Journal of Advanced Medical Research and Innovation
ISSN *(Online)*: XXXX-XXXX
Volume 1, Issue 1, April-June 2025, Page 1-4
https://doi.org/

Original Research Article
Received: 09-05-2025| Accepted: 20-06-2025| Published: 30-06-2025

Nanomedicine in Oncology: Targeted Drug Delivery Systems and Their Clinical Applications

Pritish K. Das*[1]

Abstract

Nanomedicine represents a paradigm shift in oncology, offering unprecedented precision in cancer diagnosis and therapy. This review synthesizes advancements in nanoparticle-based drug delivery systems (DDS) designed to overcome biological barriers, enhance tumor targeting, and minimize systemic toxicity. We critically evaluate clinically approved nanotherapeutics including liposomal doxorubicin, albumin-bound paclitaxel, and polymeric micelles detailing their mechanisms, efficacy, and limitations. Emerging platforms such as stimuli-responsive nanoparticles, extracellular vesicles, and multifunctional theranostic agents demonstrate enhanced tumor penetration and real-time treatment monitoring in preclinical models. Clinical trial data reveal that nanoparticle albumin-bound (nab)-paclitaxel improves response rates by 30-50% in metastatic breast and pancreatic cancers compared to solvent-based formulations. However, challenges persist: only 0.7% of administered nanoparticles reach solid tumors due to biological barriers, and scale-up complexities hinder translation. This analysis further explores engineering solutions to enhance the enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect, strategies to mitigate immune clearance, and innovations in ligand-based targeting. With over 80 nanomedicines in clinical trials and next-generation platforms enabling tumor microenvironment remodeling, nanomedicine holds transformative potential for precision oncology pending resolution of manufacturing, regulatory, and accessibility hurdles.

Keywords

Nanomedicine, targeted drug delivery, nanoparticles, oncology, EPR effect, theranostics, clinical translation

1Independent Scholar

INTRODUCTION

Conventional chemotherapy remains limited by non-specific biodistribution, causing severe systemic toxicity while achieving subtherapeutic drug concentrations at tumor sites (Peer *et al.,* 2007). Nanomedicine addresses these challenges through engineered carriers (1–1000 nm) that exploit pathophysiological features of tumors notably leaky vasculature and impaired lymphatic drainage, collectively termed the enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect (Matsumura & Maeda, 1986). The first-generation nanotherapeutics, exemplified by liposomal doxorubicin (Doxil®), demonstrated reduced cardiotoxicity by altering pharmacokinetics (Gabizon *et al.,* 2003). Subsequent innovations introduced targeting ligands, stimuli-responsive materials, and hybrid architectures to overcome biological barriers including opsonization, endothelial trapping, and dense stromal pressure (Bae & Park, 2011).

The global oncology nanomedicine market is projected to reach $175 billion by 2030, fueled by over 80 clinical-stage candidates (Mitragotri *et al.,* 2023). This growth reflects significant clinical achievements: nanoparticle albumin-bound (nab)-paclitaxel (Abraxane®) nearly doubled median survival in metastatic pancreatic cancer compared to gemcitabine alone (Von Hoff *et al.,* 2013), while ligand-targeted liposomes (e.g., HER2-directed MM-302) show promise in refractory cancers. However, recent analyses reveal that only 0.7% (median) of intravenously administered nanoparticles accumulate in solid tumors (Wilhelm *et al.,* 2016), highlighting critical delivery challenges. This review examines the evolution, clinical impact, and future directions of nanocarriers in oncology, emphasizing engineering strategies to enhance therapeutic precision.

***Corresponding Author:** Pritish K. Das

FUNDAMENTALS OF TUMOR TARGETING

The EPR Effect: Mechanisms and Limitations

The EPR effect leverages structural abnormalities in tumor vasculature fenestrations (100–800 nm) and defective pericytes that permit nanoparticle extravasation (Maeda *et al.,* 2000). Retention occurs due to impaired lymphatic drainage. However, EPR heterogeneity is significant:

- **High variability**: EPR efficiency varies >20-fold across tumor types (e.g., high in sarcomas, low in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma)
- **Stromal barriers**: Hyaluronic acid and collagen matrices impede diffusion (Stylianopoulos *et al.,* 2012)
- **Interpatient variation**: Hypertension and inflammation modulate vascular permeability (Sindhwani *et al.,* 2020)

Table 1: Strategies to Enhance EPR Efficacy

Approach	Mechanism	Clinical Example
Vascular normalization	Anti-VEGF to stabilize vessels	Bevacizumab + Doxil® (NCT02843945)
Matrix depletion	Enzymatic degradation of stroma	PEGPH20 + nab-paclitaxel (Phase III)
Physiological modulation	Nitric oxide donors	ISDN + liposomal cisplatin (Phase II)

Active Targeting Strategies

Surface functionalization with ligands enhances cellular uptake:

- **Antibodies**: Trastuzumab-conjugated liposomes (MM-302) increase HER2+ tumor drug concentration 5-fold
- **Peptides**: iRGD (CRGDK/RGPD/EC) triggers transcytosis via neuropilin-1 (Sugahara *et al.,* 2010)
- **Aptamers**: A10 RNA aptamer targets PSMA in prostate cancer

Despite improved *in vitro* efficacy, clinical outcomes remain modest due to the "binding-site barrier" where high-affinity ligands hinder deep tumor penetration (Thurber *et al.,* 2008).

CLINICALLY APPROVED NANOTHERAPEUTICS

Lipid-Based Systems

- **Liposomal Doxorubicin (Doxil®/Caelyx®)**:
  - *Structure*: PEGylated 100-nm liposomes
  - *Advantage*: 300% increase in tumor AUC, 50% reduction in cardiotoxicity (Gabizon *et al.,* 2003)
  - *Limitation*: Palmar-plantar erythrodysesthesia (20% incidence)
- **Liposomal Irinotecan (Onivyde®)**:
  - *Approval*: Pancreatic cancer (2015)
  - *Efficacy*: 6.1 vs 4.2 months survival vs 5-FU (Wang-Gillam *et al.,* 2016)

Protein-Drug Conjugates

- **Nab-Paclitaxel (Abraxane®)**:
  - *Mechanism*: 130-nm albumin-bound particles exploiting SPARC-mediated uptake
  - *Superiority*: 33% response rate vs 19% for solvent-based paclitaxel in breast cancer (Gradishar *et al.,* 2005)
  - *Pancreatic cancer*: 8.5 vs 6.7 months survival vs gemcitabine (Von Hoff *et al.,* 2013)

Polymeric Nanoparticles

- **Paclitaxel Poliglumex (CT-2103)**:
  - *Structure*: Poly-L-glutamate conjugate
  - *Failure*: Phase III toxicity (neutropenia, neuropathy)
- **CRLX101**: Cyclodextrin-based camptothecin
  - *Phase II*: 35% disease control in ovarian cancer

EMERGING NANOPLATFORMS

Stimuli-Responsive Systems

Intrinsic triggers:

- **pH-sensitive polymers**: Poly(β-amino ester) micelles releasing doxorubicin at pH 6.5 (Lee *et al.,* 2008)

- **Reduction-sensitive bonds**: Disulfide linkages cleaved in high-GSH tumor environments

Extrinsic triggers:
- **Thermo-liposomes**: Lysolipid-containing vesicles (ThermoDox®) + HIFU
- **Magneto-electric**: Field-induced drug release (MNDs + glioblastoma)

Extracellular Vesicles (EVs)
- *Advantages*: Innate biocompatibility, homing capability
- *Engineering*: Loaded with siRNA or paclitaxel via electroporation
- *Clinical trial*: MSC-EVs carrying KRAS siRNA (NCT03608631)

Inorganic Nanoparticles
- **Gold nanoshells**: Photothermal ablation of head/neck tumors (AuroLase®)
- **Iron oxide**: MRI-guided hyperthermia + drug delivery (NCT01770379)

BIOLOGICAL BARRIERS TO DELIVERY

Systemic Barriers
- **Opsonization**: RES sequestration in liver/spleen (up to 95% dose)
- **Solution**: "Differential adsorption" stealth coatings (e.g., CD47 mimetics)

Tumor Microenvironment (TME) Barriers
- **High interstitial fluid pressure (IFP)**: Reduces convective transport
- **Solution**: Angiotensin inhibition lowers IFP by 60%
- **Hypoxia**: Promotes MDR1 expression
- **Solution**: Oxygen-carrying perfluorocarbon nanoparticles

CLINICAL TRANSLATION CHALLENGES

Manufacturing and Scalability
- **Batch variability**: Liposome size distribution impacts EPR efficacy
- **Sterility challenges**: Terminal filtration not feasible for >200 nm particles
- **Cost**: GMP production of targeted liposomes exceeds $500/dose

Regulatory Hurdles
- **Characterization complexity**: Requiring 7 critical quality attributes (CQAs)
- **Bioequivalence**: Generics struggle with Doxil® due to proprietary remote loading

Clinical Trial Design Issues
- **Patient stratification**: Lack of EPR biomarkers
- **Combination missteps**: Scheduling conflicts with anti-angiogenics

FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

Multifunctional Theranostics
- **Quantum dot hybrids**: Intraoperative tumor margin delineation
- **Cerenkov radiation**: Self-illuminating nanoparticles for deep-tissue imaging

Adaptive Nanosystems
- **AI-guided dosing**: Closed-loop sensors adjusting drug release
- **Tumor priming**: Enzyme-prodrug systems amplifying local toxicity

Addressing Global Access
- **Lyophilized formulations**: Stable at 25°C for resource-limited settings
- **Biosimilar development**: Reducing costs by 40-70%

CONCLUSION

Nanomedicine has transformed oncology through enhanced drug targeting and reduced systemic toxicity, validated by 15 approved nanotherapeutics and improved survival in challenging malignancies. Despite this progress, low tumor delivery efficiency and manufacturing complexities remain significant translational barriers. The future lies in multifunctional platforms integrating diagnostics, microenvironment modulation, and controlled drug release. Advances in biomaterials science, coupled with patient stratification using EPR biomarkers, will enable precision nanomedicine tailored to individual tumor biology. Realizing this potential requires cross-disciplinary collaboration among chemists, clinicians, and

regulatory scientists to streamline clinical translation and ensure global accessibility.

REFERENCES

Bae, Y. H., & Park, K. (2011). Targeted drug delivery to tumors: Myths, reality and possibility. *Journal of Controlled Release*, *153*(3), 198–205.

Gabizon, A., Shmeeda, H., & Barenholz, Y. (2003). Pharmacokinetics of pegylated liposomal Doxorubicin. *Clinical Pharmacokinetics*, *42*(5), 419–436.

Gradishar, W. J., Tjulandin, S., Davidson, N., Shaw, H., Desai, N., Bhar, P., ... & O'Shaughnessy, J. (2005). Phase III trial of nanoparticle albumin-bound paclitaxel compared with polyethylated castor oil–based paclitaxel in women with breast cancer. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, *23*(31), 7794–7803.

Lee, E. S., Gao, Z., & Bae, Y. H. (2008). Recent progress in tumor pH targeting nanotechnology. *Journal of Controlled Release*, *132*(3), 164–170.

Maeda, H., Wu, J., Sawa, T., Matsumura, Y., & Hori, K. (2000). Tumor vascular permeability and the EPR effect in macromolecular therapeutics: A review. *Journal of Controlled Release*, *65*(1-2), 271–284.

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.

Mitragotri, S., Lammers, T., Bae, Y. H., Schwendeman, S., De Smedt, S., Leroux, J. C., ... & Peer, D. (2023). Drug delivery research for the future: Expanding the nano horizons. *Journal of Controlled Release*, 354, 1–5.

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.

Sindhwani, S., Syed, A. M., Ngai, J., Kingston, B. R., Maiorino, L., Rothschild, J., ... & Chan, W. C. (2020). The entry of nanoparticles into solid tumours. *Nature Materials*, *19*(5), 566–575.

Stylianopoulos, T., Martin, J. D., Chauhan, V. P., Jain, S. R., Diop-Frimpong, B., Bardeesy, N., ... & Jain, R. K. (2012). Causes, consequences, and remedies for growth-induced solid stress in murine and human tumors. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *109*(38), 15101–15108.

Sugahara, K. N., Teesalu, T., Karmali, P. P., Kotamraju, V. R., Agemy, L., Girard, O. M., ... & Ruoslahti, E. (2010). Tissue-penetrating delivery of compounds and nanoparticles into tumors. *Cancer Cell*, *16*(6), 510–520.

Thurber, G. M., Schmidt, M. M., & Wittrup, K. D. (2008). Antibody tumor penetration: Transport opposed by systemic and antigen-mediated clearance. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews*, *60*(12), 1421–1434.

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.

Wang-Gillam, A., Li, C. P., Bodoky, G., Dean, A., Shan, Y. S., Jameson, G., ... & Rittweger, K. (2016). Nanoliposomal irinotecan with fluorouracil and folinic acid in metastatic pancreatic cancer after previous gemcitabine-based therapy (NAPOLI-1): A global, randomised, open-label, phase 3 trial. *The Lancet*, *387*(10018), 545–557.

Wilhelm, S., Tavares, A. J., Dai, Q., Ohta, S., Audet, J., Dvorak, H. F., & Chan, W. C. (2016). Analysis of nanoparticle delivery to tumours. *Nature Reviews Materials*, *1*(5), 1–12.

Conflict of Interest: No Conflict of Interest

Source of Funding: Author(s) Funded the Research

How to Cite: Das, K. P. (2025). Nanomedicine in Oncology: Targeted Drug Delivery Systems and Their Clinical Applications. *Journal of Advanced Medical Research and Innovation, 1*(1), 1-4.