IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 2, November 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

Bridging the Translational Gap in Nanoparticle-Based Drug Delivery Systems: Formulation Strategies, Safety, Scalability and Clinical Perspectives

Mr. Omkar Gosavi[1], Mr. Aniket Bhane[1], Mr. Prathmesh Pawase[1], Mr. Sushant Shinde[2]
[1]Student, Department of Pharmacy,
Pravara Rural Education Society's Institute of Pharmacy, Loni, Maharashtra, India.
[2]Student, Department of Pharmacy,
Pravara Rural Education Society's Pravara Rural College of Pharmacy, Loni, Maharashtra, India.

Abstract : *Nanoparticle-based drug delivery has become an active area of pharmaceutical research because it offers ways to address some of the limitations of conventional dosage forms. Depending on how they are designed, nanoparticles may help improve the apparent solubility or stability of a drug, protect it from degradation, and alter where and how quickly it is released in the body. Researchers have explored several platforms, including liposomes, polymeric nanoparticles, solid lipid nanoparticles, nanostructured lipid carriers, metallic nanoparticles, and lipid nanoparticles. These systems have been studied for conditions such as cancer, infectious diseases, and neurological disorders. Even so, encouraging laboratory results do not always lead to successful medicines. Challenges can arise when a formulation is moved from a small laboratory process to industrial production, or when it encounters the complexity of the human body. This review looks at formulation and characterization methods, biological safety, biodistribution, manufacturing scale-up, quality-by-design, regulatory expectations, and clinical applications. It also considers approaches that may make nanoparticle products more consistent and more suitable for clinical use. Progress will depend on treating formulation, safety, manufacturing, and clinical evaluation as connected parts of the same development process*

Keywords: Nanoparticle drug delivery; nanomedicine; formulation development; liposomes; polymeric nanoparticles; lipid nanoparticles; biocompatibility; toxicity; scale-up; clinical translation

I. INTRODUCTION

A medicine must do more than show pharmacological activity: it also needs to reach the right site in the body, at a useful concentration, and for an appropriate length of time. Conventional dosage forms can struggle when a drug has poor water solubility, is absorbed inefficiently, breaks down quickly, or has difficulty reaching a particular tissue. In some cases, the drug is distributed widely and exposes healthy organs as well as the intended target. These issues can limit treatment benefit and contribute to unwanted effects.

Nanotechnology offers several ways to address these delivery problems. Nanoparticle systems use very small carrier structures to transport therapeutic agents through biological environments. Their composition and surface can be adjusted to protect a drug, change its apparent solubility, influence circulation or tissue distribution, and control its release. Lipid-based carriers, biodegradable polymers, metals, and other inorganic materials have all been investigated for pharmaceutical use [1–8].

Copyright to IJARSCT
www.ijarsct.co.in
DOI: 10.48175/IJARSCT-40744

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 2, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

A formulation that performs well in a laboratory experiment, however, may behave quite differently in a patient. Once nanoparticles enter the body, proteins can attach to their surfaces, immune mechanisms may recognize them, and clearance systems may remove them before they reach the intended tissue. The extent of tissue penetration can also vary. At the same time, increasing production from a small batch to a manufacturing scale can change mixing and other process conditions, with possible effects on particle size, drug loading, stability, and release.

For these reasons, successful development cannot be judged by particle size or encapsulation efficiency alone. Researchers need to consider how the formulation is made, how it behaves in biological systems, whether it is safe, whether it can be manufactured consistently, and what evidence regulators will expect. The sections that follow discuss these connected issues and outline practical ways to move nanoparticle research closer to clinical use.

II. OVERVIEW OF NANOPARTICLE-BASED DRUG DELIVERY SYSTEMS

2.1 Liposomes

Liposomes are small vesicles made from one or more phospholipid bilayers, with an aqueous space inside. This structure allows water-soluble drugs to be carried in the inner compartment, while lipid-soluble drugs can be incorporated into the bilayer. By changing how a drug is distributed in the body, liposomes can be useful for selected treatments and may reduce exposure of some healthy tissues. Pegylated liposomal doxorubicin, marketed as Doxil, is a well-established clinical example .

2.2 Polymeric nanoparticles

Polymeric nanoparticles are made from natural or synthetic polymers. Examples include poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA), polylactic acid, and chitosan. In a nanosphere, the drug is dispersed through the polymer matrix; in a nanocapsule, it is held within a core surrounded by a polymer shell. By selecting the polymer and adjusting the formulation, researchers can influence how the carrier breaks down and how quickly the drug is released [19–23].

2.3 Solid lipid nanoparticles and nanostructured lipid carriers

Solid lipid nanoparticles (SLNs) are built around a lipid core that remains solid at room and body temperature. They have been studied particularly for drugs that dissolve poorly in water. Their development can be limited, however, by restricted drug loading or by the gradual expulsion of drug from the lipid matrix during storage. Nanostructured lipid carriers combine solid and liquid lipids. The less ordered structure can create more space for drug incorporation and may help address some limitations of SLNs.

2.4 Metallic and inorganic nanoparticles

Gold, silver, silica, and iron oxide nanoparticles have been explored for imaging, diagnostic work, and experimental drug delivery. Their surfaces can be modified for different purposes, but this flexibility does not remove the need for careful safety testing. Researchers must consider how these materials break down, whether they remain in tissues over time, and whether they produce harmful biological effects.

2.5 Lipid nanoparticles

Lipid nanoparticles are particularly important for carrying nucleic acids such as messenger RNA (mRNA) and small interfering RNA (siRNA). The lipid components help protect these delicate molecules and support their delivery into cells. The use of lipid nanoparticles in mRNA vaccines and in patisiran, an approved siRNA medicine, illustrates how this delivery platform has moved into clinical practice .

Table 1. Comparison of major nanoparticle platforms used in drug delivery.

Nanoparticle platform	Main features	Example or area of use
Liposomes	Phospholipid bilayer with an aqueous core; can carry hydrophilic and lipophilic drugs.	Liposomal doxorubicin and selected medicines.
Polymeric nanoparticles	Natural or synthetic polymer carriers; composition influences degradation and release.	Controlled delivery of selected therapeutic agents.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 2, November 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

Solid lipid nanoparticles	Solid lipid matrix; often studied for lipophilic drugs.	Delivery of poorly water-soluble compounds.
Nanostructured lipid carriers	Combination of solid and liquid lipids creates a less ordered matrix.	Drug incorporation in selected formulations.
Metallic/inorganic nanoparticles	Modifiable surfaces; long-term fate and toxicity require assessment.	Imaging, diagnostics, and experimental delivery.
Lipid nanoparticles	Lipid-based carriers that can protect and deliver nucleic acids.	mRNA and siRNA delivery.

III. FORMULATION STRATEGIES

3.1 Selection of nanoparticle materials

Choosing the material is an early decision that can shape the performance and safety of the whole formulation. The choice should reflect the drug's physicochemical properties, the route of administration, the tissue or cells being targeted, and the intended release pattern. Developers also need to consider whether the material is biocompatible and biodegradable, whether it remains stable, how much drug it can carry, whether it is compatible with the active ingredient, and whether pharmaceutical-grade material can be obtained reliably at a scale suitable for production.

3.2 Particle size and size distribution

Particle size can affect how nanoparticles interact with cells, how long they remain in circulation, where they distribute, and how they are cleared. The most suitable size is not the same for every product; it depends on the carrier, the route of administration, and the intended application. The polydispersity index (PDI) is often reported alongside size to describe how broad the particle-size distribution is. A narrower distribution may indicate a more uniform preparation, but the result needs to be interpreted using the measurement method and the product's specifications.

3.3 Surface modification and functionalization

Changing the nanoparticle surface can influence its stability and the way it interacts with proteins and cells. Polyethylene glycol (PEG) is sometimes used as a coating to reduce certain protein interactions and delay immune clearance. However, anti-PEG antibodies and faster clearance have been reported in some circumstances, so PEGylation should not be treated as a universal solution. Antibodies, peptides, and carbohydrates can also be attached to a surface to encourage interaction with selected receptors. Other approaches include adjusting surface charge or using coatings that respond to conditions such as pH or enzyme activity .

3.4 Drug encapsulation and manufacturing methods

The preparation method needs to suit both the carrier and the drug. Methods used in nanoparticle formulation include thin-film hydration, solvent evaporation, nanoprecipitation, emulsification followed by solvent diffusion, high-pressure homogenization, ionic gelation, and microfluidic mixing. Each method has its own processing requirements and can produce different particle characteristics. The choice should take account of drug solubility, the desired particle properties, solvent use, and the scale at which the product may eventually be made .

3.5 Controlled and stimuli-responsive release

A nanoparticle can be designed to release its drug gradually rather than all at once. Release may take place as the drug diffuses out of the carrier, as the carrier degrades or erodes, or as the surrounding environment changes. Stimuli-responsive systems are designed to react to conditions such as pH, enzymes, temperature, or redox state. These

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 2, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

approaches are promising, but a release profile measured in a laboratory test needs to be supported by studies that better reflect physiological conditions and by pharmacokinetic evidence.

IV. PHYSICOCHEMICAL CHARACTERIZATION AND QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Characterization helps researchers understand whether a nanoparticle formulation has the properties needed for its intended use. Since no single test can describe every aspect of a nanoparticle, developers generally combine several complementary methods. The tests selected should be appropriate for the carrier, the drug, and the intended route of administration.

Particle size and distribution: often measured using dynamic light scattering, nanoparticle tracking analysis, or microscopy, depending on the sample and the question being asked.

Polydispersity index: gives an indication of how widely particle sizes vary within the measured sample.

Zeta potential: describes an electrokinetic property of the particle surface and can provide useful information about colloidal behaviour.

Morphology: the shape and structure of particles can be examined using techniques such as transmission electron microscopy, scanning electron microscopy, or atomic force microscopy.

Encapsulation efficiency and drug loading: these measurements indicate how much of the starting drug is associated with the carrier and how much drug is present relative to the amount of formulation.

In-vitro drug release: measures how the drug leaves the carrier under specified test conditions. The test method should be suitable for the formulation and its intended use.

Stability: studies look for changes during storage, including particle growth or aggregation, drug loss or leakage, and changes in other important quality attributes.

Analytical methods should be selected for the particular formulation and validated when required for their intended use. When interpreting results, it is also important to consider how the sample was prepared, whether it was diluted, the conditions used for measurement, and the limitations of the technique.

Table 2. Key characterization attributes for nanoparticle formulations.

Quality attribute	What it indicates	Common assessment method
Particle size and distribution	Particle dimensions and breadth of the size distribution.	Dynamic light scattering; nanoparticle tracking analysis.
Polydispersity index	Variation in particle-size distribution.	Dynamic light scattering.
Zeta potential	Electrokinetic surface property relevant to colloidal behaviour.	Electrophoretic light scattering.
Morphology	Particle shape and structural appearance.	TEM, SEM, or atomic force microscopy.
Encapsulation efficiency / drug loading	Drug associated with the carrier and relative drug content.	Separation followed by quantitative drug assay.
In-vitro drug release	Release profile under defined test conditions.	Appropriate in-vitro release method.
Stability	Changes in size, aggregation, drug content, or leakage during storage.	Physical and chemical stability tests.

V. SAFETY, BIOCOMPATIBILITY AND TOXICOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Safety studies need to look at the complete formulation, not just the active drug or the carrier on its own. Nanoparticles can interact with cells, proteins, blood components, and immune pathways in ways that may differ from conventional

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 2, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

dosage forms. The type and extent of testing should reflect the material, dose, route of administration, and likely duration of exposure.

5.1 Biocompatibility and cytotoxicity

Biocompatibility describes whether a material can perform its intended role without causing an unacceptable biological response. Early investigations may examine cell survival, damage to cell membranes, oxidative stress, and programmed cell death (apoptosis). No single cell line or laboratory assay can establish the overall safety of a nanoparticle product, so findings need to be considered alongside other relevant evidence.

5.2 Immunotoxicity and inflammatory responses

Some nanoparticle formulations can stimulate immune activity, including complement activation and the release of inflammatory cytokines. For certain intravenous products, complement activation-related pseudoallergy is an issue that may need to be investigated. PEG-containing formulations also deserve attention because some people may have pre-existing or treatment-induced antibodies against PEG, which can affect how the formulation behaves.

5.3 Biodistribution and organ accumulation

After administration, nanoparticles do not necessarily remain at the intended site. Depending on their composition and surface properties, they may reach several organs. The liver and spleen are common sites of uptake for many intravenously administered systems. Studies should therefore examine where the particles and their components travel, how they are broken down, how they leave the body, and whether any material remains in tissues over time.

5.4 Hemocompatibility and long-term toxicity

For products intended for intravenous administration, blood compatibility is an important part of safety testing. Relevant investigations may include red blood cell damage (hemolysis), platelet activation, changes in coagulation, complement activation, and interactions with plasma proteins. If repeated dosing or prolonged exposure is expected, longer-term studies may also be needed to look for effects on organs, tissues, inflammation, and material accumulation.

VI. SCALABILITY AND MANUFACTURING CHALLENGES

A formulation that can be prepared in a small research laboratory may be difficult to manufacture consistently in large quantities. As production volume increases, mixing, heat transfer, solvent removal, residence time, and other process conditions can change. These changes may alter particle size, drug loading, encapsulation efficiency, stability, or the rate at which the drug is released. Scale-up therefore needs to be treated as a development challenge in its own right.

6.1 Batch-to-batch reproducibility

Reproducibility means that different production batches meet the same predefined quality requirements. Differences in raw materials, equipment, process settings, or operator practices can lead to variation in critical quality attributes. Identifying the sources of variation early makes it easier to design suitable controls.

6.2 Manufacturing technologies

Several techniques are used or being explored for nanoparticle manufacturing, including high-pressure homogenization, microfluidic mixing, solvent evaporation, spray drying, and continuous processing. No single technique is suitable for every formulation. The selection should be based on the material and drug properties, the required production volume, process-control needs, solvent considerations, and the characteristics of the final dosage form.

6.3 Quality by Design and process analytical technology

Quality by Design (QbD) encourages developers to understand how materials and process conditions affect the quality of the final product. It typically begins with a Quality Target Product Profile and identifies critical quality attributes,

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 2, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

critical material attributes, and critical process parameters. Risk assessment and design-of-experiments studies can then help establish a suitable control strategy. Process Analytical Technology (PAT) may provide in-process information that helps manufacturers monitor important variables and maintain control during production.

6.4 Good Manufacturing Practices

Good Manufacturing Practices (GMP) set expectations for how medicines are produced and controlled. They cover areas such as facilities, equipment, personnel, documentation, quality systems, and contamination control. For nanoparticle products, the manufacturing process must be capable of repeatedly delivering batches that meet the product's established quality specifications.

VII. CLINICAL TRANSLATION AND PHARMACEUTICAL APPLICATIONS

7.1 Liposomal anticancer medicines

Pegylated liposomal doxorubicin (Doxil) is a prominent example of a liposomal medicine that has reached clinical use. Encapsulation changes how doxorubicin is distributed and handled in the body, and the product is used for selected cancer indications [2]. Its development illustrates both the potential of liposomal delivery and the importance of evaluating the complete formulation rather than the drug alone.

7.2 Albumin-bound nanoparticles

Abraxane is an albumin-bound formulation of paclitaxel used in cancer treatment. It provides a clinically established alternative to conventional solvent-based paclitaxel formulations and shows how a carrier-based formulation can change the way an existing drug is delivered.

7.3 Lipid nanoparticles for RNA delivery

Patisiran uses a lipid nanoparticle system to deliver siRNA for hereditary transthyretin-mediated amyloidosis. Lipid nanoparticles have also been used to deliver mRNA in COVID-19 vaccines. Together, these examples show the importance of lipid-based carriers in the clinical development of nucleic-acid medicines .

7.4 Nanocrystal medicines

Drug nanocrystals are another way to use nanoscale formulation approaches. Reducing a drug to very small crystals can increase its dissolution rate and may improve the oral delivery of selected compounds that dissolve poorly in water. This illustrates that pharmaceutical nanotechnology includes more than injectable carrier systems.

7.5 Challenges in clinical trials

Results from preclinical studies do not always predict what will happen in clinical trials. Differences between animal and human biology, variation among patients, the nature of the disease, immune responses, tissue penetration, and pharmacokinetics can all contribute to different outcomes. Changes made to the manufacturing process during development may also affect product comparability. For this reason, preclinical models should be chosen with the intended human application in mind.

VIII. REGULATORY PERSPECTIVES AND QUALITY REQUIREMENTS

Regulatory review considers whether a product has appropriate quality, safety, and efficacy evidence. Nanomaterial-containing medicines need careful characterization because particle properties can influence their behaviour in the body, including distribution and interactions with biological systems. In 2022, the US Food and Drug Administration issued guidance for drug products, including biological products, that contain nanomaterials [31]. The European Medicines Agency has also published a reflection paper addressing nanotechnology-based medicinal products for human use .

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 2, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

The ICH guidelines Q8(R2), Q9(R1), and Q10 describe established principles for pharmaceutical development, quality risk management, and pharmaceutical quality systems [33–35]. Developers must also follow the requirements that apply in the markets where the product will be studied or supplied, including relevant CDSCO requirements in India. Discussing the development plan with regulators early can help clarify expectations for product characterization, comparability, nonclinical testing, clinical studies, and manufacturing controls.

8.1 Connecting formulation quality with clinical performance

One of the most difficult questions in nanomedicine development is deciding which laboratory measurements are genuinely predictive of performance in patients. Particle size, surface charge and drug loading are useful quality attributes, but they do not explain the entire biological response. Two formulations with similar average particle sizes may behave differently when they encounter serum proteins, blood cells or tissue barriers. For this reason, formulation screening should connect physicochemical measurements with experiments that test a plausible mechanism of delivery rather than relying on a single favourable laboratory result.

An effective development programme begins by defining what the product is expected to achieve clinically. For an intravenously administered carrier, this may involve maintaining an appropriate circulation profile while controlling drug release and limiting exposure to vulnerable tissues. For an oral nanosuspension, dissolution and gastrointestinal stability may be more relevant. The choice of analytical tests should follow these intended functions. This approach also helps researchers distinguish properties that are essential to product performance from those that are simply convenient to measure.

Comparability deserves particular attention when a manufacturing process changes. A formulation made using a new mixer, different batch size or revised purification step may still meet its average particle-size specification while showing differences in the tails of its size distribution, residual solvent content or free-drug fraction. These differences can affect biological behaviour. A meaningful comparability exercise therefore considers several complementary measurements and, where justified, biological assays. Such evidence can make process development more efficient and reduce the risk of discovering major differences late in clinical development .

8.2 Choosing preclinical models that answer clinical questions

Preclinical studies are most useful when they are designed around a clear question about the intended patient population. Standard cell-culture assays are valuable for early screening, but cells grown in a simple laboratory environment do not reproduce the full range of barriers that a nanoparticle encounters in the body. Similarly, a result in one animal tumour model should not be interpreted as proof that the same level of drug delivery will occur in human tumours. Differences in vascular structure, immune function and disease heterogeneity may alter nanoparticle distribution .

A practical approach is to combine methods that provide different kinds of evidence. Cell-based assays can help explore uptake and toxicity mechanisms. More complex culture systems may reveal how particles interact with tissue architecture. Animal studies can provide information about systemic exposure, clearance, organ distribution and repeated-dose effects. Throughout this sequence, researchers should explain what each model can and cannot establish. Clear reporting of dose, administration route, sampling times and the method used to measure drug and carrier components is especially important.

It is also useful to distinguish delivery of the nanoparticle carrier from delivery of the active drug. Measuring a fluorescent label attached to a carrier does not always demonstrate that intact, pharmacologically available drug reached the same location. Drug release, carrier degradation and redistribution can separate these signals. Studies that measure both the carrier and the active compound, when feasible, may provide a more reliable basis for clinical decisions.

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429
Volume 6, Issue 2, November 2026
Impact Factor: 8.2

IX. TRANSLATIONAL BARRIERS AND POTENTIAL STRATEGIES

The difficulties involved in clinical translation are connected. A formulation may be stable at laboratory scale but difficult to reproduce, or it may show acceptable cell-based results but behave differently in an animal or human system. Manufacturing, biological performance, safety, and regulatory expectations should therefore be considered together from the early stages of formulation development.

Table 3. Common translational barriers and approaches that may help address them.

Challenge during translation	Approach that may help
Formulation loses stability	Adjust the formulation and packaging, select suitable storage conditions, and use tests that can detect stability changes.
Particles clump together	Improve surface stabilization and keep important manufacturing conditions under control.
Uncertain distribution in the body	Study protein-corona formation, clearance routes, and the movement of particles into tissues.
Possible toxic effects	Carry out dose-related safety studies that reflect the intended route and repeated use, where relevant.
Variation between manufacturing batches	Use QbD principles, risk assessment, and well-controlled manufacturing steps.
Difficulties when increasing production scale	Assess scalable mixing methods, microfluidic approaches, and continuous processing.
Preclinical results do not predict clinical outcomes well	Choose relevant biological models and measure outcomes that matter for the intended clinical use.
Unclear regulatory expectations	Seek scientific advice early and maintain a clear plan for quality and product development.

9.1 Economic feasibility and practical access

Clinical translation is influenced not only by scientific performance but also by the cost and reliability of production. A highly complex carrier may offer a theoretical advantage while requiring expensive materials, difficult purification or storage conditions that limit routine use. Developers should therefore evaluate manufacturing yield, raw-material supply, analytical testing needs, packaging and distribution requirements while the formulation is still being optimized.

Cold-chain requirements can be particularly important for products containing sensitive biological payloads. A formulation that performs well immediately after preparation may be difficult to distribute if it requires strict temperature control or has a short shelf life. Stability studies should consider the conditions likely to occur during transportation and clinical use. Decisions about lyophilization, protective excipients or alternative packaging should be based on evidence that the final product retains its critical quality attributes.

The most useful formulation is not necessarily the most technologically elaborate one. In some circumstances, a simpler platform with well-understood materials and reproducible manufacturing may provide a better path to patient access than a more complicated design. Considering clinical benefit, production cost and practical distribution together can help direct research resources toward systems with a realistic chance of improving care.

X. FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

The next stage of nanoparticle development will depend on products that are not only effective but also safe, reproducible, and practical to manufacture. Personalized nanomedicine is one possible direction: information about a patient's disease and biological characteristics could help guide the choice of treatment or delivery system. Stimuli-responsive nanoparticles may offer more controlled release in selected environments, although their clinical benefit still needs to be demonstrated. Artificial intelligence and machine learning may also help researchers understand how

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 2, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

formulation variables influence particle size, drug encapsulation, stability, and release, making formulation development more systematic.

Manufacturing advances may be just as important as new carrier designs. Microfluidic systems, continuous processing, and automation could make production more controlled and consistent. On the biological side, organ-on-chip platforms, three-dimensional tissue models, and carefully selected animal models may provide a clearer picture of how nanoparticles interact with living systems. Future development should also consider sustainability, including safer solvents, efficient use of materials, and reduced manufacturing waste.

XI. CONCLUSION

Nanoparticle-based drug delivery systems offer useful ways to address some limitations of conventional medicines. Liposomes, polymeric nanoparticles, lipid nanoparticles, and other platforms have shown potential in modifying drug delivery and supporting treatments in several therapeutic areas. However, moving a promising formulation from the laboratory into clinical practice is still difficult. Formulation variability, incomplete understanding of biological interactions, safety concerns, manufacturing scale-up, and regulatory requirements can all slow progress.

A stronger chance of clinical success comes from considering the whole development pathway from the beginning. This means linking formulation design and physicochemical characterization with safety testing, pharmacokinetic studies, manufacturing feasibility, and regulatory planning. Quality-by-design principles, appropriate analytical methods, reliable process controls, and relevant preclinical models can help reduce avoidable problems. Close collaboration among formulation scientists, pharmacologists, toxicologists, engineers, clinicians, manufacturers, and regulators will be important if promising nanoparticle research is to become safe, effective, and accessible medicines.

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. 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
3. Sercombe, L., Veerati, T., Moheimani, F., Wu, S. Y., Sood, A. K., & Hua, S. (2015). Advances and challenges of liposome assisted drug delivery. Frontiers in Pharmacology, 6, 286. https://doi.org/10.3389/fphar.2015.00286
4. Torchilin, V. P. (2005). Recent advances with liposomes as pharmaceutical carriers. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 4, 145–160. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd1632
5. Cullis, P. R., & Hope, M. J. (2017). Lipid nanoparticle systems for enabling gene therapies. Molecular Therapy, 25(7), 1467–1475. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymthe.2017.03.013
6. Hou, X., Zaks, T., Langer, R., & Dong, Y. (2021). Lipid nanoparticles for mRNA delivery. Nature Reviews Materials, 6, 1078–1094. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41578-021-00358-0
7. Mitchell, M. J., Billingsley, M. M., Haley, R. M., et al. (2021). Engineering precision nanoparticles for drug delivery. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 20, 101–124. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41573-020-0090-8
8. Anselmo, A. C., & Mitragotri, S. (2016). Nanoparticles in the clinic. Bioengineering & Translational Medicine, 1(1), 10–29. https://doi.org/10.1002/btm2.10003
9. Anselmo, A. C., & Mitragotri, S. (2019). Nanoparticles in the clinic: An update. Bioengineering & Translational Medicine, 4(3), e10143. https://doi.org/10.1002/btm2.10143
10. Wilhelm, S., Tavares, A. J., Dai, Q., et al. (2016). Analysis of nanoparticle delivery to tumours. Nature Reviews Materials, 1, 16014. https://doi.org/10.1038/natrevmats.2016.14
11. Shi, J., Kantoff, P. W., Wooster, R., & Farokhzad, O. C. (2017). Cancer nanomedicine: Progress, challenges and opportunities. Nature Reviews Cancer, 17, 20–37. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc.2016.108
12. Blanco, E., Shen, H., & Ferrari, M. (2015). Principles of nanoparticle design for overcoming biological barriers to drug delivery. Nature Biotechnology, 33, 941–951. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.3330

IJARSCT
International Journal of Advanced Research in Science, Communication and Technology
International Open-Access, Double-Blind, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Multidisciplinary Online Journal
ISSN: 2581-9429 Volume 6, Issue 2, November 2026 Impact Factor: 8.2

13. 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
14. Dobrovolskaia, M. A., & McNeil, S. E. (2007). Immunological properties of engineered nanomaterials. Nature Nanotechnology, 2, 469–478. https://doi.org/10.1038/nnano.2007.223
15. Nel, A. E., Mädler, L., Velegol, D., et al. (2009). Understanding biophysicochemical interactions at the nano-bio interface. Nature Materials, 8, 543–557. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmat2442
16. Monopoli, M. P., Åberg, C., Salvati, A., & Dawson, K. A. (2012). Biomolecular coronas provide the biological identity of nanosized materials. Nature Nanotechnology, 7, 779–786. https://doi.org/10.1038/nnano.2012.207
17. Suk, J. S., Xu, Q., Kim, N., Hanes, J., & Ensign, L. M. (2016). PEGylation as a strategy for improving nanoparticle-based drug and gene delivery. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 99, 28–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2015.09.012
18. Owens, D. E., III, & Peppas, N. A. (2006). Opsonization, biodistribution, and pharmacokinetics of polymeric nanoparticles. International Journal of Pharmaceutics, 307(1), 93–102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpharm.2005.10.010
19. Panyam, J., & Labhasetwar, V. (2003). Biodegradable nanoparticles for drug and gene delivery to cells and tissue. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 55(3), 329–347. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-409X(02)00228-4
20. 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
21. Danhier, F., Ansorena, E., Silva, J. M., Coco, R., Le Breton, A., & Préat, V. (2012). PLGA-based nanoparticles: An overview of biomedical applications. Journal of Controlled Release, 161(2), 505–522. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2012.01.043
22. Fessi, H., Puisieux, F., Devissaguet, J. P., Ammoury, N., & Benita, S. (1989). Nanocapsule formation by interfacial polymer deposition following solvent displacement. International Journal of Pharmaceutics, 55(1), R1–R4. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-5173(89)90281-0
23. Reis, C. P., Neufeld, R. J., Ribeiro, A. J., & Veiga, F. (2006). Nanoencapsulation I. Methods for preparation of drug-loaded polymeric nanoparticles. Nanomedicine: Nanotechnology, Biology and Medicine, 2(1), 8–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nano.2005.12.003
24. Zhang, L., Gu, F. X., Chan, J. M., Wang, A. Z., Langer, R. S., & Farokhzad, O. C. (2008). Nanoparticles in medicine: Therapeutic applications and developments. Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics, 83(5), 761–769. https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.clpt.6100400
25. Bobo, D., Robinson, K. J., Islam, J., Thurecht, K. J., & Corrie, S. R. (2016). Nanoparticle-based medicines: A review of FDA-approved materials and clinical trials to date. Pharmaceutical Research, 33, 2373–2387. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11095-016-1958-5