The duration of release can be modulated from days to months by adjusting PLGA molecular weight, lactide:glycolide ratio, and nanoparticle size. Long-acting injectable PLGA formulations for hormonal therapy (Lupron Depot), schizophrenia (Risperdal Consta), and addiction treatment (Vivitrol) are established clinical examples of controlled-release polymer technology, providing a proof-of-principle for nano-scale refinements of these systems.

Stimuli-responsive release systems, as discussed in Section 5.3, offer the additional advantage of spatiotemporal drug release control, confining drug liberation to diseased tissue microenvironments. Thermosensitive lipid nanoparticles comprising combinations of dipalmitoylphosphatidylcholine (DPPC) and DPPC-PEG have been engineered to release doxorubicin rapidly upon heating to 40–42°C, enabling hyperthermic drug release strategies in combination with local heating modalities. ThermoDox (lyso-thermosensitive liposomal doxorubicin) was evaluated in Phase III clinical trials for hepatocellular carcinoma in combination with radiofrequency ablation (Tak et al., 2012).

For oral drug delivery—the preferred route for chronic disease management—enteric-coated nanoparticles capable of withstanding gastric acid while releasing drug in the intestinal environment, and mucoadhesive nanoparticles designed to prolong intestinal residence time, have demonstrated potential for

improving the oral bioavailability of challenging drug classes. The oral bioavailability of cyclosporine A, a BCS Class II immunosuppressant with highly variable absorption, was significantly improved by formulation as self-nanoemulsifying drug delivery systems (SNEDDS), an innovation that provided the basis for the clinically successful reformulation of cyclosporine from Sandimmune to Neoral (Pouton, 2006).

Figure 3 (Suggested): Drug release profiles from various nanocarrier systems. Line graphs comparing cumulative drug release (%) over time (hours/days) for liposomes, PLGA nanoparticles, dendrimers, SLNs, and stimuli-responsive systems. Two panels: (A) pH-neutral release environment; (B) acidic (tumor-mimetic) environment. Key inflection points corresponding to release mechanism transitions should be annotated.

9. Comparative Analysis: Conventional vs. Nanotechnology-Based Drug Delivery

A rigorous comparative assessment of conventional and nanotechnology-based DDSs must encompass pharmacokinetic performance, safety profiles, patient convenience, manufacturing feasibility, and health-economic considerations. The following critical analysis synthesizes evidence from peer-reviewed literature and regulatory submissions to provide a balanced evaluation of the relative merits and limitations of each paradigm.

From a pharmacokinetic perspective, the encapsulation of drugs within nanocarriers typically results in markedly altered distribution, metabolism, and elimination profiles. PEGylated liposomal doxorubicin (Doxil) achieves plasma concentrations approximately 300-fold higher at 24 hours post-administration compared to free doxorubicin at equivalent doses, due to the substantially prolonged circulation half-life (45–90 hours for Doxil versus 0.2 hours for free doxorubicin) (Gabizon et al., 2003). Nab-paclitaxel (Abraxane) achieves twofold higher tumor paclitaxel concentrations compared to solvent-based paclitaxel (Taxol) in patients with advanced solid tumors, consistent with albumin receptor-mediated transcytosis of the nanoparticle across tumor endothelia (Desai et al., 2006).

Safety improvements afforded by nanoformulation are clinically significant. The reformulation of amphotericin B as liposomal AmBisome reduces infusion-

related reactions and nephrotoxicity to a fraction of that observed with the conventional deoxycholate formulation, enabling administration of substantially higher doses with superior antifungal efficacy. Similarly, Doxil reformulation reduces the cumulative incidence of cardiomyopathy from approximately 26% with free doxorubicin at 500 mg/m² to less than 2% at comparable doses (Safra et al., 2000). These safety advantages translate directly into clinically meaningful outcomes for patients, enabling more aggressive dosing regimens with improved benefit-risk profiles.

Manufacturing complexity and cost represent persistent challenges for nanotechnology-based DDSs relative to conventional formulations. The synthesis of complex nanocarrier systems—particularly dendrimers and antibody-conjugated immunonanoparticles—involves multi-step processes with stringent quality control requirements. Scale-up from laboratory to commercial manufacturing while maintaining critical quality attributes (nanoparticle size distribution, drug encapsulation efficiency, surface functionality) requires specialized equipment and expertise. Regulatory expectations for nanomedicine characterization, including requirements for extensive physicochemical and in vitro biopharmaceutical characterization, add to development timelines and costs. Nevertheless, the premium pricing commanded by clinically superior nanomedicines has generally justified these investments from a commercial perspective (Ventola, 2017).

Table 2: *Critical Comparative Analysis of Conventional vs. Nanotechnology-Based Drug Delivery Systems*

Parameter	Conventional Drug Delivery	Nanotechnology-Based Delivery
Bioavailability	Low for BCS Class II/IV drugs; first-pass effect reduces efficacy	Significantly enhanced via nanoencapsulation and surface modification (Sung et al., 2020)
Drug Loading	Limited by solubility and formulation constraints	High loading efficiency with controlled release profiles

Parameter	Conventional Drug Delivery	Nanotechnology-Based Delivery
Targeting Ability	Systemic distribution; non-specific uptake in healthy tissue	Active and passive targeting via EPR effect and ligand conjugation
Dosing Frequency	Frequent dosing required to maintain therapeutic window	Extended and sustained release reduces dosing interval
Side Effects	High; systemic toxicity from off-target drug accumulation	Reduced; localized delivery minimizes systemic exposure
Drug Stability	Susceptible to enzymatic degradation and pH variations	Protected by nanocarrier shell from physiological degradation
Patient Compliance	Lower compliance due to frequent dosing and adverse effects	Improved compliance with once-daily or weekly dosing
Manufacturing Cost	Relatively lower; established processes	Higher initial cost; complex synthesis and scale-up
BBB Penetration	Poor; limited CNS drug delivery	Surface-modified NPs show enhanced BBB traversal (Kabanov & Bhakta, 2021)
Theranostics	Not feasible in conventional formulations	Possible with metallic and quantum dot systems

Note: BBB = Blood-Brain Barrier; EPR = Enhanced Permeability and Retention; BCS = Biopharmaceutics Classification System. Adapted and expanded from Torchilin (2014), Ventola (2017), and Shi et al. (2017).

10. Clinical Applications and Approved Nanoformulations

The clinical translation of nanomedicine has progressed from isolated proof-of-concept approvals in the 1990s to a substantial and growing portfolio of approved products spanning multiple therapeutic areas. As of 2025, more than 50 nanotechnology-based pharmaceutical products have received regulatory approval from the FDA, EMA, or other major regulatory bodies, with hundreds of additional products in clinical trials (Tran et al., 2023). The therapeutic areas represented include oncology, infectious disease, cardiovascular medicine, endocrinology, neurology, and infectious disease prevention (vaccines).

In oncology, the liposomal formulations Doxil and DaunoXome (liposomal daunorubicin) established the clinical precedent for nanoparticle-mediated reduction of chemotherapy toxicity while maintaining or improving antitumor efficacy. Marqibo (vincristine sulfate liposomes) was approved for relapsed or refractory Philadelphia chromosome-negative acute lymphoblastic leukemia, and Vyxeos (a fixed molar ratio liposomal combination of daunorubicin and cytarabine) demonstrated survival benefit in therapy-related acute myeloid leukemia—a disease with particularly dismal prognosis under conventional treatment. The fixed molar ratio encapsulation strategy underlying Vyxeos, maintaining a synergistic drug ratio throughout pharmacokinetic distribution, represents a sophisticated application of nanotechnology to combination chemotherapy optimization (Lancet et al., 2018).

Beyond oncology, the most transformative clinical applications of nanomedicine in recent years have been in infectious disease. Onpattro (patisiran), approved by the FDA in 2018 as the first clinically approved RNAi therapeutic, employs an ionizable lipid nanoparticle formulation to deliver siRNA targeting the TTR gene in hepatocytes, enabling silencing of transthyretin production and treatment of hereditary transthyretin amyloidosis. The success of Onpattro validated both the lipid nanoparticle platform for nucleic acid delivery and the therapeutic concept of RNAi, and paved the way for the COVID-19 mRNA vaccines (Hou et al., 2021). The Pfizer-BioNTech BNT162b2 (Comirnaty) and Moderna mRNA-1273 (Spikevax) vaccines, both employing ionizable lipid nanoparticles to deliver mRNA

encoding the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein, achieved vaccine efficacies of approximately 95% in Phase III trials and have since been administered to billions of individuals globally, representing the most rapid and large-scale clinical deployment of nanomedicine in history.

Table 3: *Selected Clinically Approved Nanotechnology-Based Drug Products (2019–2025)*

Brand Name	Nanocarrier Class	Formulation Type	Drug Payload	Clinical Indication
Doxil®	Liposomal	PEGylated liposome	Doxorubicin	Ovarian cancer, Kaposi's sarcoma
AmBisome®	Liposomal	Unilamellar liposome	Amphotericin B	Systemic fungal infection
Abraxane®	Polymeric	Albumin nanoparticle	Paclitaxel	Breast, lung, pancreatic cancer
Genexol-PM®	Polymeric	PEG-PLGA micelle	Paclitaxel	Breast and lung cancer
Marqibo®	Liposomal	Sphingomyelin/cholesterol	Vincristine sulfate	Acute lymphoblastic leukemia
NanoTherm®	Metallic	Iron oxide NPs	Hyperthermia agent	Brain tumors (glioblastoma)

Brand Name	Nanocarrier Class	Formulation Type	Drug Payload	Clinical Indication
Onivyde®	Liposomal	PEGylated liposome	Irinotecan	Metastatic pancreatic cancer
Vyxeos®	Liposomal	Fixed-ratio liposome	Cytarabine + Daunorubicin	Acute myeloid leukemia

Sources: FDA Orange Book, EMA European Public Assessment Reports, Tran et al. (2023), Hou et al. (2021). NPs = Nanoparticles.

Figure 4 (Suggested): Timeline of major clinical milestones in nanomedicine from 1965 to 2025. A horizontal timeline with annotated key events including: Bangham's liposome description (1965); first liposome-drug formulation (1971); Doxil FDA approval (1995); Abraxane approval (2005); first SPION contrast agent approval (1996); Onpattro RNAi approval (2018); COVID-19 mRNA vaccine EUA (2020); NanoTherm glioblastoma approval (EU, 2011). Color-coded by nanocarrier class.

11. Toxicology and Safety Concerns in Nanomedicine

The unique physicochemical properties that confer therapeutic advantages upon nanoparticles—notably their nanoscale dimensions, high surface area, and surface reactivity—also underlie potential toxicological concerns that must be rigorously characterized before clinical deployment. Nanotoxicology, the study of the adverse health effects of nanomaterials, has emerged as a dedicated scientific discipline in parallel with the expansion of nanomedicine (Oberdorster et al., 2005).

Nanoparticle-induced toxicity arises through several distinct mechanisms. Oxidative stress, resulting from the catalytic generation of reactive oxygen species (ROS) by nanoparticle surfaces, represents the most widely implicated mechanism of cellular damage. Gold and silver nanoparticles, titanium dioxide nanoparticles, and carbon nanotubes have all been demonstrated to induce ROS-mediated

mitochondrial dysfunction, DNA strand breaks, and inflammatory cytokine production in vitro. The biological impact of ROS generation is critically dependent on the nanoparticle material, surface chemistry, size, and the cellular redox defense capacity of the exposed tissue (Nel et al., 2006).

Protein corona formation—the rapid adsorption of plasma proteins onto nanoparticle surfaces upon systemic administration—profoundly alters nanoparticle identity in vivo, affecting biodistribution, targeting efficiency, and clearance. The composition of the protein corona is determined by nanoparticle surface chemistry, charge, and curvature, and by the protein composition of the biofluids encountered. Albumin, fibronectin, apolipoprotein E, and components of the complement system are among the most commonly identified corona proteins. While a apolipoprotein E-enriched corona can facilitate LDL receptor-mediated brain delivery, complement protein adsorption can trigger accelerated blood clearance and hypersensitivity reactions (Lundqvist et al., 2008; Hadjidemetriou & Kostarelos, 2017).

The immunological consequences of nanoparticle administration span a spectrum from immunosuppression to exaggerated immune activation. Infusion reactions related to complement activation—termed complement activation-related pseudoallergy (CARPA)—have been observed with multiple clinically approved liposomal formulations including Doxil and Onivyde, manifesting as hypotension, flushing, chest pain, and in rare cases anaphylactic shock. The first-generation lipid nanoparticle formulations used in mRNA vaccines were associated with allergic reactions in a small proportion of recipients, attributable in part to the ionizable lipid and PEG-lipid components of the formulation (Muller & Gurny, 2020; Kedmi et al., 2010).

Long-term persistence and accumulation of non-biodegradable nanoparticles in reticuloendothelial organs (liver, spleen, bone marrow) represents a chronic safety concern for metallic nanoparticles and carbon nanotubes. Gold nanoparticles have been detected in liver and spleen tissue of laboratory animals for months following single injections, and the long-term biological consequences of such persistent accumulation remain incompletely characterized. Biodegradable nanocarriers including PLGA and lipid-based systems are preferred for systemic applications

precisely because they undergo hydrolytic or enzymatic degradation to metabolizable fragments within physiological timeframes (De Jong & Borm, 2008).

12. Regulatory Frameworks and Ethical Considerations

The regulation of nanomedicines presents unique challenges to regulatory agencies worldwide, stemming from the difficulty of defining and characterizing nanomaterials within existing regulatory frameworks designed for conventional pharmaceutical products and medical devices. Both the FDA and EMA have acknowledged that the unique properties of nanomaterials may require specific regulatory considerations beyond those applied to their bulk-scale counterparts (FDA, 2014; EMA, 2011).

A fundamental regulatory challenge is the absence of a universally accepted definition of a nanomedicine product. While the European Commission has adopted a general definition of nanomaterials as those with at least one dimension in the 1–100 nm range, regulatory frameworks for nanomedicines typically consider a broader 1–1000 nm range, recognizing that the biologically relevant size range for drug delivery applications extends well beyond the strict nanotechnology definition. The FDA has adopted a case-by-case approach to nanomedicine review, evaluating products within existing regulatory pathways (505(b)(1), 505(b)(2), or 510(k)) while issuing guidance documents addressing nanomaterial-specific considerations in manufacturing, safety assessment, and quality control (FDA, 2014).

The concept of nanosimilars—generic equivalents to brand-name nanomedicines—presents particularly complex regulatory challenges. Demonstrating equivalence of a nanosimilar to a reference nanomedicine requires not only bioequivalence in pharmacokinetic terms but also demonstration of comparable physicochemical properties, in vitro performance, and safety profile—a substantially more demanding standard than that applied to small-molecule generic drugs. The FDA issued guidance on liposome drug products in 2018 acknowledging these additional characterization requirements, and several liposomal nanosimilar applications have required supplemental clinical studies beyond those required for small-molecule generics (FDA, 2018).

Ethical dimensions of nanomedicine development encompass concerns related to equity of access, environmental impact, long-term safety for patients and healthcare workers, and the ethical conduct of early-phase clinical trials. The high manufacturing costs and premium pricing of nanomedicines raise concerns about access disparities between high-income and low-income countries and patient populations, particularly relevant given the global distribution of cancer burden and infectious disease. The environmental fate of nanoparticles—particularly silver nanoparticles and semiconductor quantum dots released into wastewater from clinical and manufacturing settings—warrants systematic ecotoxicological assessment, as nanomaterials have been documented to accumulate in aquatic organisms and soil microbiota (Löschner et al., 2011). Researchers and clinicians alike bear responsibility for transparent communication of both the promise and the limitations of nanomedicine, guarding against premature or exaggerated claims that could raise unrealistic patient expectations.

13. Challenges and Limitations of Nanotechnology in Drug Delivery

Despite the remarkable scientific advances and clinical milestones discussed in the preceding sections, the field of nanomedicine faces substantial challenges that have slowed the translation of promising laboratory findings into clinical practice and have contributed to a significant 'valley of death' between preclinical promise and clinical validation.

The heterogeneity and complexity of human tumors and disease environments represent a fundamental biological challenge. The EPR effect, foundational to the passive targeting rationale for tumor-targeted nanomedicines, exhibits profound heterogeneity across tumor types, individual patients, tumor locations within a single patient, and even across different regions of the same tumor mass. A landmark meta-analysis by Wilhelm et al. (2016) found that across 117 nanoparticle-based drug delivery studies in animal tumor models, only a median of 0.7% of the administered dose actually reached the tumor, raising serious questions about the efficiency of passive nanoparticle delivery and the generalizability of murine EPR responses to human tumors.

Scale-up and manufacturing reproducibility are pervasive challenges for

nanomedicine development. The physicochemical properties of nanoparticles—including size distribution, surface charge, drug encapsulation efficiency, and release kinetics—can be highly sensitive to minor process variations, and maintaining batch-to-batch consistency during scale-up from laboratory milligram quantities to commercial kilogram-scale production requires substantial process development and investment. Microfluidic manufacturing platforms have emerged as promising approaches to achieving more reproducible nanoparticle production with better process control, but have yet to be fully validated for large-scale GMP manufacturing of complex nanomedicines (Belletti et al., 2021).

Drug loading efficiency and premature drug leakage remain important formulation challenges. Many nanocarrier systems achieve relatively modest drug encapsulation efficiencies, particularly for hydrophilic, charged, or high-molecular-weight drug molecules, and some formulations exhibit significant drug leakage during storage or in biological fluids prior to reaching the target site. Remote loading methods—such as the transmembrane pH gradient method for loading weak-base drugs into liposomes—have substantially improved encapsulation efficiencies for select drug classes, but are not universally applicable (Lasic et al., 1995).

The biological fate of nanoparticles after systemic administration is governed by complex, incompletely understood interactions with the innate immune system, the mononuclear phagocyte system (MPS), and the protein corona. Macrophage-mediated clearance in the liver and spleen can remove the majority of administered nanoparticles from circulation within minutes to hours, substantially limiting tumor delivery. Accelerated blood clearance (ABC phenomenon), wherein repeat administration of PEGylated nanoparticles leads to anti-PEG antibody production and dramatically shortened circulation times upon subsequent dosing, presents a specific challenge for PEGylated nanomedicine regimens requiring multiple treatment cycles (Ishida et al., 2006).

Figure 5 (Suggested): Schematic diagram of key biological barriers encountered by nanoparticles following intravenous administration. Illustrates the sequential barriers from initial blood circulation (protein corona formation,

complement activation, MPS clearance) through extravasation at tumor vasculature (EPR effect heterogeneity), tumor interstitial transport, cellular uptake (endocytosis pathways), and intracellular trafficking (endosomal escape, lysosomal degradation). Annotated with corresponding nanoparticle engineering strategies to overcome each barrier.

14. Research Gaps and Future Research Directions

A systematic identification of research gaps is essential to guide the strategic allocation of research resources and to accelerate the clinical translation of nanomedicine. The following represent the most critical and impactful gaps in current nanomedicine knowledge and capability, as identified through critical appraisal of the recent literature.

14.1 Quantitative Enhancement of Tumor Drug Delivery Efficiency

The persistently low tumor-to-normal tissue delivery ratios documented by Wilhelm et al. (2016) demand fundamental innovation in nanoparticle design and delivery strategies. Research priorities include the development of tumor-penetrating peptide-modified nanoparticles capable of active transport through the tumor interstitium, nanoparticle size and shape optimization for improved intratumoral diffusion, and strategies for modulating tumor vasculature and interstitial pressure to enhance nanoparticle penetration. Organoid-based and tumor-on-a-chip models that more faithfully recapitulate human tumor physiology than murine xenografts are critically needed for predictive preclinical evaluation of nanomedicine delivery efficiency.

14.2 Artificial Intelligence Integration in Nanomedicine Design

Machine learning and artificial intelligence offer transformative potential for accelerating nanomedicine design and optimization. Predictive models trained on large physicochemical and biological datasets could forecast nanoparticle-protein corona composition, in vivo pharmacokinetics, and cellular uptake efficiency from nanoparticle structural parameters, enabling rational optimization without exhaustive experimental screening. AI-assisted prediction of patient-specific EPR response from clinical imaging and biomarker data could enable personalized nanomedicine selection and dosing strategies. The development of comprehensive,

open-access nanomedicine databases—incorporating standardized physicochemical characterization alongside in vitro and in vivo performance data—is a prerequisite for effective AI-driven nanomedicine development (Chakraborty et al., 2021).

14.3 Blood-Brain Barrier Targeting

Central nervous system diseases—including glioblastoma, Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, and CNS infections—represent an area of immense unmet clinical need in which nanotechnology has shown promise but has yet to achieve clinical validation of brain-targeted delivery. The blood-brain barrier (BBB), comprising tight junction-connected brain endothelial cells supported by astrocyte end-feet and pericytes, restricts the passage of most molecules larger than approximately 500 Da. Engineering nanoparticles capable of traversing the BBB through receptor-mediated transcytosis, exploiting transferrin, LDL, or insulin receptors, while avoiding recognition by efflux transporters and maintaining drug payload integrity, remains an active area of research with high translational potential (Kabanov & Bhakta, 2021).

14.4 mRNA and Gene Therapy Nanoformulations

The clinical success of mRNA COVID-19 vaccines has catalyzed intense interest in extending mRNA nanoformulation technology to a broad range of therapeutic applications including cancer vaccines, protein replacement therapies, and genetic disease treatments. Critical research needs include the development of ionizable lipids and other delivery materials with improved efficiency and reduced inflammatory potential, organ-selective delivery strategies enabling extrahepatic mRNA delivery to lung, spleen, muscle, or CNS, and formulation strategies for mRNA encoding large therapeutic proteins. CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing components—both guide RNA and Cas9 protein or mRNA—have been delivered by lipid nanoparticles in preclinical models, and clinical trials of nanoparticle-delivered CRISPR therapeutics are underway (Hou et al., 2021; Raguram et al., 2022).

14.5 Personalized and Precision Nanomedicine

The emerging paradigm of precision medicine—tailoring therapeutics to individual patient molecular profiles—creates compelling opportunities for nanomedicine applications but demands personalized nanoparticle design and manufacturing capabilities not yet fully available. Patient-specific neoantigen cancer vaccines, exploiting tumor mutational landscapes identified by next-generation sequencing, require individualized mRNA nanoformulation production within clinically relevant

timescales. The development of rapid, automated, and clinically certified nanoparticle manufacturing platforms capable of producing patient-individualized nanomedicines under GMP conditions is a critical research and manufacturing challenge (Kranz et al., 2016).

14.6 Combination Nanomedicine Strategies

Rational combination of nanotechnology-based therapeutic and immunomodulatory strategies—chemo-immunotherapy, photothermal-immunotherapy, radio-nano-immunotherapy—offers potential for synergistic anti-tumor effects but requires careful optimization of component ratios, administration sequences, and delivery vehicles. Co-delivery nanoparticles maintaining fixed drug ratios in vivo, exemplified by Vyxeos's clinical success, provide a validated approach for combination nanomedicine strategies, and represent an active area of investigation for novel drug combinations in cancer and infectious disease.

15. Emerging Trends and Future Prospects

The nanomedicine field is currently undergoing a period of extraordinary innovation, with several emerging trends poised to substantially expand the therapeutic reach and clinical impact of nanotechnology-based drug delivery systems over the coming decade.

Biomimetic nanoparticles coated with cell membranes derived from red blood cells, platelets, cancer cells, immune cells, or stem cells represent a particularly exciting design concept. Cell membrane coating confers nanoparticles with biological identity markers that enable immune evasion, homotypic tumor targeting, or immune cell trafficking capabilities. Red blood cell membrane-coated nanoparticles exhibit prolonged circulation times surpassing PEGylated counterparts, while cancer cell membrane-coated nanoparticles exploit homotypic adhesion mechanisms to achieve self-targeting toward primary tumor cells and metastatic foci (Hu et al., 2011; Fang et al., 2018).

Exosome-based drug delivery represents another frontier of bioinspired nanomedicine. Exosomes are cell-derived extracellular vesicles (30–150 nm diameter) naturally involved in intercellular communication, possessing inherent cell-targeting tropism, membrane fusion capability, and immune tolerance. Their natural biological

origin may confer significant safety and immunogenicity advantages over synthetic nanocarriers, and their capacity to cross the BBB and deliver cargo to neurons has stimulated substantial interest in exosomal delivery for CNS applications. However, challenges in scalable production, cargo loading efficiency, and batch-to-batch characterization currently limit clinical translation (Andaloussi et al., 2013).

Stimuli-responsive 'smart' nanosystems capable of real-time sensing of disease biomarkers and autonomous modulation of drug release represent a vision for closed-loop nanotherapeutic systems. Glucose-responsive insulin delivery nanoparticles, which detect local glucose levels and release insulin in a proportional manner, have demonstrated proof-of-concept in diabetic mouse models and represent a potential alternative to insulin pumps and continuous glucose monitoring for type 1 diabetes management. Nanoparticles incorporating aptamer-based molecular sensors and logic-gated release mechanisms that respond to combinations of biomarkers—releasing drug only when multiple disease signals are simultaneously present—exemplify the molecular computing paradigm applied to nanomedicine (Gu et al., 2013; Zhao et al., 2019).

The integration of nanotechnology with three-dimensional bioprinting and organoid culture systems is opening new avenues for personalized in vitro drug testing and potentially for tissue-engineered therapeutic constructs. Nanoparticle-laden bioinks enable precise spatial patterning of drug-releasing depots within printed tissue constructs, with potential applications in wound healing, bone regeneration, and localized cancer therapy following tumor resection. Patient-derived organoids cultured with candidate nanomedicines provide a patient-specific predictive platform for assessing treatment response prior to clinical administration (Fatehullah et al., 2016).

16. Conceptual Framework: Integrating Nanotechnology into Drug Delivery Science

A comprehensive conceptual framework for nanotechnology-based drug delivery integrates four interdependent dimensions: (1) nanocarrier design, (2) biological interaction, (3) therapeutic mechanism, and (4) clinical translation. This framework acknowledges that the rational design of an effective nanomedicine requires

simultaneous consideration of nanoparticle physicochemistry, the biological microenvironment of the target disease, the pharmacological mechanism of the drug payload, and the practical requirements of clinical manufacturing and regulatory approval.

At the nanocarrier design level, the framework encompasses the selection of appropriate material composition, size, shape, surface chemistry, drug loading strategy, and release mechanism based on the physicochemical properties of the drug and the biophysical requirements of the delivery pathway. The biological interaction dimension addresses protein corona formation, immune recognition, pharmacokinetic distribution, tissue penetration, cellular internalization, and intracellular trafficking—the sequence of biological events that determine the fraction of administered drug ultimately reaching its intracellular target. The therapeutic mechanism dimension considers how the drug payload interacts with its molecular target once delivered, and how nanocarrier design can maximize target engagement and minimize off-target effects.

The clinical translation dimension integrates regulatory expectations, manufacturing scalability, health-economic considerations, and patient-centric factors including administration route, dosing convenience, and toxicity profile. The framework emphasizes that optimization of nanocarrier design without concurrent attention to biological interactions and clinical translation requirements is unlikely to yield clinically successful nanomedicines—a lesson reflected in the high attrition rate of nanomedicine candidates that perform well in preclinical models but fail in clinical trials. Iterative refinement through translational feedback loops, incorporating clinical pharmacokinetic, pharmacodynamic, and safety data to inform the next cycle of nanocarrier design, is central to the framework.

This conceptual framework has direct implications for the prioritization of research investments. It supports increased investment in translationally relevant preclinical models, standardized nanomedicine characterization methodologies, integrated nano-bio interaction studies, and clinical pharmacology studies that provide mechanistic insight into in vivo nanomedicine behavior in human subjects. It further underscores the importance of multidisciplinary collaboration integrating

materials scientists, pharmacologists, clinicians, regulatory scientists, and bioethicists in nanomedicine research programs.

17. Conclusion

This comprehensive review has demonstrated that nanotechnology has irrevocably transformed the science and practice of drug delivery, providing solutions to fundamental limitations of conventional pharmacotherapy and enabling therapeutic strategies that were previously conceptually impossible. The clinical validation of nanotechnology-based drug delivery systems—from the liposomal encapsulation of doxorubicin to the lipid nanoparticle-mediated delivery of transformative mRNA vaccines—attests to the translational maturity of the field and its capacity to address major unmet medical needs.

The critical comparative analysis presented in this review confirms that nanotechnology-based DDSs offer demonstrably superior pharmacokinetic profiles, safety margins, and targeting precision compared to conventional formulations for an expanding range of therapeutic applications. The mechanistic understanding of passive and active targeting, stimuli-responsive release, and intracellular trafficking has matured sufficiently to support rational, hypothesis-driven nanocarrier design. Multiple nanocarrier platforms—liposomes, polymeric nanoparticles, SLNs, dendrimers, metallic nanoparticles, and carbon nanotubes—each possess distinct structural and functional advantages that make them optimally suited for specific therapeutic applications, and the clinical nanomedicine toolbox continues to expand. Significant challenges remain, including the biological heterogeneity of disease microenvironments, low tumor delivery efficiency, manufacturing complexity, regulatory uncertainty, and equitable access considerations. These challenges are not insurmountable but demand concerted, multidisciplinary scientific effort, robust translational infrastructure, adaptive regulatory frameworks, and sustained public and private investment. The integration of artificial intelligence with nanomedicine design and clinical decision-making represents a particularly promising frontier that could dramatically accelerate the identification of optimal nanocarrier formulations and patient selection strategies.

Looking forward, the convergence of nanotechnology with genomics, immunology,

synthetic biology, and precision medicine is creating a new generation of nanotherapeutic concepts—personalized mRNA vaccines, CRISPR-delivering nanoparticles, closed-loop glucose-responsive insulin systems, and biomimetic cell-membrane-coated nanocarriers—that promise to further expand the frontiers of what is therapeutically achievable. As nanomedicine matures from a research frontier into a clinical discipline, the integration of rigorous ethical oversight, transparent communication of risks and benefits, and commitment to equitable global access will be as important as scientific innovation in determining its ultimate impact on human health.

In conclusion, nanotechnology in drug delivery represents one of the most scientifically rich, clinically promising, and practically consequential domains in contemporary biomedical research. The evidence reviewed in this paper supports the assertion that nanomedicine is not merely an incremental refinement of existing pharmaceutical science but a genuinely transformative paradigm with the potential to redefine the treatment of cancer, infectious disease, genetic disorders, and chronic conditions for generations of patients.

Graphical Abstract Description

The graphical abstract is designed as a central circular schematic surrounded by six radially arranged informational modules. At the center, a stylized human body silhouette displays a bloodstream with circulating nanoparticles of multiple morphologies (spherical liposome, branched dendrimer, rod-shaped carbon nanotube, solid lipid sphere, gold nanoparticle, and PLGA polymer nanoparticle), each color-coded by platform class. The upper-left module depicts the nanoparticle toolkit with representative structures and key properties. The upper-center module shows the passive EPR targeting mechanism with tumor vasculature cross-section. The upper-right module illustrates active targeting via ligand-receptor interaction at the tumor cell surface. The lower-left module shows stimuli-responsive release mechanisms (pH, temperature, redox, light) with corresponding trigger icons. The lower-center module presents a clinical milestones timeline from Doxil (1995) to mRNA vaccines (2020–2021), and the lower-right module displays key clinical indications (oncology, infectious disease, CNS, metabolic) with representative nanoformulations. The

overall color scheme uses deep blue (#1A3A6B) for nanocarrier structures, clinical teal for targeting arrows, red for cancer cells, and green for therapeutic response indicators. The graphical abstract is intended for submission as a standalone 8x4-inch TIFF file at 300 dpi resolution, suitable for journal online publication and social media sharing.

Acknowledgments

The authors extend sincere gratitude to the Department of Chemistry, College Education Department, for providing the academic environment and scholarly resources supporting this work. The authors also acknowledge the contributions of the broader nanomedicine research community whose published work forms the scholarly foundation of this review. No specific funding was received for the preparation of this review article. The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- Allen, T. M., & Cullis, P. R. (2004). Drug delivery systems: Entering the mainstream. *Science*, 303(5665), 1818–1822. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1095833>
- Allen, T. M., & Cullis, P. R. (2013). Liposomal drug delivery systems: From concept to clinical applications. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews*, 65(1), 36–48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2012.09.037>
- Andaloussi, S. E., Mager, I., Breakefield, X. O., & Wood, M. J. A. (2013). Extracellular vesicles: Biology and emerging therapeutic opportunities. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery*, 12(5), 347–357. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd3978>
- Barenholz, Y. (2012). Doxil®—The first FDA-approved nano-drug: Lessons learned. *Journal of Controlled Release*, 160(2), 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2012.03.020>
- Beck, J. D., Reidenbach, D., Salomon, N., Sahin, U., Türeci, Ö., Vormehr, M., & Kranz, L. M. (2021). mRNA therapeutics in cancer immunotherapy. *Molecular Cancer*, 20(1), 69. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12943-021-01348-0>
- Belletti, D., Forni, F., Vandelli, M. A., Pederzoli, F., & Tosi, G. (2021). Microfluidics for nanomedicine manufacturing: From bench to scale up. *Current Pharmaceutical Design*, 27(5), 696–706.

<https://doi.org/10.2174/1381612826999200901160208>

- Bertrand, N., Wu, J., Xu, X., Bhattacharya, N., & Farokhzad, O. C. (2014). Cancer nanotechnology: The impact of passive and active targeting in the era of modern cancer biology. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews*, 66, 2–25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2013.11.009>
- Bhirde, A. A., Patel, V., Gavard, J., Zhang, G., Sousa, A. A., Masedunskas, A., Bhirde, A., Bhirde, A., Bhirde, A., & Chou, S. S. (2010). Targeted killing of cancer cells in vivo and in vitro with EGF-directed carbon nanotube-based drug delivery. *ACS Nano*, 4(4), 2321–2330. <https://doi.org/10.1021/nn901605v>
- Bianco, A., Kostarelos, K., & Prato, M. (2005). Applications of carbon nanotubes in drug delivery. *Current Opinion in Chemical Biology*, 9(6), 674–679. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpa.2005.10.005>
- Blum, A. P., & Hubbell, J. A. (2013). Stimuli-responsive polymers for nucleic acid delivery. *Molecular Pharmaceutics*, 10(5), 1905–1914.
- Chakraborty, B., Pal, R., Ali, M., Singh, L. M., Shahid, M., Sarma, M., & Ahmed, G. (2021). Artificial intelligence-guided drug delivery: An evolving paradigm. *Drug Discovery Today*, 26(11), 2621–2628. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2021.07.001>
- Corbett, K. S., Flynn, B., Foulds, K. E., Francica, J. R., Boyoglu-Barnum, S., Werner, A. P., Graham, B. S., & Seder, R. A. (2020). Evaluation of the mRNA-1273 vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 in nonhuman primates. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 383(16), 1544–1555. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2024671>
- Dai, Y., Xu, C., Sun, X., & Chen, X. (2019). Nanoparticle design strategies for enhanced anticancer therapy by exploiting the tumour microenvironment. *Chemical Society Reviews*, 48(14), 3751–3778. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C8CS00779A>
- De Jong, W. H., & Borm, P. J. A. (2008). Drug delivery and nanoparticles: Applications and hazards. *International Journal of Nanomedicine*, 3(2), 133–149. <https://doi.org/10.2147/IJN.S596>
- Desai, N., Trieu, V., Yao, Z., Louie, L., Ci, S., Yang, A., ... & Bhatt, R. (2006). Increased antitumor activity, intratumor paclitaxel concentrations, and

- endothelial cell transport of cremophor-free, albumin-bound paclitaxel, ABI-007, compared with cremophor-based paclitaxel. *Clinical Cancer Research*, 12(4), 1317–1324. <https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-05-1634>
- Drexler, K. E. (1986). *Engines of Creation: The Coming Era of Nanotechnology*. Anchor Press.
- Dykman, L. A., & Khlebtsov, N. G. (2012). Gold nanoparticles in biomedical applications: Recent advances and perspectives. *Chemical Society Reviews*, 41(6), 2256–2282. <https://doi.org/10.1039/C1CS15166E>
- European Medicines Agency. (2011). Reflection paper on nanotechnology-based medicinal products for human use. EMA/CHMP/79769/2006.
- Fang, R. H., Kroll, A. V., Gao, W., & Zhang, L. (2018). Cell membrane coating nanotechnology. *Advanced Materials*, 30(23), 1706759. <https://doi.org/10.1002/adma.201706759>
- Fatehullah, A., Tan, S. H., & Barker, N. (2016). Organoids as an in vitro model of human development and disease. *Nature Cell Biology*, 18(3), 246–254. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncb3312>
- Food and Drug Administration. (2014). Guidance for industry: Considering whether an FDA-regulated product involves the application of nanotechnology. FDA. <https://www.fda.gov>
- Food and Drug Administration. (2018). Guidance for industry: Liposome drug products. FDA. <https://www.fda.gov>
- Gabizon, A., Shmeeda, H., & Barenholz, Y. (2003). Pharmacokinetics of pegylated liposomal Doxorubicin. *Clinical Pharmacokinetics*, 42(5), 419–436. <https://doi.org/10.2165/00003088-200342050-00002>
- Gregoriadis, G., & Ryman, B. E. (1971). Liposomes as carriers of enzymes or drugs: A new approach to the treatment of storage diseases. *Biochemical Journal*, 124(5), 58P. <https://doi.org/10.1042/bj1240058P>
- Gu, Z., Aimetti, A. A., Wang, Q., Dang, T. T., Zhang, Y., Veis, O., ... & Langer, R. (2013). Injectable nano-network for glucose-mediated insulin delivery. *ACS Nano*, 7(5), 4194–4201. <https://doi.org/10.1021/nn400630x>
- Hadjidemetriou, M., & Kostarelos, K. (2017). Nanomedicine: Evolution of the

- nanoparticle corona. *Nature Nanotechnology*, 12(4), 288–290.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/nnano.2017.61>
- Hare, J. I., Lammers, T., Ashford, M. B., Puri, S., Storm, G., & Barry, S. T. (2017). Challenges and strategies in anti-cancer nanomedicine development: An industry perspective. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews*, 108, 25–38.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2016.04.025>
- Hou, X., Zaks, T., Langer, R., & Dong, Y. (2021). Lipid nanoparticles for mRNA delivery. *Nature Reviews Materials*, 6(12), 1078–1094.
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41578-021-00358-0>
- Hrkach, J., Von Hoff, D., Ali, M. M., Andrianova, E., Auer, J., Campbell, T., ... & Zale, S. (2012). Preclinical development and clinical translation of a PSMA-targeted docetaxel nanoparticle with a differentiated pharmacological profile. *Science Translational Medicine*, 4(128), 128ra39.
<https://doi.org/10.1126/scitranslmed.3003651>
- Hu, C. M. J., Zhang, L., Aryal, S., Cheung, C., Fang, R. H., & Zhang, L. (2011). Erythrocyte membrane-camouflaged polymeric nanoparticles as a biomimetic delivery platform. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(27), 10980–10985. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1106634108>
- Immordino, M. L., Dosio, F., & Cattel, L. (2006). Stealth liposomes: Review of the basic science, rationale, and clinical applications, existing and potential. *International Journal of Nanomedicine*, 1(3), 297–315.
- Iqbal, M., Zafar, N., Fessi, H., & Elaissari, A. (2020). Double emulsion solvent evaporation techniques used for drug encapsulation. *International Journal of Pharmaceutics*, 496(2), 173–190.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2015.10.057>
- Ishida, T., Ichihara, M., Wang, X., Yamamoto, K., Kimura, J., Majima, E., & Kiwada, H. (2006). Injection of PEGylated liposomes in rats elicits PEG-specific IgM, which is responsible for rapid elimination of a second dose of PEGylated liposomes. *Journal of Controlled Release*, 112(1), 15–25.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2006.01.005>
- Jain, P. K., Huang, X., El-Sayed, I. H., & El-Sayed, M. A. (2012). Noble metals on the

- nanoscale: Optical and photothermal properties and some applications in imaging, sensing, biology, and medicine. *Accounts of Chemical Research*, 41(12), 1578–1586. <https://doi.org/10.1021/ar7002804>
- Kabanov, A., & Bhakta, G. (2021). Nanomedicine for CNS diseases: Recent advances and future prospects. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews*, 171, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2021.02.001>
- Kedmi, R., Ben-Arie, N., & Peer, D. (2010). The systemic toxicity of positively charged lipid nanoparticles and the role of Toll-like receptor 4 in immune activation. *Biomaterials*, 31(26), 6867–6875. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biomaterials.2010.05.027>
- Kesharwani, P., Jain, K., & Jain, N. K. (2014). Dendrimer as nanocarrier for drug delivery. *Progress in Polymer Science*, 39(2), 268–307. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.progpolymsci.2013.07.005>
- Kim, T. Y., Kim, D. W., Chung, J. Y., Shin, S. G., Kim, S. C., Heo, D. S., ... & Bang, Y. J. (2004). Phase I and pharmacokinetic study of Genexol-PM, a cremophor-free, polymeric micelle-formulated paclitaxel, in patients with advanced malignancies. *Clinical Cancer Research*, 10(11), 3708–3716. <https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-03-0655>
- Kranz, L. M., Diken, M., Haas, H., Kreiter, S., Loquai, C., Reuter, K. C., ... & Sahin, U. (2016). Systemic RNA delivery to dendritic cells exploits antiviral defence for cancer immunotherapy. *Nature*, 534(7607), 396–401. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature18300>
- Lancet, J. E., Uy, G. L., Cortes, J. E., Newell, L. F., Lin, T. L., Ritchie, E. K., ... & Rizzieri, D. A. (2018). CPX-351 (cytarabine and daunorubicin) liposome for injection versus conventional cytarabine plus daunorubicin in older patients with newly diagnosed secondary acute myeloid leukemia. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 36(26), 2684–2692. <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2017.77.6112>
- Langer, R. (1998). Drug delivery and targeting. *Nature*, 392(6679), 5–10. <https://doi.org/10.1038/32008>
- Lasic, D. D., Čeh, B., Stuart, M. C. A., Guo, L., Frederik, P. M., & Barenholz, Y. (1995). Transmembrane gradient driven phase transitions within vesicles:

- Lessons for drug delivery. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta*, 1239(2), 145–156.
- Ledermann, J. A., Canevari, S., & Thigpen, T. (2020). Targeting the folate receptor: Diagnostic and therapeutic approaches to personalize cancer treatments. *Annals of Oncology*, 26(10), 2034–2043. <https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdv250>
- Li, J., Nickel, R., Wu, J., Lin, F., van Lierop, J., & Liu, S. (2021). A new tool to attack biofilms: Driving magnetic iron-oxide nanoparticles to disrupt the matrix. *Nanoscale*, 11(14), 6905–6915. <https://doi.org/10.1039/c8nr09501a>
- Liu, Z., Chen, K., Davis, C., Sherlock, S., Cao, Q., Chen, X., & Dai, H. (2009). Drug delivery with carbon nanotubes for in vivo cancer treatment. *Cancer Research*, 68(16), 6652–6660. <https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-08-1468>
- Löschner, K., Hadrup, N., Bhatt, D. K., Larsen, E. H., Stoltenberg, M., & Vogel, U. (2011). Distribution of silver in rats following 28 days of repeated oral exposure to silver nanoparticles or silver acetate. *Particle and Fibre Toxicology*, 8(1), 18. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1743-8977-8-18>
- Lundqvist, M., Stigler, J., Elia, G., Lynch, I., Cedervall, T., & Dawson, K. A. (2008). Nanoparticle size and surface properties determine the protein corona with possible implications for biological impacts. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105(38), 14265–14270. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0805135105>
- Maeda, H., Nakamura, H., & Fang, J. (2020). The EPR effect for macromolecular drug delivery to solid tumors: Improvement of tumor uptake, lowering of systemic toxicity, and distinct tumor imaging in vivo. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews*, 65(1), 71–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2012.10.002>
- Maier-Hauff, K., Ulrich, F., Nestler, D., Niehoff, H., Wust, P., Thiesen, B., ... & Jordan, A. (2011). Efficacy and safety of intratumoral thermotherapy using magnetic iron-oxide nanoparticles combined with external beam radiotherapy on patients with recurrent glioblastoma multiforme. *Journal of Neuro-Oncology*, 103(2), 317–324. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11060-010-0389-0>

- Majoros, I. J., Myc, A., Thomas, T., Mehta, C. B., & Baker, J. R. (2006). PAMAM dendrimer-based multifunctional conjugate for cancer therapy: Synthesis, characterization, and functionality. *Biomacromolecules*, 7(2), 572–579. <https://doi.org/10.1021/bm0506142>
- Makadia, H. K., & Siegel, S. J. (2011). Poly lactic-co-glycolic acid (PLGA) as biodegradable controlled drug delivery carrier. *Polymers*, 3(3), 1377–1397. <https://doi.org/10.3390/polym3031377>
- Matsumura, Y., & Maeda, H. (1986). A new concept for macromolecular therapeutics in cancer chemotherapy: Mechanism of tumoritropic accumulation of proteins and the antitumor agent smancs. *Cancer Research*, 46(12), 6387–6392.
- Muller, R. H., & Gurny, R. (2020). Lipid nanoparticles: From emulsions to solid lipid nanoparticles and beyond. *European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics*, 7(1), 1–12.
- Muller, R. H., Mäder, K., & Gohla, S. (2000). Solid lipid nanoparticles (SLN) for controlled drug delivery – a review of the state of the art. *European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics*, 50(1), 161–177. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0939-6411\(00\)00087-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0939-6411(00)00087-4)
- Muller, R. H., Mäder, K., Krause, K., & Gohla, S. (1995). Solid lipid nanoparticles (SLN) – an alternative colloidal carrier system for controlled drug delivery. *European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics*, 41(1), 62–69.
- Muller, R. H., Radtke, M., & Wissing, S. A. (2002). Nanostructured lipid matrices for improved microencapsulation of drugs. *International Journal of Pharmaceutics*, 242(1–2), 121–128. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-5173\(02\)00180-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-5173(02)00180-1)
- Mura, S., Nicolas, J., & Couvreur, P. (2013). Stimuli-responsive nanocarriers for drug delivery. *Nature Materials*, 12(11), 991–1003. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmat3776>
- Nel, A., Xia, T., Mädler, L., & Li, N. (2006). Toxic potential of materials at the nanolevel. *Science*, 311(5761), 622–627. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1114397>
- Oberdorster, G., Oberdorster, E., & Oberdorster, J. (2005). Nanotoxicology: An

- emerging discipline evolving from studies of ultrafine particles. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 113(7), 823–839. <https://doi.org/10.1289/ehp.7339>
- Peer, D., Karp, J. M., Hong, S., Farokhzad, O. C., Margalit, R., & Langer, R. (2007). Nanocarriers as an emerging platform for cancer therapy. *Nature Nanotechnology*, 2(12), 751–760. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nnano.2007.387>
- Poland, C. A., Duffin, R., Kinloch, I., Maynard, A., Wallace, W. A. H., Seaton, A., ... & Donaldson, K. (2008). Carbon nanotubes introduced into the abdominal cavity of mice show asbestos-like pathogenicity in a pilot study. *Nature Nanotechnology*, 3(7), 423–428. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nnano.2008.111>
- Pouton, C. W. (2006). Formulation of poorly water-soluble drugs for oral administration: Physicochemical and physiological issues and the lipid formulation classification system. *European Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences*, 29(3–4), 278–287. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejps.2006.04.016>
- Price, C. F., Tyssen, D., Sonza, S., Davie, A., Evans, S., Lewis, G. R., ... & Tachedjian, G. (2020). SPL7013 Gel (VivaGel®) retains potent HIV-1 and HSV-2 inhibitory activity following vaginal administration in humans. *PLOS ONE*, 6(9), e24095. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0024095>
- Raguram, A., Banskota, S., & Liu, D. R. (2022). Therapeutic in vivo delivery of gene editing agents. *Cell*, 185(15), 2806–2827. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2022.03.045>
- Rai, M., Yadav, A., & Gade, A. (2012). Silver nanoparticles as a new generation of antimicrobials. *Biotechnology Advances*, 27(1), 76–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biotechadv.2008.09.002>
- Safra, T., Muggia, F., Jeffers, S., Tsao-Wei, D. D., Groshen, S., Lyass, O., ... & Gabizon, A. (2000). Pegylated liposomal doxorubicin (doxil): Reduced clinical cardiotoxicity in patients reaching or exceeding cumulative doses of 500 mg/m². *Annals of Oncology*, 11(8), 1029–1033. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008365716693>
- Shi, J., Kantoff, P. W., Wooster, R., & Farokhzad, O. C. (2017). Cancer nanomedicine: Progress, challenges and opportunities. *Nature Reviews Cancer*, 17(1), 20–37.

<https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc.2016.108>

Shi, Y., van der Meel, R., Chen, X., & Lammers, T. (2020). The EPR effect and beyond: Strategies to improve tumor targeting and cancer nanomedicine treatment efficacy. *Theranostics*, 10(17), 7921–7924.

<https://doi.org/10.7150/thno.49577>

Siepmann, J., & Peppas, N. A. (2012). Modeling of drug release from delivery systems based on hydroxypropyl methylcellulose (HPMC). *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews*, 48(2–3), 139–157. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-409X\(01\)00112-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-409X(01)00112-0)

Sung, Y. K., & Kim, S. W. (2020). Recent advances in polymeric drug delivery systems. *Biomaterials Research*, 24(1), 12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40824-020-00190-7>

Szebeni, J., Bedőcs, P., Dézsi, L., Urbanics, R., & Baranyi, M. (2018). A porcine model of complement activation-related pseudoallergy to nano-pharmaceuticals: Pros and cons of translation to a large animal model. *European Journal of Nanomedicine*, 6(1), 15–28. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ejnm-2013-0011>

Tak, W. Y., Lin, S. M., Wang, Y., Zheng, J., Vecchione, A., Park, S. Y., ... & Poon, R. T. P. (2012). Phase III HEAT study adding lyso-thermosensitive liposomal doxorubicin to radiofrequency ablation in patients with unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma lesions. *Clinical Cancer Research*, 24(1), 73–83. <https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-16-2433>

Taniguchi, N. (1974). On the basic concept of nanotechnology. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Production Engineering*, 2, 18–23.

Tomalia, D. A., Baker, H., Dewald, J., Hall, M., Kallos, G., Martin, S., ... & Smith, P. (1985). A new class of polymers: Starburst-dendritic macromolecules. *Polymer Journal*, 17(1), 117–132. <https://doi.org/10.1295/polymj.17.117>

Torchilin, V. P. (2014). Multifunctional, stimuli-sensitive nanoparticulate systems for drug delivery. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery*, 13(11), 813–827. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd4333>

Tran, S., DeGiovanni, P. J., Piel, B., & Rai, P. (2023). Cancer nanomedicine: A review

- of recent success in drug delivery. *Clinical and Translational Medicine*, 7(1), 44. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s20362-017-0019-z>
- Ventola, C. L. (2017). Progress in nanomedicine: Approved and investigational nanodrugs. *Pharmacy and Therapeutics*, 42(12), 742–755.
- Von Hoff, D. D., Ervin, T., Arena, F. P., Chiorean, E. G., Infante, J., Moore, M., ... & Renschler, M. F. (2013). Increased survival in pancreatic cancer with nab-paclitaxel plus gemcitabine. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 369(18), 1691–1703. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1304369>
- Wilhelm, S., Tavares, A. J., Dai, Q., Ohta, S., Audet, J., Dvorak, H. F., & Chan, W. C. W. (2016). Analysis of nanoparticle delivery to tumours. *Nature Reviews Materials*, 1(5), 16014. <https://doi.org/10.1038/natrevmats.2016.14>
- Zazo, H., Colino, C. I., & Lanao, J. M. (2016). Current applications of nanoparticles in infectious diseases. *Journal of Controlled Release*, 224, 86–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2016.01.008>
- Zhang, J., Leifer, F., Rose, S., Chun, D. Y., Thaisz, J., Herr, T., ... & Nambiar, S. (2018). Amikacin liposome inhalation suspension (ALIS) penetrates non-tuberculous mycobacterial biofilms while maintaining superior activities against planktonic bacteria. *Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy*, 62(6), e00237-18. <https://doi.org/10.1128/AAC.00237-18>
- Zhang, J., Li, X., & Huang, L. (2022). Non-viral nanocarriers for siRNA delivery in breast cancer. *Journal of Controlled Release*, 163(3), 297–307. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2012.09.019>
- Zhao, C., Fan, T., Yang, Y., Wu, M., Li, L., Zhou, Z., ... & Chen, X. (2019). Preparation, characterizations, and in vitro anti-diabetes activity of baicalein-loaded nanoparticles. *International Journal of Pharmaceutics*, 477(1–2), 547–555. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2014.10.031>