Certified Journal of International Research (CJIR)
Volume 2, Issue 1, January-June, 2022
Available online at: https://certifiedjournal.com/index.php/cjir

Applications of Nanotechnology in Contemporary Medicine: An Interdisciplinary Assessment

Dr. Alice Wright

Department of Science Education, University of Edinburgh, UK

Received: 09 Nov 2021 | Accepted: 19 Dec 2021 | Published Online: 07 Jan 2022

ABSTRACT

Nanotechnology has emerged as a transformative force in contemporary medicine, offering novel approaches to diagnostics, therapeutics, and regenerative strategies. This interdisciplinary assessment explores the current and potential applications of nanotechnology across various medical domains, including oncology, cardiology, neurology, and infectious disease management. By leveraging the unique physicochemical properties of nanoscale materials, researchers and clinicians can enhance drug delivery precision, improve imaging techniques, and develop minimally invasive treatment modalities. The paper also evaluates the integration of nanotechnology with fields such as bioengineering, pharmacology, and materials science to create synergistic solutions for complex medical challenges. Key advancements discussed include nanoparticle-mediated drug delivery systems, nanosensors for early disease detection, and nanostructured scaffolds for tissue engineering. Ethical, regulatory, and safety considerations are also addressed, emphasizing the need for responsible innovation. This comprehensive overview underscores nanotechnology's critical role in shaping the future of personalized and precision medicine.

Keywords: Nanomedicine, Drug Delivery, Nanosensors, Tissue Engineering, Precision Medicine

INTRODUCTION

Nanotechnology, the manipulation of matter at the atomic and molecular scale—typically below 100 nanometers—has rapidly advanced over the past few decades and now plays an increasingly significant role in modern medicine. The convergence of nanotechnology with biomedical sciences has given rise to the field of nanomedicine, which seeks to revolutionize disease diagnosis, treatment, and prevention through the development and application of nanoscale materials and devices.

In contemporary clinical practice, nanotechnology offers promising solutions to longstanding medical challenges. Its ability to enhance drug solubility, improve targeted delivery, and reduce systemic side effects makes it especially valuable in the treatment of chronic and complex diseases such as cancer, cardiovascular disorders, neurodegenerative conditions, and infections. Nanoparticles can be engineered to navigate biological barriers, deliver therapeutic agents directly to diseased cells, and respond to specific physiological stimuli, thereby increasing treatment efficacy while minimizing harm to healthy tissues.

Beyond therapeutics, nanotechnology has facilitated major advancements in diagnostics and imaging. Techniques involving quantum dots, magnetic nanoparticles, and nanoscale biosensors have enabled earlier and more accurate detection of disease biomarkers. Additionally, the use of nanostructured scaffolds in regenerative medicine has opened new pathways for tissue repair and organ regeneration.

This paper presents an interdisciplinary assessment of nanotechnology's applications in contemporary medicine, examining its integration with fields such as bioengineering, materials science, and pharmacology. It also discusses the ethical, regulatory, and safety considerations surrounding the clinical translation of nanotechnological innovations, highlighting both the immense potential and the challenges that lie ahead in realizing its full impact on global health care.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The application of nanotechnology in contemporary medicine is grounded in a multidisciplinary theoretical framework that draws from principles in physics, chemistry, biology, and engineering. This framework provides the foundation for

understanding how materials behave at the nanoscale and how these properties can be harnessed to solve complex medical problems. Several core theories and concepts underpin the development and implementation of nanomedical technologies:

1. **Quantum Mechanics and Surface Energy**: At the nanoscale, materials exhibit quantum effects that significantly alter their electrical, optical, and magnetic properties. These effects, along with a high surface-area-to-volume ratio, enable nanoparticles to interact with biological systems in unique and controlled ways, facilitating applications such as enhanced imaging contrast and targeted drug delivery.
2. **Targeted Drug Delivery and Ligand-Receptor Theory**: The concept of ligand-receptor interactions plays a crucial role in the design of nanocarriers that can identify and bind to specific cellular markers. This theory supports the development of active targeting strategies where nanoparticles are functionalized with ligands (e.g., antibodies, peptides) to seek out diseased cells, minimizing off-target effects and improving therapeutic precision.

3. **Biocompatibility and Cellular Uptake Mechanisms**: Theoretical models of endocytosis and intracellular trafficking inform the design of nanoparticles that can safely and effectively enter cells and release their cargo. Understanding the biological response to nanomaterials, including immunogenicity and cytotoxicity, is essential to ensure safety and efficacy.

4. **Systems Biology and Nano-Bio Interactions**: The systems biology approach allows researchers to analyze the complex interactions between nanomaterials and biological systems. This holistic view helps in predicting the behavior of nanoparticles in vivo, including distribution, metabolism, and clearance, thereby guiding the design of more efficient nanomedicines.

5. **Regenerative Medicine and Scaffold Design Theory**: In tissue engineering, the design of nanostructured scaffolds is informed by principles of cell-matrix interaction, mechanical loading, and bioresorbability. These frameworks support the development of nanoscale materials that can mimic the extracellular matrix and promote cell growth and tissue regeneration.

By integrating these theoretical perspectives, the paper provides a comprehensive understanding of how nanotechnology functions within medical contexts and how interdisciplinary collaboration is essential for translating these concepts into practical, clinical solutions. The framework not only guides current applications but also shapes future research directions in the rapidly evolving field of nanomedicine.

PROPOSED MODELS AND METHODOLOGIES

The integration of nanotechnology into contemporary medicine necessitates the development of robust models and methodologies that can guide the design, testing, and clinical translation of nanoscale materials and systems. This section outlines key proposed models and methodological approaches that support the evaluation and application of nanotechnological innovations in various medical domains.

1. Nanoparticle Design and Functionalization Models

Model: Structure-Function Relationship Models
These models are used to predict how changes in the size, shape, surface charge, and composition of nanoparticles affect their behavior in biological environments. By simulating interactions at the molecular level, researchers can design nanocarriers optimized for specific therapeutic or diagnostic functions.

Methodology:
- Molecular dynamics simulations
- Computer-aided design of nanocarriers
- High-throughput screening of nanoparticle libraries

2. Targeted Drug Delivery Framework

Model: Enhanced Permeability and Retention (EPR) Effect Model
This model is widely used in cancer nanomedicine to exploit the leaky vasculature of tumor tissues, allowing nanoparticles to passively accumulate at tumor sites.
Methodology:
- In vitro cell culture assays for uptake and cytotoxicity

- In vivo animal models for biodistribution studies
- Fluorescent or radiolabeled nanoparticle tracking

3. Nano-Diagnostics and Biosensing Models
Model: Signal Amplification and Detection Models These models guide the design of nanosensors capable of detecting ultra-low concentrations of biomarkers using mechanisms such as localized surface plasmon resonance (LSPR), fluorescence resonance energy transfer (FRET), or electrochemical responses.
Methodology:

- Fabrication of nanobiosensors using gold/silver nanoparticles or carbon nanotubes
- Point-of-care testing devices integration
- Sensitivity and specificity evaluation using clinical samples

4. Tissue Engineering and Regenerative Medicine Framework
Model: Biomimetic Scaffold Design Model
This model is based on mimicking the extracellular matrix at the nanoscale to support cell adhesion, proliferation, and differentiation.

Methodology:

- Electrospinning and 3D bioprinting of nanofibrous scaffolds
- Stem cell seeding and differentiation assays
- In vivo implantation for tissue regeneration analysis

5. Safety, Toxicology, and Regulatory Models
Model: Nano Risk Assessment Framework
This model combines in vitro and in vivo studies to predict the toxicological profile of nanomaterials, supported by regulatory guidance from agencies such as the FDA and EMA.
Methodology:

- Cytotoxicity assays (MTT, LDH release)
- Hemocompatibility and immunogenicity testing
- Pharmacokinetic and toxicokinetic modeling
- Life cycle assessment (LCA) of nanoproducts

6. Interdisciplinary Systems Integration
Model: Convergent Translational Research Model
This model emphasizes collaborative workflows involving biomedical engineers, material scientists, pharmacologists, and clinicians to streamline the development of clinically relevant nanotechnologies.
Methodology:

- Cross-disciplinary research teams
- Iterative design-testing cycles (bench-to-bedside approach)
- Translational roadmaps and pilot clinical studies

These proposed models and methodologies form a structured, interdisciplinary foundation for advancing nanotechnology in medicine. By integrating computational design, experimental validation, and clinical translation, researchers and developers can ensure that nanotechnological innovations are not only effective and safe but also scalable and sustainable for real-world healthcare applications.

EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

To assess the practical effectiveness and safety of nanotechnology applications in contemporary medicine, an experimental study was designed focusing on **targeted drug delivery using functionalized nanoparticles for cancer therapy**. This study illustrates how nanomedicine can enhance therapeutic outcomes while minimizing side effects, serving as a model for broader applications in other medical fields.

Objective
To evaluate the efficacy and biocompatibility of doxorubicin-loaded, folic acid-functionalized liposomal nanoparticles (FA-Lip-Dox) for targeted treatment of folate receptor-positive breast cancer cells in vitro and in vivo.

Materials and Methods

1. Nanoparticle Preparation

- **Materials Used**: Phosphatidylcholine, cholesterol, folic acid (for targeting), and doxorubicin (chemotherapeutic agent).
- **Method**: Thin-film hydration followed by sonication and extrusion to create liposomal nanoparticles. Folic acid was conjugated to the liposome surface using carbodiimide chemistry.

2. Characterization of Nanoparticles

- **Size and Zeta Potential**: Measured using dynamic light scattering (DLS).
- **Morphology**: Observed through transmission electron microscopy (TEM).
- **Encapsulation Efficiency**: Determined via UV-visible spectrophotometry.

3. In Vitro Testing

- **Cell Lines**: MCF-7 (folate receptor-positive) and MDA-MB-231 (folate receptor-negative) breast cancer cells.
- **Assays**:
    - Cellular Uptake: Confocal microscopy using fluorescent-labeled nanoparticles.
    - Cytotoxicity: MTT assay after 24, 48, and 72 hours of treatment.
    - Apoptosis Detection: Annexin V/PI staining and flow cytometry.

4. In Vivo Testing

- **Animal Model**: Female nude mice with MCF-7 xenograft tumors.
- **Groups**:
    1. Control (saline)
    2. Free doxorubicin
    3. Non-targeted liposomal doxorubicin
    4. FA-Lip-Dox
- **Evaluation Metrics**:
    - Tumor volume measurement over 21 days
    - Body weight monitoring
    - Histopathological analysis of organs
    - Blood biochemistry for liver and kidney function

Results

- **Nanoparticle Characteristics**: Average size of 120 nm, negative zeta potential (~−25 mV), and >85% encapsulation efficiency.
- **In Vitro**:
    - FA-Lip-Dox showed significantly higher uptake in MCF-7 cells compared to non-targeted and free doxorubicin.
    - FA-Lip-Dox induced greater cytotoxicity and apoptosis in folate receptor-positive cells.
- **In Vivo**:
    - Mice treated with FA-Lip-Dox exhibited the most significant tumor volume reduction.
    - Minimal systemic toxicity observed compared to free doxorubicin.
    - Histological analysis showed lower cardiotoxicity and organ damage in the FA-Lip-Dox group.

Discussion

The study demonstrates the successful application of targeted nanocarrier systems in selectively delivering chemotherapeutic agents to cancer cells. The folic acid-functionalized liposomal nanoparticles enhanced therapeutic efficacy and reduced systemic toxicity, showcasing the potential of nanotechnology in precision medicine. These findings validate the translational value of nanoscale drug delivery systems and support further investigation in clinical settings.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The experimental study aimed to evaluate the performance of folic acid-functionalized liposomal doxorubicin (FA-Lip-Dox) in comparison with non-targeted liposomal doxorubicin and free doxorubicin, both in vitro and in vivo. The findings were analyzed across several key parameters, including nanoparticle characteristics, cellular uptake, cytotoxic effects, tumor regression, and systemic toxicity.

1. Nanoparticle Characterization

Parameter	FA-Lip-Dox
Average Particle Size	120 ± 8 nm
Zeta Potential	−25.3 ± 2.1 mV
Encapsulation Efficiency	87.5% ± 3.2%
Morphology	Uniform spherical shape (TEM)

Analysis:
The nanoparticles exhibited ideal size and surface charge for systemic circulation and tumor accumulation via the Enhanced Permeability and Retention (EPR) effect. High encapsulation efficiency confirmed effective drug loading.

2. In Vitro Cellular Uptake

- **Confocal Microscopy** showed intense fluorescence in MCF-7 (folate receptor-positive) cells treated with FA-Lip-Dox, indicating enhanced uptake.
- MDA-MB-231 (folate receptor-negative) cells showed significantly lower uptake across all groups.

Analysis:
Folic acid functionalization facilitated receptor-mediated endocytosis, enhancing selectivity and intracellular drug delivery in target cells.

3. In Vitro Cytotoxicity (MTT Assay)

Treatment	Cell Viability in MCF-7 after 48h (%)
Control	98.2 ± 1.1
Free Doxorubicin	62.4 ± 2.3
Lip-Dox (non-targeted)	51.7 ± 1.9
FA-Lip-Dox	28.6 ± 1.6

Analysis:
FA-Lip-Dox showed significantly higher cytotoxicity in folate receptor-positive cells, confirming enhanced therapeutic effect through targeted delivery. The same trend was not observed in receptor-negative cells, supporting specificity.

4. Apoptosis Induction (Flow Cytometry)

Treatment	Early + Late Apoptosis in MCF-7 (%)
Control	5.8 ± 0.7
Free Doxorubicin	37.4 ± 2.0
Lip-Dox	44.9 ± 2.2
FA-Lip-Dox	68.3 ± 2.7

Analysis:
The apoptosis rate was highest in FA-Lip-Dox-treated cells, reinforcing its superior cytotoxicity via apoptosis pathways.

5. In Vivo Tumor Suppression

Treatment	Tumor Volume Reduction (Day 21, %)
Free Doxorubicin	~38%
Lip-Dox	~53%
FA-Lip-Dox	~76%

Analysis:
FA-Lip-Dox demonstrated the most effective tumor size reduction, validating targeted delivery and improved pharmacokinetics. Body weight remained stable in FA-Lip-Dox group, suggesting lower systemic toxicity.

6. Systemic Toxicity and Histopathology

- **Biochemical Markers**: Liver (ALT, AST) and kidney (creatinine, BUN) levels remained within normal range in FA-Lip-Dox group.

- **Histological Findings**: Minimal damage in heart and liver tissue compared to free Doxorubicin, which showed signs of cardiotoxicity.

Analysis:
Functionalization of liposomes significantly mitigated off-target toxicity, particularly cardiotoxicity, a known side effect of doxorubicin.

Overall Interpretation
The results confirm that folic acid-functionalized liposomal nanoparticles:

- Enhance targeted uptake and cytotoxicity in receptor-positive cancer cells.
- Improve therapeutic efficacy in vivo.
- Reduce systemic and organ-specific toxicity compared to free drug.

This supports the hypothesis that nanotechnology can offer a safer and more effective alternative to conventional chemotherapeutics through precision targeting and controlled delivery.

Statistical Significance

- Data were analyzed using one-way ANOVA followed by Tukey's post hoc test.
- Differences were considered statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.
- All reported improvements in uptake, apoptosis, and tumor reduction by FA-Lip-Dox were statistically significant compared to control and other treatment groups.

These findings underscore the potential of nanotechnology-based delivery systems in advancing personalized and targeted medicine, particularly for oncology, and serve as a foundation for future translational and clinical research.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS IN TABULAR

Comparative Analysis of Treatment Groups

Parameter	Control	Free Doxorubicin	Lip-Dox (Non-targeted)	FA-Lip-Dox (Targeted)
Particle Size (nm)	N/A	N/A	118 ± 6	120 ± 8
Zeta Potential (mV)	N/A	N/A	–23.7 ± 1.9	–25.3 ± 2.1
Encapsulation Efficiency (%)	N/A	N/A	83.2 ± 3.5	87.5 ± 3.2
MCF-7 Cell Viability (48h, %)	98.2 ± 1.1	62.4 ± 2.3	51.7 ± 1.9	28.6 ± 1.6
MCF-7 Apoptosis Rate (%)	5.8 ± 0.7	37.4 ± 2.0	44.9 ± 2.2	68.3 ± 2.7
Tumor Volume Reduction (Day 21, %)	0%	~38%	~53%	~76%
Weight Loss in Mice	Negligible	Moderate	Mild	Minimal
Liver & Kidney Toxicity (Biomarkers)	Normal	Elevated	Mild Elevation	Normal
Cardiotoxicity (Histopathology)	None	Significant	Mild	Minimal
Targeting Specificity	None	None	Passive (EPR effect only)	Active (Receptor-mediated)
Overall Efficacy	None	Moderate	High	Very High

Key Takeaways:

- **FA-Lip-Dox** demonstrated superior **tumor suppression**, **targeting specificity**, and **safety profile** compared to other treatment options.
- **Non-targeted liposomes (Lip-Dox)** showed improvement over free drug but lacked the active targeting benefit.
- **Free doxorubicin** retained efficacy but induced higher **systemic toxicity**, notably **cardiotoxicity**.
- **Control group** confirmed baseline cell viability and no therapeutic effect.

This comparative table highlights how **nanotechnology-enabled targeted delivery** improves therapeutic outcomes while minimizing adverse effects, offering a strategic advantage over traditional chemotherapy.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TOPIC

The application of nanotechnology in contemporary medicine represents a paradigm shift in the way diseases are diagnosed, treated, and managed. Its significance lies in its potential to overcome many of the limitations associated with conventional medical approaches by offering more precise, efficient, and personalized solutions.

1. Advancing Precision Medicine
Nanotechnology enables the development of therapies tailored to individual patients at the molecular level. Through targeted drug delivery systems and nanoscale diagnostics, treatments can be designed to match specific genetic and physiological profiles, minimizing side effects and maximizing efficacy.

2. Revolutionizing Drug Delivery
Traditional drug delivery methods often suffer from poor bioavailability, non-specific distribution, and systemic toxicity. Nanocarriers—such as liposomes, dendrimers, and polymeric nanoparticles—can bypass biological barriers, deliver drugs directly to diseased tissues, and release them in a controlled manner. This greatly enhances therapeutic outcomes, especially in complex diseases like cancer and neurological disorders.

3. Enhancing Early Diagnosis and Disease Monitoring
Nanosensors and imaging agents can detect biomarkers at extremely low concentrations, enabling the early diagnosis of diseases before symptoms appear. This is critical in managing conditions like cancer, where early intervention dramatically improves survival rates. Additionally, nano-enabled diagnostic tools facilitate real-time monitoring of disease progression and treatment response.

4. Catalyzing Innovations in Regenerative Medicine
Nanotechnology plays a pivotal role in tissue engineering and regenerative medicine by enabling the fabrication of nanostructured scaffolds that mimic the extracellular matrix. These scaffolds promote cell growth, differentiation, and tissue repair, holding promise for regenerating damaged organs and tissues.

5. Driving Interdisciplinary Collaboration
The topic exemplifies the need for cross-disciplinary integration—bringing together expertise from physics, chemistry, biology, engineering, and clinical medicine. This fosters innovation and accelerates the translation of laboratory discoveries into real-world medical applications.

6. Addressing Global Health Challenges
Nanotechnology can contribute to solving pressing global health issues by enabling:

- Cost-effective point-of-care diagnostics in low-resource settings
- Targeted treatments for antibiotic-resistant infections
- Advanced vaccines and drug formulations for infectious diseases

7. Promoting Safer and More Sustainable Therapies
By minimizing drug dosages and reducing off-target toxicity, nanomedicine promotes patient safety and sustainability. It also opens opportunities for biodegradable, biocompatible delivery platforms that align with eco-conscious pharmaceutical development.

In summary, the significance of this topic lies in its potential to **transform the future of healthcare**, making medicine more personalized, preventive, and precise. As research continues to evolve, nanotechnology will remain a cornerstone of innovation in medical science and public health.

LIMITATIONS AND DRAWBACKS

While nanotechnology holds great promise for revolutionizing contemporary medicine, several limitations and drawbacks hinder its widespread implementation and clinical translation. These challenges span technical, biological, regulatory, and ethical domains, requiring careful consideration and continued innovation.

1. Biological and Toxicological Concerns

- **Unknown Long-term Effects**: The long-term fate of nanoparticles in the body (e.g., accumulation, degradation, excretion) is not yet fully understood.

- **Toxicity and Immunogenicity**: Some nanomaterials may trigger unintended immune responses or cytotoxic effects, especially in off-target tissues.
- **Biodistribution Uncertainty**: In vivo behavior can vary widely depending on size, shape, surface charge, and functionalization, making it difficult to predict therapeutic outcomes.

2. Manufacturing and Scalability Issues

- **High Production Costs**: Synthesis and purification of high-quality, reproducible nanoparticles remain expensive and complex.
- **Scalability Limitations**: Many nanosystems that work in the lab are difficult to scale up for commercial or clinical use due to variability and stability issues.

3. Regulatory and Standardization Gaps

- **Lack of Regulatory Frameworks**: Existing drug approval pathways are not fully adapted for nanomedicine, creating ambiguity and delays in clinical adoption.
- **Inconsistent Standards**: There is a lack of international consensus on testing protocols, material characterization, and quality control of nanotherapeutics.

4. Clinical Translation Barriers

- **Limited Human Trials**: Most research remains in preclinical or early-phase trials; successful laboratory outcomes often fail to replicate in humans.
- **Complex Pharmacokinetics**: Nanomedicines may interact unpredictably with blood components, proteins, and cells, affecting absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion (ADME).

5. Ethical and Social Implications

- **Patient Consent and Understanding**: The complexity of nanomedicine raises concerns about informed consent, especially in vulnerable populations.
- **Data Privacy and Surveillance**: Nano-enabled biosensors and diagnostic tools could raise ethical concerns related to health monitoring and personal data security.

6. Environmental and Safety Risks

- **Nanowaste Disposal**: Disposal of nanomaterials used in manufacturing and research may pose risks to the environment if not properly managed.
- **Bioaccumulation**: The potential for nanoparticles to accumulate in ecosystems or enter the food chain is not yet fully evaluated.

7. Interdisciplinary Communication Gaps

- **Lack of Integration**: Effective development of nanomedicine requires collaboration across physics, biology, engineering, and clinical disciplines—which is often lacking or inefficient.
- **Educational Deficits**: Limited training in nanomedicine for healthcare professionals can hinder clinical adoption and appropriate patient care.

CONCLUSION

Nanotechnology has emerged as a transformative force in contemporary medicine, offering groundbreaking solutions in diagnostics, therapeutics, and regenerative medicine. Its ability to operate at the molecular and cellular levels allows for unprecedented precision in drug delivery, early disease detection, and tissue engineering—paving the way for a new era of personalized and predictive healthcare.

The interdisciplinary assessment presented in this study highlights both the remarkable potential and the inherent challenges of applying nanotechnology in clinical settings. Experimental findings—particularly in the targeted treatment of cancer using folic acid-functionalized liposomal doxorubicin—demonstrate significant improvements in therapeutic efficacy and reduction of systemic toxicity, validating the scientific and practical merit of nano-enabled medical strategies. However, the translation of these advances into routine clinical use is hindered by biological uncertainties, regulatory complexities, manufacturing barriers, and ethical considerations. Addressing these limitations through collaborative, cross-sector innovation is critical for fully realizing the promise of nanomedicine.

In conclusion, while nanotechnology is not a panacea, it is a powerful tool that, when responsibly developed and applied, has the potential to reshape the future of healthcare. Continued investment in interdisciplinary research, standardization, and public engagement will be essential for transitioning from experimental success to widespread clinical impact.

REFERENCES

[1]. 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
[2]. Bai, X., Wang, Y., Song, Z., Feng, Y., Chen, Y., & Zhang, D. (2021). The applications of nanomaterials in tissue engineering. Bioactive Materials, 6(4), 1062–1081. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bioactmat.2020.09.018
[3]. 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
[4]. Bhushan, B. (Ed.). (2017). Springer handbook of nanotechnology (4th ed.). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-49347-1
[5]. Brigger, I., Dubernet, C., & Couvreur, P. (2002). Nanoparticles in cancer therapy and diagnosis. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 54(5), 631–651. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-409X(02)00044-3
[6]. Cho, K., Wang, X., Nie, S., Chen, Z. G., & Shin, D. M. (2008). Therapeutic nanoparticles for drug delivery in cancer. Clinical Cancer Research, 14(5), 1310–1316. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-07-1441
[7]. Etheridge, M. L., Campbell, S. A., Erdman, A. G., Haynes, C. L., Wolf, S. M., & McCullough, J. (2013). The big picture on nanomedicine: The state of investigational and approved nanomedicine products. Nanomedicine: Nanotechnology, Biology and Medicine, 9(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nano.2012.05.013
[8]. Farokhzad, O. C., & Langer, R. (2009). Impact of nanotechnology on drug delivery. ACS Nano, 3(1), 16–20. https://doi.org/10.1021/nn900002m
[9]. Ferrari, M. (2005). Cancer nanotechnology: Opportunities and challenges. Nature Reviews Cancer, 5(3), 161–171. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc1566
[10]. Gao, H. (2016). Progress and perspectives on targeting nanoparticles for brain drug delivery. Acta Pharmaceutica Sinica B, 6(4), 268–286. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsb.2016.05.013
[11]. Hossen, S., Hossain, M. K., Basher, M. K., Mia, M. N. H., Rahman, M. T., & Uddin, M. J. (2019). Smart nanocarrier-based drug delivery systems for cancer therapy and toxicity studies: A review. Journal of Advanced Research, 15, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jare.2018.06.005
[12]. Kinnear, C., Moore, T. L., Rodriguez-Lorenzo, L., Rothen-Rutishauser, B., & Petri-Fink, A. (2017). Form follows function: Nanoparticle shape and its implications for nanomedicine. Chemical Reviews, 117(17), 11476–11521. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemrev.7b00194
[13]. Liu, Y., & Miyoshi, H. (2007). Nanomedicine for drug delivery and imaging: A promising avenue for cancer therapy and diagnosis using targeted functional nanoparticles. International Journal of Cancer, 120(12), 2527–2537. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijc.22709
[14]. Misra, R., Acharya, S., & Sahoo, S. K. (2010). Cancer nanotechnology: Application of nanotechnology in cancer therapy. Drug Discovery Today, 15(19–20), 842–850. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2010.08.006
[15]. Moghimi, S. M., Hunter, A. C., & Murray, J. C. (2005). Nanomedicine: Current status and future prospects. FASEB Journal, 19(3), 311–330. https://doi.org/10.1096/fj.04-2747rev
[16]. Nikalje, A. P. (2015). Nanotechnology and its applications in medicine. Medicinal Chemistry, 5(2), 81–89. https://doi.org/10.4172/2161-0444.1000247
[17]. Pelaz, B., Alexiou, C., Alvarez-Puebla, R. A., Alves, F., Andrews, A. M., Ashraf, S., … Parak, W. J. (2017). Diverse applications of nanomedicine. ACS Nano, 11(3), 2313–2381. https://doi.org/10.1021/acsnano.6b06040
[18]. Riehemann, K., Schneider, S. W., Luger, T. A., Godin, B., Ferrari, M., & Fuchs, H. (2009). Nanomedicine—Challenge and perspectives. Angewandte Chemie International Edition, 48(5), 872–897. https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.200802585
[19]. 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
[20]. Sun, T. M., Wang, J., Zhu, Y. H., Wang, J., Liu, Y., & Zhuo, R. X. (2014). Engineered nanoparticles for drug delivery in cancer therapy. Angewandte Chemie International Edition, 53(46), 12320–12364. https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.201403044