www.idosr.org
Mercy
©IDOSR PUBLICATIONS
ISSN: 2550-794X
International Digital Organization for Scientific Research
IDOSR JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH 10(3):95-103, 2025.
https://doi.org/10.59298/IDOSRJSR/2024/10.3.95103
IDOSRJSR10.300000

Toxicological and Regulatory Aspects of Nanomedicine in Oncology: Safety, Efficacy, and Translation

Mercy Latricia

Department of Pharmacognosy Kampala International University Uganda
Email: atricia.mercy@studwc.kiu.ac.ug

ABSTRACT

Nanomedicine has emerged as a transformative approach in oncology, offering promising advances in cancer diagnostics, targeted therapy, and personalized treatment. Despite its immense potential, concerns regarding the toxicological profile, biosafety, and regulatory approval of nanomedical formulations remain significant barriers to clinical translation. This review provides a comprehensive analysis of the toxicological implications and regulatory considerations associated with nanomedicine use in oncology. It discusses the pharmacokinetics, biodistribution, immunogenicity, and potential cytotoxicity of various nanocarriers, including liposomes, dendrimers, metallic nanoparticles, and polymeric nanostructures. The review highlights the challenges in evaluating long-term safety due to the unique physicochemical properties of nanoparticles, such as size, shape, surface charge, and coating. Furthermore, we examine the current regulatory frameworks adopted by agencies like the FDA and EMA, focusing on preclinical evaluation, Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP), clinical trial design, and post-marketing surveillance. Case studies of approved nano-oncology drugs such as Doxil® and Abraxane® are presented to elucidate the pathway from bench to bedside. The article underscores the urgent need for standardized toxicity testing protocols, harmonized regulatory guidelines, and multidisciplinary collaboration to ensure the safe and effective integration of nanomedicine into routine oncologic care. As the field advances, addressing these toxicological and regulatory challenges will be crucial to harnessing the full therapeutic potential of nanotechnology in cancer treatment.

Keywords: Nanomedicine, Oncology, Toxicology, Regulatory Guidelines, Clinical Translation

INTRODUCTION

Nanotechnology has revolutionized the field of oncology by introducing a wide range of innovative solutions for cancer imaging, diagnosis, drug delivery, and the development of personalized treatment strategies[1–4]. The integration of nanotechnology into medicine referred to as nanomedicine entails the use of nanoscale materials (typically between 1 to 100 nanometers) to interact with biological systems for therapeutic and diagnostic purposes[5–9]. Due to their small size and modifiable surface properties, nanomaterials can be engineered to possess unique physicochemical and biological characteristics, enabling them to traverse biological barriers, interact at the cellular and subcellular levels, and deliver therapeutic payloads with enhanced precision.

In the context of cancer therapy, nanomedicine has offered several advantages over traditional treatment modalities[10, 11]. Nanocarriers can be designed to encapsulate chemotherapeutic agents, thereby enhancing drug solubility, improving pharmacokinetics, extending circulation time, and facilitating targeted delivery to tumor tissues[12–14]. This selective accumulation in tumors often achieved through mechanisms like the enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect or active targeting using ligands can significantly reduce off-target effects and systemic toxicity[15–17]. Moreover, multifunctional nanoplatforms can simultaneously serve as diagnostic and therapeutic tools (so-called "theranostics"), enabling real-time monitoring of treatment response[2, 16, 18].

However, while the biomedical potential of nanomedicine is immense, there are notable challenges that complicate its clinical application, especially in oncology. Chief among these are concerns regarding the toxicological profile of nanomaterials[19]. The very features that make nanoparticles suitable for targeted therapy such as high surface reactivity, prolonged circulation, and enhanced cellular uptake may also result in unintended interactions with non-target tissues and biomolecules. Nanoparticles can trigger oxidative stress, inflammation, immunogenicity, genotoxicity, and long-term accumulation in organs such as the liver, spleen,

lungs, and kidneys. Furthermore, their biotransformation, degradation pathways, and elimination from the body are not always well understood, leading to uncertainties about long-term safety[20].

The complexity of nanomaterials poses unique challenges for toxicological evaluation. Traditional toxicology tools and guidelines, which were developed for conventional small-molecule drugs or bulk materials, are often inadequate for assessing the nuanced behaviors of nanoparticles[21]. For example, characteristics such as shape, size, surface charge, coating, and aggregation state can influence nanoparticle toxicity in ways that are not yet fully predictable. Consequently, there is a pressing need for standardized protocols and predictive models that can accurately assess nanoparticle safety across preclinical and clinical stages[22].

In addition to toxicological concerns, regulatory frameworks governing the development and approval of nanomedicine are still evolving and, in many cases, lag behind scientific progress. Regulatory agencies such as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the European Medicines Agency (EMA), and others face the challenge of adapting existing drug approval processes to accommodate the complexity and diversity of nanomedicines[23]. Current regulatory pathways may not fully account for nanoparticle-specific parameters, leading to ambiguity in safety thresholds, quality control, and manufacturing standards. Moreover, the absence of internationally harmonized guidelines complicates global development and commercialization, contributing to delays in clinical translation[24]. The regulatory uncertainty is compounded by gaps in scientific data, particularly regarding long-term effects, environmental safety, and the behavior of nanomaterials under real-world conditions. As a result, many promising nano-formulations that show excellent preclinical efficacy fail to reach the clinic. Bridging this translational gap requires a multidisciplinary effort involving toxicologists, clinicians, material scientists, and regulatory bodies to establish robust evaluation frameworks that balance innovation with patient safety[24, 25]. This review aims to critically examine the toxicological and regulatory dimensions of nanomedicine in oncology. By synthesizing current evidence and identifying existing gaps, we seek to provide a comprehensive understanding of the potential risks associated with nanotherapeutics and propose strategies to mitigate them. Furthermore, the review highlights recent advancements in in vitro and in vivo testing models, discusses emerging regulatory trends, and outlines a roadmap for accelerating the safe clinical adoption of nanomedicine in cancer care. Ultimately, improving the safety profile and regulatory clarity of nanomedicine will be crucial for unlocking its full potential in transforming cancer treatment.

2. Toxicological Considerations in Nanomedicine for Oncology

2.1 Nanoparticle–Biological Interactions

Nanoparticles (NPs) exhibit complex interactions with biological systems that influence their pharmacokinetics, biodistribution, and safety profiles. Upon administration whether intravenous, oral, or inhalational nanoparticles immediately encounter a biological milieu rich in proteins, lipids, and other biomolecules[26, 27]. This leads to the rapid formation of a "protein corona", a dynamic layer of adsorbed proteins that alters the nanoparticle's original surface characteristics, masking targeting ligands and affecting cellular uptake, immune recognition, and overall biodistribution[28]. Moreover, opsonisation the process by which serum proteins mark particles for clearance can prompt phagocytic uptake by cells of the mononuclear phagocyte system (MPS), particularly in the liver, spleen, and lungs. These organs act as biological filters and often become unintended sites of accumulation, which may contribute to off-target effects or toxicity.[28, 29]

Nanoparticle behavior is highly dependent on their physicochemical properties, such as **size,** shape, surface charge, hydrophobicity**,** and surface functionalization[30]. For instance, smaller nanoparticles (<10 nm) may undergo rapid renal clearance, while those in the 10–100 nm range tend to accumulate more in tumors via the enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect. Positively charged nanoparticles often exhibit increased cellular uptake but may also disrupt cellular membranes and provoke stronger immune responses compared to neutral or negatively charged ones[31]. Furthermore, nanoparticle interactions can affect cell signaling pathways**,** membrane integrity**,** and organellar functions**,** especially when particles enter cells through endocytosis or membrane penetration[32]. These interactions necessitate careful design and rigorous assessment during preclinical testing to ensure both therapeutic efficacy and safety. Understanding the nuances of nanoparticle-biological interactions is crucial for optimizing delivery systems and minimizing adverse outcomes in nanomedicine applications[33].

2.2 Immunotoxicity and Genotoxicity

The introduction of nanoparticles into the body can elicit undesirable immune and genetic responses, collectively termed immunotoxicity and genotoxicity[34]. These concerns are paramount, particularly in oncology, where nanoparticles are frequently used to deliver cytotoxic drugs or imaging agents. Immune system interactions can result in mild to severe inflammatory responses**,** including cytokine storms, which are characterized by an uncontrolled release of pro-inflammatory cytokines such as IL-6, TNF-α, and IFN-γ. These storms can lead to systemic inflammatory response syndrome (SIRS), multi-organ dysfunction, and even death in severe cases[35]. Nanoparticles may activate innate immune responses by engaging toll-like receptors (TLRs) or complement pathways. Surface properties, including shape, charge, and material composition, significantly influence immunogenicity. For example, cationic liposomes and dendrimers are more likely to trigger mast cell degranulation and complement activation. Additionally, contaminants or endotoxins present during nanoparticle synthesis can amplify immune reactions if not properly removed[36, 37].

From a genotoxicity standpoint, several classes of nanoparticles, including silver nanoparticles, quantum dots, titanium dioxide, and carbon-based nanomaterials, have been shown to induce DNA strand breaks, chromosomal aberrations, and mitochondrial dysfunction[38]. These effects are often mediated through the generation of reactive oxygen species (ROS), leading to oxidative stress, lipid peroxidation, and cellular apoptosis. The small size of nanoparticles allows them to enter the nucleus or interfere with DNA replication and repair mechanisms[38].

Given their potential to alter gene expression or damage genetic material, nanoparticles may carry a carcinogenic risk, especially with repeated or long-term exposure. Therefore, comprehensive in vitro and in vivo assays, including Ames test, comet assay, and micronucleus tests, are essential for evaluating the immuno- and genotoxic profiles of new nanomaterials before clinical translation[39].

2.3 Long-Term and Cumulative Toxicity

While the immediate effects of nanoparticle exposure are often well studied, the long-term and cumulative toxicity associated with chronic or repeated exposure remains a significant safety concern. Many nanoparticles, especially those that are non-biodegradable or slow to degrade, can persist in tissues and organs for extended periods, leading to bioaccumulation and biopersistence[40, 41]. Over time, this may result in chronic inflammation, organ dysfunction, or even tumorigenesis. Materials such as polymeric nanoparticles (e.g., PLA, PLGA), silica, gold, and metal oxides can accumulate in organs like the liver, spleen, kidneys, and lungs, potentially interfering with normal physiology[42]. Studies have shown that gold nanoparticles may remain in the liver for months, where they can elicit fibrosis or hepatocellular damage depending on their dose and coating. Similarly, carbon nanotubes have been implicated in lung fibrosis and granuloma formation akin to asbestos-like pathologies[42].

Moreover, nanoparticles that cross the blood-brain barrier (BBB) may accumulate in the brain, raising concerns about neurotoxicity, particularly with materials such as quantum dots and silver nanoparticles[43]. Some nanoparticles can disrupt endocrine signaling or accumulate in reproductive organs, posing additional concerns for fertility and developmental toxicity. The clearance mechanisms for nanoparticles—via renal excretion, biliary elimination, or macrophage-mediated degradation—can be inefficient for certain formulations, especially those exceeding renal filtration limits or those resistant to enzymatic breakdown. As a result, longitudinal studies using animal models and advanced imaging techniques are necessary to track biodistribution and accumulation over time[43].

Regulatory agencies increasingly demand chronic toxicity studies spanning months to years, along with toxicokinetic modeling, to assess the risks of long-term nanoparticle use. Addressing cumulative toxicity is essential for the safe and sustainable development of nanomedicines, especially those intended for repeated or lifelong administration in chronic conditions such as cancer[44, 45].

3. Safety Evaluation and Preclinical Testing

The successful development of nanomedicine hinges on rigorous safety evaluation and preclinical testing to ensure minimal toxicity and optimal efficacy. Due to their nanoscale properties, nanomedicines interact with biological systems differently than traditional therapeutics, necessitating comprehensive safety assessments before clinical translation. Preclinical testing typically follows a tiered approach, beginning with in vitro assays to identify potential cytotoxic effects, followed by in vivo studies to evaluate systemic toxicity, pharmacokinetics, and biodistribution.[46] These tests aim to characterize the dose-response relationship, identify target organs of toxicity, and assess potential immunogenicity. Safety evaluation must also consider nanoparticle-specific factors such as size, surface charge, material composition, shape, and functionalization, all of which influence biological interactions. Moreover, the regulatory landscape for nanomedicine is still evolving, prompting the need for standardized protocols and robust testing strategies. Alongside traditional models, newer in vitro and in vivo platforms are being integrated into preclinical pipelines to enhance predictive accuracy and reduce reliance on animal testing. Importantly, safety evaluations must go beyond short-term toxicity and include long-term effects such as chronic exposure, genotoxicity, and reproductive toxicity[46]. A multidisciplinary framework combining materials science, pharmacology, and toxicology is essential to achieve a comprehensive understanding of nanomedicine safety prior to human trials.

3.1 In Vitro Assays

In vitro assays are a foundational component of nanomedicine safety evaluation, offering a cost-effective, rapid, and ethical approach for preliminary toxicity screening. These assays are conducted using cultured cancerous and non-cancerous human or animal cell lines to assess cell viability, membrane integrity, oxidative stress, and apoptotic activity[47]. Commonly used tests include the MTT assay, which measures mitochondrial metabolic activity; the LDH release assay, which indicates cell membrane damage; and reactive oxygen species (ROS) assays that reveal oxidative stress induced by nanoparticles. Additional assays such as flow cytometry, comet assays, and ELISA are used to assess apoptosis, genotoxicity, and inflammatory responses[48, 49]. However, while in vitro systems offer high-throughput screening potential, they lack the complexity of whole organisms and do not fully mimic the interactions between nanoparticles and systemic physiological processes such as immune responses, metabolism, or clearance. Furthermore, results can vary significantly depending on the cell type, nanoparticle concentration, exposure duration, and particle surface modifications[50]. These limitations underscore the importance of interpreting in vitro results with caution and supplementing them with more

advanced models. Despite these challenges, in vitro assays remain indispensable for initial risk assessment and for refining nanomedicine formulations before moving to animal studies.

3.2 In Vivo Animal Studies

In vivo animal studies play a critical role in evaluating the safety, efficacy, and biodistribution of nanomedicines under physiologically relevant conditions. Rodent models, particularly mice and rats, are most commonly employed due to their genetic similarity to humans, well-characterized immune systems, and ease of handling[51]. These models provide crucial insights into pharmacokinetics (absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion), organ-specific toxicity, immunogenic responses, and the therapeutic window of nanoparticle formulations. Key endpoints include histopathological examinations of organs such as the liver, kidney, spleen, lungs, and brain, which are common sites of nanoparticle accumulation. Blood chemistry analyses (e.g., liver enzymes, kidney markers, hematological indices) offer additional data on systemic toxicity[52]. Tumor-bearing models are also utilized to evaluate targeting efficiency and therapeutic efficacy. Despite their value, animal studies are resource-intensive and face ethical concerns and translational limitations due to interspecies differences. Therefore, optimizing study design such as using humanized mouse models, applying non-invasive imaging techniques, and ensuring adequate control groups is essential for generating meaningful data. Regulatory agencies often require comprehensive in vivo data before approving clinical trials, making animal studies a cornerstone of preclinical nanomedicine development[53]. Nonetheless, complementary models are increasingly being adopted to enhance predictive relevance and reduce animal use.

3.3 Emerging Models

Emerging models such as 3D cell cultures, organoids, and zebrafish embryos are revolutionizing the field of nanomedicine safety testing by bridging the gap between traditional in vitro assays and in vivo animal models[54]. These systems offer a more physiologically relevant environment that mimics tissue architecture, cellular heterogeneity, and complex biological interactions. Three-dimensional (3D) cell cultures, for instance, allow nanoparticles to penetrate tissue-like matrices, simulating real drug diffusion and cellular uptake dynamics. Organoids, derived from stem cells or primary tissues, replicate the microanatomy and function of organs such as the liver, kidney, and brain, providing valuable insights into organ-specific toxicity and nanoparticle behavior. Zebrafish embryos serve as whole-organism models that enable high-throughput, real-time imaging of nanoparticle distribution and toxicity, while maintaining genetic and physiological similarities to humans[55]. These emerging platforms offer several advantages, including reduced ethical concerns, scalability, and the ability to perform longitudinal assessments. Moreover, they facilitate early detection of off-target effects and support mechanism-of-action studies. However, standardization, reproducibility, and regulatory acceptance remain challenges[56]. Nonetheless, these advanced models are gaining traction as complementary tools in the nanotoxicology pipeline, promising more accurate predictions of human responses while reducing reliance on conventional animal testing.

4. Regulatory Landscape for Nanomedicine in Oncology

4.1 Global Regulatory Frameworks: The regulation of nanomedicines across the globe is governed by major health authorities such as the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the European Medicines Agency (EMA), and Japan's Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA). These agencies have adopted a case-by-case evaluation system for nanomedicinal products, owing to the inherent complexity and novelty of nanotechnology-based therapeutics[57]. While there is a growing recognition of the need for nano-specific regulatory frameworks, most evaluations still rely heavily on traditional pharmaceutical criteria developed for conventional drugs. This approach often fails to fully capture the unique pharmacokinetic, pharmacodynamic, and toxicity profiles of nanoparticles. Despite some guidance documents being issued, there remains a lack of harmonized international standards. Differences in policy among regions can delay market authorization and complicate the global commercialization of nanomedicines[58]. Therefore, there is an urgent need for globally coordinated, nano-specific regulatory guidelines to streamline development and approval processes.

4.2 Regulatory Challenges: The regulatory landscape for nanomedicines faces several key challenges that hinder effective assessment and approval. One major issue is the absence of a universally accepted definition and classification system for nanomedicines, which leads to inconsistencies in regulation across jurisdictions[59]. The inherent complexity of nanocarriers ranging from variations in size, shape, surface modifications, and composition adds another layer of difficulty in standardizing safety and efficacy evaluations. This complexity also makes it hard to extrapolate findings across different formulations, even within the same drug class. Furthermore, the evaluation of generic nanomedicines, known as nanosimilars, is particularly problematic due to difficulties in establishing bioequivalence with reference products. Small differences in manufacturing processes can significantly impact the biological behavior of nanoparticles, making traditional bioequivalence approaches inadequate[60]. These challenges call for novel regulatory tools, robust analytical techniques, and updated evaluation metrics tailored specifically to the unique characteristics of nanotherapeutics.

4.3 GMP and Quality Assurance: Ensuring the quality, safety, and efficacy of nanomedicines requires strict adherence to Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP), which play a crucial role in maintaining product consistency, sterility, and reproducibility[61]. Due to the nanoscale complexity and sensitivity of these formulations, any variation in production can lead to significant differences in clinical performance or safety outcomes. Regulatory agencies now require comprehensive physicochemical characterization of nanoparticles,

including parameters such as particle size distribution, zeta potential, morphology, surface chemistry, and drug loading efficiency[61]. Additionally, critical quality attributes must be monitored throughout manufacturing and storage to detect potential degradation or aggregation. The absence of well-defined quality control protocols specific to nanomedicines further complicates compliance, especially for advanced systems like liposomes or polymeric nanoparticles[61]. Thus, integrating quality-by-design (QbD) principles and advanced analytical tools is increasingly emphasized. A rigorous GMP framework, coupled with transparent documentation and continuous monitoring, is essential to meet regulatory expectations and ensure clinical reliability[62, 63].

5. Case Studies: Approved Nano-Oncology Therapeutics

5.1 Doxil® (PEGylated Liposomal Doxorubicin): Doxil® is the first FDA-approved nanomedicine, marking a pivotal advancement in oncology therapeutics. It utilizes a PEGylated liposomal delivery system to encapsulate the chemotherapeutic agent doxorubicin[64]. The polyethylene glycol (PEG) coating significantly extends the drug's circulation time by evading recognition and clearance by the mononuclear phagocyte system, thereby improving its accumulation at tumor sites via the enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect[64]. This targeted approach reduces systemic toxicity and improves therapeutic outcomes in cancers such as ovarian cancer, multiple myeloma, and Kaposi's sarcoma. Despite its success, Doxil® also highlighted important manufacturing challenges, particularly in achieving batch-to-batch reproducibility on a commercial scale. Additionally, the PEGylated formulation has been associated with immune hypersensitivity reactions, including hand-foot syndrome and infusion-related side effects[65]. These concerns underscore the need for robust quality control and continuous monitoring in nanoformulations. Nonetheless, Doxil® remains a benchmark in nanomedicine development.

5.2 Abraxane® (Albumin-bound Paclitaxel): Abraxane® represents a major innovation in the delivery of paclitaxel, a potent chemotherapeutic agent used in the treatment of breast, lung, and pancreatic cancers. By binding paclitaxel to albumin nanoparticles, Abraxane® eliminates the need for conventional solvents like Cremophor EL, which are known to cause severe hypersensitivity reactions and necessitate steroid premedication[66]. This albumin-bound formulation enhances drug solubility, facilitates transport across endothelial cells, and exploits natural pathways of albumin uptake by tumors, thus improving drug accumulation at the tumor site. Clinically, Abraxane® demonstrates superior tolerability and reduced toxicity while maintaining or enhancing anticancer efficacy compared to traditional formulations. Its approval by the FDA reflects a successful alignment of preclinical safety, clinical efficacy, and scalable manufacturing practices[67]. The development and regulatory approval of Abraxane® exemplify how nanotechnology can address long-standing drug delivery limitations and pave the way for safer, more effective cancer therapies through rational nanoparticle design.

6. Strategies to Improve Safety and Regulatory Compliance

Ensuring the safety and regulatory acceptance of nano-oncology therapeutics necessitates a combination of advanced design strategies, predictive modeling, and international collaboration. One key approach is surface modification, where nanoparticles are coated with biocompatible polymers such as polyethylene glycol (PEG) to enhance stability, reduce immunogenicity, and minimize off-target effects[68]. This helps improve the pharmacokinetics and biodistribution of nanodrugs while reducing adverse immune responses. Theranostic platforms, which integrate therapeutic and diagnostic functions into a single nanosystem, offer real-time monitoring of drug delivery and treatment efficacy, providing valuable feedback that can guide personalized therapy. Additionally, the adoption of nano-specific quantitative structure-activity relationship (nano-QSAR) models allows for the prediction of toxicological and pharmacological profiles based on nanoparticle physicochemical properties, facilitating safer and more rational design[68]. Furthermore, the development of harmonized regulatory guidelines through collaboration among global agencies, academia, and industry stakeholders is critical for standardizing evaluation criteria, streamlining approval processes, and ensuring consistent safety assessments across international markets.

CONCLUSION

Nanomedicine offers a new frontier in oncology, with the potential to revolutionize cancer treatment through precise targeting and enhanced efficacy. However, its successful clinical translation is heavily dependent on addressing toxicological concerns and establishing robust regulatory mechanisms. Bridging the gap between innovative research and clinical application will require a multidisciplinary approach involving toxicologists, oncologists, regulators, and nanotechnologists. Developing predictive models for nanotoxicity, standardized characterization protocols, and unified regulatory frameworks will be critical in accelerating the safe integration of nanomedicine into cancer care. As the field matures, the balance between innovation and regulation must be carefully maintained to fully realize the promise of nanotechnology in oncology.

REFERENCES

1. Alghamdi, M.A., Fallica, A.N., Virzì, N., Kesharwani, P., Pittalà, V., Greish, K.: The Promise of Nanotechnology in Personalized Medicine. J Pers Med. 12, 673 (2022). https://doi.org/10.3390/jpm12050673

2. Ammar, M.M., Ali, R., Abd Elaziz, N.A., Habib, H., Abbas, F.M., Yassin, M.T., Maniah, K., Abdelaziz, R.: Nanotechnology in oncology: advances in biosynthesis, drug delivery, and theranostics. Discov Onc. 16, 1172 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/s12672-025-02664-3
3. Anjum, S., Ishaque, S., Fatima, H., Farooq, W., Hano, C., Abbasi, B.H., Anjum, I.: Emerging Applications of Nanotechnology in Healthcare Systems: Grand Challenges and Perspectives. Pharmaceuticals (Basel). 14, 707 (2021). https://doi.org/10.3390/ph14080707
4. Alum, E.U., Nwuruku, O.A., Ugwu, O.P.-C., Uti, D.E., Alum, B.N., Edwin, N.: Harnessing nature: plant-derived nanocarriers for targeted drug delivery in cancer therapy. Phytomedicine Plus. 5, 100828 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.phyplu.2025.100828
5. Bhange, M., Telange, D.: Convergence of nanotechnology and artificial intelligence in the fight against liver cancer: a comprehensive review. Discov Onc. 16, 77 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/s12672-025-01821-y
6. Chen, Y., Zhou, Q., Jia, Z., Cheng, N., Zhang, S., Chen, W., Wang, L.: Enhancing cancer immunotherapy: Nanotechnology-mediated immunotherapy overcoming immunosuppression. Acta Pharmaceutica Sinica B. 14, 3834–3854 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsb.2024.05.032
7. Hetta, H.F., Ramadan, Y.N., Al-Harbi, A.I., A. Ahmed, E., Battah, B., Abd Ellah, N.H., Zanetti, S., Donadu, M.G.: Nanotechnology as a Promising Approach to Combat Multidrug Resistant Bacteria: A Comprehensive Review and Future Perspectives. Biomedicines. 11, 413 (2023). https://doi.org/10.3390/biomedicines11020413
8. Uti, D.E., Alum, E.U., Atangwho, I.J., Ugwu, O.P.-C., Egbung, G.E., Aja, P.M.: Lipid-based nano-carriers for the delivery of anti-obesity natural compounds: advances in targeted delivery and precision therapeutics. Journal of Nanobiotechnology. 23, 336 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12951-025-03412-z
9. Magadani, R., Ndinteh, D.T., Roux, S., Nangah, L.P., Atangwho, I.J., Uti, D.E., Alum, E.U., Egba, S.I.: Cytotoxic Effects of Lecaniodiscus Cupanioides (Planch.) Extract and Triterpenoids-derived Gold Nanoparticles On MCF-7 Breast Cancer Cell Lines. Anti-Cancer Agents in Medicinal Chemistry (Formerly Current Medicinal Chemistry - Anti-Cancer Agents). 25, 841–850 (2025). https://doi.org/10.2174/0118715206325529241004064307
10. Gholami, A., Mohkam, M., Soleimanian, S., Sadraeian, M., Lauto, A.: Bacterial nanotechnology as a paradigm in targeted cancer therapeutic delivery and immunotherapy. Microsyst Nanoeng. 10, 1–43 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41378-024-00743-z
11. Uti, D.E., Atangwho, I.J., Alum, E.U., Ntaobeten, E., Obeten, U.N., Bawa, I., Agada, S.A., Ukam, C.I.-O., Egbung, G.E.: Antioxidants in cancer therapy mitigating lipid peroxidation without compromising treatment through nanotechnology. Discover Nano. 20, 70 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1186/s11671-025-04248-0
12. Anwar, D.M., Hedeya, H.Y., Ghozlan, S.H., Ewas, B.M., Khattab, S.N.: Surface-modified lipid-based nanocarriers as a pivotal delivery approach for cancer therapy: application and recent advances in targeted cancer treatment. Beni-Suef University Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences. 13, 106 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1186/s43088-024-00566-x
13. Meng, X., Shen, Y., Zhao, H., Lu, X., Wang, Z., Zhao, Y.: Redox-manipulating nanocarriers for anticancer drug delivery: a systematic review. J Nanobiotechnology. 22, 587 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12951-024-02859-w
14. Lombardo, D., Kiselev, M.A.: Methods of Liposomes Preparation: Formation and Control Factors of Versatile Nanocarriers for Biomedical and Nanomedicine Application. Pharmaceutics. 14, 543 (2022). https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics14030543
15. Li, M., Jiang, S., Simon, J., Paßlick, D., Frey, M.-L., Wagner, M., Mailänder, V., Crespy, D., Landfester, K.: Brush Conformation of Polyethylene Glycol Determines the Stealth Effect of Nanocarriers in the Low Protein Adsorption Regime. Nano Lett. 21, 1591–1598 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.nanolett.0c03756
16. Kumar, R., Dkhar, D.S., Kumari, R., Divya, Mahapatra, S., Srivastava, A., Dubey, V.K., Chandra, P.: Ligand conjugated lipid-based nanocarriers for cancer theranostics. Biotechnology and Bioengineering. 119, 3022–3043 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1002/bit.28205
17. Mi, P.: Stimuli-responsive nanocarriers for drug delivery, tumor imaging, therapy and theranostics. Theranostics. 10, 4557–4588 (2020). https://doi.org/10.7150/thno.38069
18. Ammar, M.M., Ali, R., Abd Elaziz, N.A., Habib, H., Abbas, F.M., Yassin, M.T., Maniah, K., Abdelaziz, R.: Nanotechnology in oncology: advances in biosynthesis, drug delivery, and theranostics. Discov Onc. 16, 1172 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/s12672-025-02664-3
19. Sorrentino, C., Ciummo, S.L., Fieni, C., Di Carlo, E.: Nanomedicine for cancer patient-centered care. MedComm (2020). 5, e767 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1002/mco2.767
20. Vandghanooni, S., Jaymand, M., Eskandani, M.: The use of nanomedicines in the healthcare systems: a policy brief. Drug Development and Industrial Pharmacy. 51, 523–533 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1080/03639045.2025.2489594

21. Desai, N., Rana, D., Patel, M., Bajwa, N., Prasad, R., Vora, L.K.: Nanoparticle Therapeutics in Clinical Perspective: Classification, Marketed Products, and Regulatory Landscape. Small. 21, 2502315 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1002/smll.202502315
22. Zhang, N., Xiong, G., Liu, Z.: Toxicity of metal-based nanoparticles: Challenges in the nano era. Front Bioeng Biotechnol. 10, 1001572 (2022). https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2022.1001572
23. Rodríguez-Gómez, F.D., Monferrer, D., Penon, O., Rivera-Gil, P.: Regulatory pathways and guidelines for nanotechnology-enabled health products: a comparative review of EU and US frameworks. Front Med (Lausanne). 12, 1544393 (2025). https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2025.1544393
24. Ma, X., Tian, Y., Yang, R., Wang, H., Allahou, L.W., Chang, J., Williams, G., Knowles, J.C., Poma, A.: Nanotechnology in healthcare, and its safety and environmental risks. Journal of Nanobiotechnology. 22, 715 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12951-024-02901-x
25. Ramos, T.I., Villacis-Aguirre, C.A., López-Aguilar, K.V., Santiago Padilla, L., Altamirano, C., Toledo, J.R., Santiago Vispo, N.: The Hitchhiker's Guide to Human Therapeutic Nanoparticle Development. Pharmaceutics. 14, 247 (2022). https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics14020247
26. Tripathi, D., Pandey, P., Sharma, S., Rai, A.K., Prabhu B.H., M.: Advances in nanomaterials for precision drug delivery: Insights into pharmacokinetics and toxicity. Bioimpacts. 15, 30573 (2024). https://doi.org/10.34172/bi.30573
27. Janjua, T.I., Cao, Y., Kleitz, F., Linden, M., Yu, C., Popat, A.: Silica nanoparticles: A review of their safety and current strategies to overcome biological barriers. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews. 203, 115115 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2023.115115
28. Mehta, M., Bui, T.A., Yang, X., Aksoy, Y., Goldys, E.M., Deng, W.: Lipid-Based Nanoparticles for Drug/Gene Delivery: An Overview of the Production Techniques and Difficulties Encountered in Their Industrial Development. ACS Mater. Au. 3, 600–619 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1021/acsmaterialsau.3c00032
29. Haripriyaa, M., Suthindhiran, K.: Pharmacokinetics of nanoparticles: current knowledge, future directions and its implications in drug delivery. Future Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences. 9, 113 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1186/s43094-023-00569-y
30. Joudeh, N., Linke, D.: Nanoparticle classification, physicochemical properties, characterization, and applications: a comprehensive review for biologists. Journal of Nanobiotechnology. 20, 262 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12951-022-01477-8
31. Zhao, Z., Ukidve, A., Krishnan, V., Mitragotri, S.: Effect of physicochemical and surface properties on *in vivo* fate of drug nanocarriers. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews. 143, 3–21 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2019.01.002
32. Sanità, G., Carrese, B., Lamberti, A.: Nanoparticle Surface Functionalization: How to Improve Biocompatibility and Cellular Internalization. Front. Mol. Biosci. 7, (2020). https://doi.org/10.3389/fmolb.2020.587012
33. Kim, K.-M., Choi, M.-H., Lee, J.-K., Jeong, J., Kim, Y.-R., Kim, M.-K., Paek, S.-M., Oh, J.-M.: Physicochemical properties of surface charge-modified ZnO nanoparticles with different particle sizes. IJN. 9, 41–56 (2014). https://doi.org/10.2147/IJN.S57923
34. Kyriakides, T.R., Raj, A., Tseng, T.H., Xiao, H., Nguyen, R., Mohammed, F.S., Halder, S., Xu, M., Wu, M.J., Bao, S., Sheu, W.C.: Biocompatibility of nanomaterials and their immunological properties. Biomed Mater. 16, 10.1088/1748-605X/abe5fa (2021). https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-605X/abe5fa
35. Liu, J., Liu, Z., Pang, Y., Zhou, H.: The interaction between nanoparticles and immune system: application in the treatment of inflammatory diseases. J Nanobiotechnology. 20, 127 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12951-022-01343-7
36. Ahmar Rauf, M., Nisar, M., Abdelhady, H., Gavande, N., Iyer, A.K.: Nanomedicine approaches to reduce cytokine storms in severe infections. Drug Discov Today. 27, 103355 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2022.103355
37. Uti, D.E., Atangwho, I.J., Omang, W.A., Alum, E.U., Obeten, U.N., Udeozor, P.A., Agada, S.A., Bawa, I., Ogbu, C.O.: Cytokines as key players in obesity low grade inflammation and related complications. Obesity Medicine. 54, 100585 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obmed.2025.100585
38. Shukla, R.K., Badiye, A., Vajpayee, K., Kapoor, N.: Genotoxic Potential of Nanoparticles: Structural and Functional Modifications in DNA. Front Genet. 12, 728250 (2021). https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2021.728250
39. Gutleb, A.C., Murugadoss, S., Stępnik, M., SenGupta, T., El Yamani, N., Longhin, E.M., Olsen, A.-K.H., Wyrzykowska, E., Jagiello, K., Judzinska, B., Cambier, S., Honza, T., McFadden, E., Shaposhnikov, S., Puzyn, T., Serchi, T., Weber, P., Arnesdotter, E., Skakalova, V., Jirsova, K., Grudzinski, I.P., Collins, A., Rundén-Pran, E., Dusinska, M.: New Approach Methods (NAMs) for genotoxicity assessment of nano- and advanced materials; Advantages and challenges. Mutation Research - Genetic Toxicology and Environmental Mutagenesis. 904, 503867 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mrgentox.2025.503867
40. Missaoui, W.N., Arnold, R.D., Cummings, B.S.: Toxicological status of nanoparticles: What we know and what we don't know. Chem Biol Interact. 295, 1–12 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbi.2018.07.015

41. Pathak, G., Mangla, S., Gupta, G.K., Bhan, V., Kapoor, R.K.: Toxicological assessment and risk management of nanoparticles mediated composite materials-critical review: state of the art. Discov Polym. 2, 12 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/s44347-025-00023-7
42. Shi, Y., Li, X., Li, Z., Sun, J., Gao, T., Wei, G., Guo, Q.: Nano-formulations in disease therapy: designs, advances, challenges, and future directions. J Nanobiotechnology. 23, 396 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12951-025-03442-7
43. Tripathy, D.B., Pradhan, S., Gupta, A., Agarwal, P.: Nanoparticles induced neurotoxicity. Nanotoxicology. 19, 325–352 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1080/17435390.2025.2488310
44. Mohammadpour, R., Cheney, D.L., Grunberger, J.W., Yazdimamaghani, M., Jedrzkiewicz, J., Isaacson, K.J., Dobrovolskaia, M.A., Ghandehari, H.: One-year Chronic Toxicity Evaluation of Single Dose Intravenously Administered Silica Nanoparticles in Mice and their Ex vivo Human Hemocompatibility. J Control Release. 324, 471–481 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2020.05.027
45. Zielińska, A., Costa, B., Ferreira, M.V., Miguéis, D., Louros, J.M.S., Durazzo, A., Lucarini, M., Eder, P., V. Chaud, M., Morsink, M., Willemen, N., Severino, P., Santini, A., Souto, E.B.: Nanotoxicology and Nanosafety: Safety-by-Design and Testing at a Glance. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 17, 4657 (2020). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17134657
46. Mangla, B., Kumar, P., Javed, S., Pathan, T., Ahsan, W., Aggarwal, G.: Regulating nanomedicines: challenges, opportunities, and the path forward. Nanomedicine. 0, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/17435889.2025.2533107
47. Nogueira, D.R., Mitjans, M., Rolim, C.M.B., Vinardell, M.P.: Mechanisms Underlying Cytotoxicity Induced by Engineered Nanomaterials: A Review of In Vitro Studies. Nanomaterials. 4, 454–484 (2014). https://doi.org/10.3390/nano4020454
48. Brassolatti, P., de Almeida Rodolpho, J.M., Franco de Godoy, K., de Castro, C.A., Flores Luna, G.L., Dias de Lima Fragelli, B., Pedrino, M., Assis, M., Nani Leite, M., Cancino-Bernardi, J., Speglich, C., Frade, M.A., de Freitas Anibal, F.: Functionalized Titanium Nanoparticles Induce Oxidative Stress and Cell Death in Human Skin Cells. Int J Nanomedicine. 17, 1495–1509 (2022). https://doi.org/10.2147/IJN.S325767
49. Bhattacharjee, S., de Haan, L.H., Evers, N.M., Jiang, X., Marcelis, A.T., Zuilhof, H., Rietjens, I.M., Alink, G.M.: Role of surface charge and oxidative stress in cytotoxicity of organic monolayer-coated silicon nanoparticles towards macrophage NR8383 cells. Part Fibre Toxicol. 7, 25 (2010). https://doi.org/10.1186/1743-8977-7-25
50. Sampaio, A.R., Maia, R.F., Ciardulli, M.C., Santos, H.A., Sarmento, B.: Organ-on-chip platforms for nanoparticle toxicity and efficacy assessment: Advancing beyond traditional in vitro and in vivo models. Materials Today Bio. 33, 102053 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mtbio.2025.102053
51. Mukherjee, P., Roy, S., Ghosh, D., Nandi, S.K.: Role of animal models in biomedical research: a review. Lab Anim Res. 38, 18 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1186/s42826-022-00128-1
52. Domínguez-Oliva, A., Hernández-Ávalos, I., Martínez-Burnes, J., Olmos-Hernández, A., Verduzco-Mendoza, A., Mota-Rojas, D.: The Importance of Animal Models in Biomedical Research: Current Insights and Applications. Animals. 13, 1223 (2023). https://doi.org/10.3390/ani13071223
53. Frühwein, H., Paul, N.W.: "Lost in translation?" Animal research in the era of precision medicine. J Transl Med. 23, 152 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12967-025-06084-3
54. Yao, Q., Cheng, S., Pan, Q., Yu, J., Cao, G., Li, L., Cao, H.: Organoids: development and applications in disease models, drug discovery, precision medicine, and regenerative medicine. MedComm (2020). 5, e735 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1002/mco2.735
55. Dave, R., Pandey, K., Patel, R., Gour, N., Bhatia, D.: Leveraging 3D cell culture and AI technologies for next-generation drug discovery. Cell Biomaterials. 1, 100050 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celbio.2025.100050
56. Serrano, D.R., Luciano, F.C., Anaya, B.J., Ongoren, B., Kara, A., Molina, G., Ramirez, B.I., Sánchez-Guirales, S.A., Simon, J.A., Tomietto, G., Rapti, C., Ruiz, H.K., Rawat, S., Kumar, D., Lalatsa, A.: Artificial Intelligence (AI) Applications in Drug Discovery and Drug Delivery: Revolutionizing Personalized Medicine. Pharmaceutics. 16, 1328 (2024). https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics16101328
57. Musazzi, U.M., Franzè, S., Condorelli, F., Minghetti, P., Caliceti, P.: Feeding Next-Generation Nanomedicines to Europe: Regulatory and Quality Challenges. Adv Healthc Mater. 12, 2301956 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1002/adhm.202301956
58. Farjadian, F., Ghasemi, A., Gohari, O., Roointan, A., Karimi, M., Hamblin, M.R.: Nanopharmaceuticals and nanomedicines currently on the market: challenges and opportunities. Nanomedicine (Lond). 14, 93–126 (2019). https://doi.org/10.2217/nnm-2018-0120
59. Foulkes, R., Man, E., Thind, J., Yeung, S., Joy, A., Hoskins, C.: The regulation of nanomaterials and nanomedicines for clinical application: current and future perspectives. Biomaterials Science. 8, 4653–4664 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1039/D0BM00558D
60. Nyazema, N.Z., Chanyandura, J.T., Kumar, P.O.: Nanomedicine and regulatory science: the challenges in Africa. Front. Biomater. Sci. 2, (2023). https://doi.org/10.3389/fbiom.2023.1184662

61. Vandghanooni, S., Jaymand, M., Eskandani, M.: The use of nanomedicines in the healthcare systems: a policy brief. Drug Development and Industrial Pharmacy. 51, 523–533 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1080/03639045.2025.2489594
62. Yang, S., Hu, X., Zhu, J., Zheng, B., Bi, W., Wang, X., Wu, J., Mi, Z., Wu, Y.: Aspects and Implementation of Pharmaceutical Quality by Design from Conceptual Frameworks to Industrial Applications. Pharmaceutics. 17, 623 (2025). https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics17050623
63. Simões, A., Veiga, F., Vitorino, C.: Question-based review for pharmaceutical development: An enhanced quality approach. European Journal of Pharmaceutics and Biopharmaceutics. 195, 114174 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpb.2023.114174
64. Gabizon, A.A., Gabizon-Peretz, S., Modaresahmadi, S., La-Beck, N.M.: Thirty years from FDA approval of pegylated liposomal doxorubicin (Doxil/Caelyx): an updated analysis and future perspective. BMJ Oncol. 4, e000573 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjonc-2024-000573
65. Chen, J., Hu, S., Sun, M., Shi, J., Zhang, H., Yu, H., Yang, Z.: Recent advances and clinical translation of liposomal delivery systems in cancer therapy. European Journal of Pharmaceutical Sciences. 193, 106688 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejps.2023.106688
66. Murphy, G., Brayden, D.J., Cheung, D.L., Liew, A., Fitzgerald, M., Pandit, A.: Albumin-based delivery systems: Recent advances, challenges, and opportunities. Journal of Controlled Release. 380, 375–395 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2025.01.035
67. Cho, H., Jeon, S.I., Ahn, C.-H., Shim, M.K., Kim, K.: Emerging Albumin-Binding Anticancer Drugs for Tumor-Targeted Drug Delivery: Current Understandings and Clinical Translation. Pharmaceutics. 14, 728 (2022). https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics14040728
68. Shirzad, M., Shaban, M., Mohammadzadeh, V., Rahdar, A., Fathi-karkan, S., Hoseini, Z.S., Najafi, M., Kharaba, Z., Aboudzadeh, M.A.: Artificial Intelligence-Assisted Design of Nanomedicines for Breast Cancer Diagnosis and Therapy: Advances, Challenges, and Future Directions. BioNanoSci. 15, 354 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1007/s12668-025-01980-w

CITE AS: Mercy Latricia (2025). Toxicological and Regulatory Aspects of Nanomedicine Oncology: Safety, Efficacy, and Translation. IDOSR JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH 10(3):95-103. https://doi.org/10.59298/IDOSRJSR/2024/10.3.95103