INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES
[ISSN: 0975-4725; CODEN(USA): IJPS00]
Journal Homepage: https://www.ijpsjournal.com

OPEN ACCESS

Review Paper

Advanced Therapeutic Modalities and Novel Drug Delivery Systems: A Comprehensive Review of Targeted Strategies in Cardiovascular and Oncological Pharmacology

Aakanksha Pagar*, Kajal Pansare, Nayana Pagar, Tejaswini Kulkarni, Dr. Chandrashekhar Patil

Department of Pharmacology,1Divine College of Pharmacy, Satana.

ARTICLE INFO

Published: 13 Aug 2026
Keywords:
Nanomedicine, Targeted Drug Delivery, Antibody-Drug Conjugates, Tumor Microenvironment, Atherosclerosis, Stimuli-Responsive Carriers, Liposomes
DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.21917206

ABSTRACT

Conventional pharmacotherapeutics are frequently constrained by poor aqueous solubility, rapid systemic clearance, narrow therapeutic indices, and off-target toxicities. In the realms of oncology and cardiovascular pharmacology, these limitations often translate to suboptimal efficacy or severe adverse events, such as chemotherapy-induced cardiomyopathy or systemic immunosuppression. Over the past decade, the convergence of nanotechnology, biomaterials science, and molecular targeting has catalyzed the development of Novel Drug Delivery Systems (NDDS) and advanced therapeutic modalities. This review provides a critical evaluation of targeted strategies designed to circumvent biological barriers. In oncology, we examine the evolution from passive targeting via the Enhanced Permeability and Retention (EPR) effect to active targeting utilizing ligand-functionalized nanoparticles, antibody-drug conjugates (ADCs), and stimuli-responsive vectors. In cardiovascular pharmacology, we analyze targeted interventions for atherosclerosis, myocardial infarction, and pathological angiogenesis using biomimetic carriers, targeted liposomes, and magnetic nanoparticles. Finally, we address the critical translational bottlenecks hindering clinical adoption, including scale-up complexities, biocompatibility concerns, and regulatory challenges

INTRODUCTION

The fundamental paradigm of modern medical pharmacology is undergoing a decisive shift from the discovery of new chemical entities to the precise optimization of existing therapeutics through advanced delivery mechanisms (Langer, 1998). Traditional systemic administration relies heavily on passive biodistribution, which frequently exposes healthy tissues to toxic drug

***Corresponding Author:** Aakanksha Pagar
Address: *Department of Pharmacology,1Divine College of Pharmacy, Satana.*
Email : aakankshapagar83@gmail.com
Relevant conflicts of interest/financial disclosures: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

concentrations while delivering sub-therapeutic doses to the intended pathological site. This pharmacological challenge is acutely pronounced in oncology and cardiology—the two leading contributors to global mortality (Ferrari, 2005)

In oncology, the therapeutic index of classic cytostatic and cytotoxic agents is notoriously narrow. Conventional cytotoxic drugs fail to differentiate effectively between rapidly dividing malignant cells and healthy, highly proliferative hematological or gastrointestinal progenitors, culminating in dose-limiting toxicities (Peer et al., 2007). Similarly, in cardiovascular disease (CVD), delivering therapeutic agents directly to ischemic myocardium, inflamed endothelial walls, or unstable atherosclerotic plaques is severely hindered by physiological forces, including high shear stress, rapid arterial blood flow, and the selective endothelial barrier (Sung & Kim, 2020).

To overcome these long-standing anatomical and physiological hurdles, Novel Drug Delivery Systems (NDDS) have emerged as a disruptive technological class. By modulating the pharmacokinetics, biodistribution, and intracellular uptake of therapeutic payloads, these advanced modalities—ranging from liposomes and polymeric nanoparticles to engineered cellular vectors—offer unprecedented spatial and temporal precision (Torchilin, 2005). This comprehensive review delineates the mechanistic principles underlying these targeted strategies, contrasts their specific applications across oncological and cardiovascular pharmacology, and critically evaluates the milestones and roadblocks characterizing their clinical translation

2. ADVANCED DRUG DELIVERY FRAME WORKS IN ONCOLOGICAL PHARMACOLOGY

The tumor microenvironment (TME) presents both formidable physical barriers and unique physiological opportunities for targeted drug delivery. Malignant progression induces profound alterations in tissue architecture, characterized by leaky, highly disorganized vasculature, compromised lymphatic drainage, dense extracellular matrix (ECM) deposition, and an acidic, hypoxic interstitial milieu (Maeda et al., 2000). Advanced oncological NDDS leverage these distinctive abnormalities through distinct passive and active targeting paradigms.

2.1 Passive vs. Active Targeting Mechanisms

Historically, cancer nanomedicine relied heavily on passive targeting, governed by the Enhanced Permeability and Retention (EPR) effect (Matsumura & Maeda, 1986). The defective, rapid endothelial lining of tumor blood vessels—featuring fenestrations ranging from 100 nm to 2 μm—allows macromolecules and nanoparticles to extravasate preferentially into the interstitial space of the tumor. Concurrently, dysfunctional or absent lymphatic drainage prevents their clearance, leading to selective intratumoral accumulation. However, the notable heterogeneity of the EPR effect in human clinical tumors has necessitated the transition toward active targeting strategies (Davis et al., 2008).

Active targeting involves the surface functionalization of nanocarriers with specific targeting moieties (ligands, antibodies, or peptides) that explicitly recognize overexpressed receptors on tumor cells or tumor endothelial cells, promoting receptor-mediated endocytosis (Farokhzad & Langer, 2009).

TABLE 2: Passive vs. Active Targeting Mechanisms

TARGET RECEPTOR	LIGAND TYPE	THERAPEUTIC PAYLOAD / NANOCARRIER	CLINICAL / INVESTIGATIONAL APPLICATION
EGFR (Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor)	Monoclonal Antibodies/ Peptides	Polymeric Nanoparticles / Liposomes	Epithelial tumors (Non-small cell lung cancer, Colorectal cancer)
HER2 (Human Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor 2)	Trastuzumab / Fab fragments	Gold Nanoparticles / Silica Nanoparticles	HER2-positive Breast and Gastric cancers
Folate Receptor	Folic Acid	Liposomal Doxorubicin / Dendrimers	Ovarian, Cervical, and Lung carcinomas
***αvβ3* Integrin**	RGD (Arg-Gly Asp) Peptide	Polymer-Drug Conjugates	Tumor Angiogenesis / Neovasculature targeting

2.2 Stimuli-Responsive (Smart) Nanocarriers

To ensure that the therapeutic payload remains safely encapsulated during circulation but is released rapidly and exclusively within the tumor parenchyma or inside the malignant cell, researchers have developed stimuli-responsive nanocarriers (Mura et al., 2013). These systems undergo swift physical or chemical transitions in response to specific chemical or physical triggers.

Endogenous Triggers:

- **pH-Responsive Systems**: The interstitial pH of the TME is typically acidic (pH 6.5 - 6.8) due to anaerobic glycolysis (the Warburg effect), and endo-lysosomal compartments are even more acidic (pH 4.5 - 5.0). Nanocarriers incorporating acid-labile chemical bonds (such as hydrazone, acetal, or ester linkages) remain structurally stable at physiological pH (pH 7.4) but rapidly hydrolyze inside the acidic tumor environment to release the active drug (Bae et al., 2003).
- **Redox-Responsive Systems**: The intracellular concentration of glutathione (GSH) in malignant tumor cells is significantly higher (2 - 10 mM) than in the extracellular fluid (~2 - 10 μM). Incorporating disulfide bonds (S-S) within the crosslinked core of polymeric nanoparticles ensures structural integrity during systemic circulation and rapid intracellular cleavage and payload release upon internalization (Meng et al., 2009).

Exogenous Triggers:

- **Thermo-responsive and Magnetic Fields**: Nanoparticles functionalized with thermo-sensitive polymers, such as poly(N-isopropylacrylamide) (PNIPAM), exhibit a lower critical solution temperature (LCST). When exposed to localized mild hyperthermia induced via external alternating magnetic fields (AMF) or high-intensity focused ultrasound (HIFU), the carrier undergoes a structural collapse, forcing rapid payload ejection (Schermal et al., 2011).

2.3 Antibody-Drug Conjugates (ADCs) and Next-Gen Biologicals

Antibody-Drug Conjugates (ADCs) represent a highly successful clinical manifestation of targeted oncological pharmacology (Sievers & Senter, 2013). Composed of a tumor-specific monoclonal antibody (mAb) covalently bound to a highly potent cytotoxic payload (such as monomethyl auristatin E [MMAE] or deruxtecan) via a specialized chemical linker, ADCs act as molecular guided missiles. The structural stability of the linker is paramount; it must remain intact in systemic circulation to prevent off-target systemic toxicity but undergo rapid cleavage (either

enzymatically via intracellular cathepsin B or chemically via reduction) once endocytosed into the target cell's lysosomal compartment (Chari et al., 2014).

3. ADVANCED DRUG DELIVERY FRAMEWORKS IN CARDIOVASCULAR PHARMACOLOGY

While oncology has historically dominated the nanomedicine landscape, the application of NDDS to cardiovascular diseases has seen rapid acceleration (Format et al., 2017). Cardiovascular pathology is predominantly driven by inflammation, endothelial dysfunction, and mechanical ischemia, all of which present unique targets for advanced biomaterials.

3.1 Targeting Atherosclerotic Plaques

Atherosclerosis is an inflammatory disease driven by the accumulation of low-density lipoproteins (LDL) and subsequent macrophage infiltration within the arterial intima (Libby, 2021). Vulnerable plaques, prone to rupture and causing acute myocardial infarction or stroke, are characterized by overexpressed adhesion molecules. Advanced NDDS utilize nanoparticles functionalized with ligands targeting Vascular Cell Adhesion Molecule-1 (VCAM-1), Intercellular Adhesion Molecule-1 (ICAM-1), or macrophage scavenger receptors (such as CD36).

For instance, lipid-polymeric hybrid nanoparticles loaded with statins or anti-inflammatory agents (e.g., IL-10 or methotrexate) can be targeted directly to inflamed endothelium (Kamaly et al., 2016). This localized delivery dramatically reduces the systemic dose required to stabilize vulnerable plaques, minimizing potential adverse hepatic or muscular effects associated with high-dose systemic statin therapies.

3.2 Myocardial Ischemia and Infarction Strategies

Following an acute myocardial infarction (AMI), the primary clinical objective is to salvage ischemic tissue and prevent adverse left ventricular remodeling. However, systemic delivery of small molecule drugs, growth factors, or stem cells to the infarcted myocardium is exceptionally inefficient due to poor retention within the beating heart and low blood flow to the ischemic core (Christman et al., 2004).

To circumvent this, bioengineered injectable hydrogels (composed of alginate, collagen, or synthetic polymers) are utilized. These hydrogels are liquid at room temperature but undergo rapid gelation upon intramyocardial injection, creating a protective localized matrix. This matrix acts as a sustained-release depot for angiogenic factors like Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor (VEGF) or Basic Fibroblast Growth Factor (bFGF), promoting local neovascularization. Furthermore, the mechanical support provided by the hydrogel wall attenuates wall stress, directly limiting adverse ventricular dilation (Rane & Christman, 2011).

3.3 Biomimetic and Cell-Membrane Coated Systems

A major hurdle for synthetic nanocarriers in cardiovascular systems is rapid clearance by the mononuclear phagocyte system (MPS) in the liver and spleen. To bypass immune surveillance, next-generation "biomimetic" carriers are engineered by cloaking synthetic nanoparticle cores (such as PLGA) with naturally derived cell membranes (Hu et al., 2011).

By extracting membranes from platelets or macrophages, these biomimetic nanoparticles inherit the surface proteins (e.g., CD47 "don't eat me" signals, integrins) of the source cells (Fang et al., 2018). Platelet-membrane-coated nanoparticles inherently home to sites of vascular denudation and collagen exposure, allowing for highly specific delivery of antirestenotic drugs

directly to injured arterial walls following percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI).

4. DEEP DIVE INTO INTRACELLULAR TRAFFICKING AND LYSOSOMAL ESCAPE

To maximize the performance of both oncological and cardiovascular NDDS, understanding the intracellular journey of nanomedicines following endocytosis has emerged as a crucial physiological milestone. Once a functionalized carrier docks with its target surface receptor—such as the folate receptor in carcinomas or VCAM-1 in inflamed cardiovascular endothelium—it undergoes receptor-mediated endocytosis, entrapping the active payload inside early endosomes (Sahay et al., 2010).

As early endosomes mature into late endosomes and eventually fuse with lysosomes, the internal lumen experiences a drastic decrease in pH alongside a high expression of degrading hydrolytic enzymes. For many sensitive therapeutics, including small interfering RNA (siRNA), messenger RNA (mRNA), and specific therapeutic proteins, this lysosomal destination acts as a biological graveyard, neutralizing the molecule before it reaches its subcellular site of action (such as the cytosol or the nucleus). Consequently, modern platforms engineer structural mechanisms to achieve rapid endosomal escape (De Koker et al., 2011).

primary mechanism harnessed for endosomal escape is the "proton sponge effect," commonly utilized by cationic polymers such as polyethylenimine (PEI) and amine-terminated dendrimers. These polymers possess a high buffering capacity at internal endosomal pH levels. As the endosomal proton pump (v-ATPase) actively pumps hydrogen ions into the compartment to lower the pH, the unprotonated amines on the nanocarrier absorb these protons, preventing acidification. This forces the pump to continuously transport more protons, along with an influx of chloride counter-ions, leading to an immense osmotic gradient. Water rapidly rushes into the endosome to equilibrate the concentration, causing physical swelling and eventual rupture of the endosomal membrane, releasing the synthetic vector safely into the cytoplasm (Nel et al., 2009).

An alternative, highly elegant approach relies on the integration of fusogenic peptides or pH-sensitive lipids (such as DOPE) within lipidic nanoparticles. At physiological pH, these lipids maintain a stable bilayer composition. Upon entering the acidic endosome, they undergo a structural transition from a lamellar phase to an inverted hexagonal phase (HII). This structural flip induces local membrane fusion between the nanocarrier

bilayer and the endosomal vesicle wall, establishing a physical pore through which the active pharmacological

agent can diffuse directly into the cytosolic compartment (Zelphati & Szoka, 1996).

5. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF BIOLOGICAL AND HEMODYNAMIC BARRIERS

Designing effective targeted strategies requires a comprehensive understanding of the drastically divergent anatomical and physiological challenges characterizing malignant and cardiovascular tissues.

TABLE 2: Comparative analysis of biological and hemodynamic barriers

PARAMETER	ONCOLOGICAL PATHOPHYSIOLOGY	CARDIOVASCULAR PATHOPHYSIOLOGY
Primary Vascular Status	Disorganized, chaotic angiogenesis; highly fenestrated endothelial walls.	Endothelial denudation, thrombosis, or intact but highly inflamed endothelium.
Fluid Dynamics & Shear	Stagnant blood flow; significantly elevated Interstitial Fluid Pressure (IFP).	High velocity, turbulent blood flow; extreme hemodynamic shear stress.
Primary Cellular Targets	Malignant parenchymal cells, tumor-associated macrophages, tumor endothelial cells.	Foam cells, vascular smooth muscle cells (VSMCs), activated endothelial cells, cardiomyocytes.
Main Clearance Risk	Extravasation limitations due to dense extracellular matrix (ECM) and high IFP.	Rapid physical washing out due to high volumetric blood flow rates.

6. TRANSLATIONAL BOTTLENECKS AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

Despite brilliant preclinical successes, the clinical translation of advanced NDDS remains modest (Mitragotri et al., 2014). Several critical scientific and manufacturing bottlenecks must be resolved before these systems achieve standard-of-care status.

6.1 Nanotoxicity and Immune Phenomenon

A significant physiological impediment is the Accelerated Blood Clearance (ABC) phenomenon. Many long-circulating nanocarriers rely on surface PEGylation (polyethylene glycol coating) to evade immune detection. However, repeated administrations can induce the production of anti-PEG IgM antibodies, leading to rapid hepatic clearance and unexpected hypersensitivity reactions (Dams et al., 2000). Furthermore, the long-term tissue accumulation and biodegradation kinetics of inorganic materials (such as carbon nanotubes or quantum dots) raise chronic toxicity concerns, favoring the shift back toward inherently biodegradable lipidic and polymeric systems.

6.2 Industrial Scale-Up and cGMP Challenges

The synthesis of advanced multi-functional nanocarriers frequently involves intricate, multi-step chemical conjugations (e.g., linking target ligands, stimuli-responsive bridges, and fluorophores to a single carrier). While achievable at a milligram scale in academic laboratories, translating these protocols to large-scale, batch-to-batch reproducible current Good Manufacturing Practice (cGMP) industrial scales is highly complex. Minor structural variations during scale-up can profoundly alter encapsulation efficiency, particle size distribution, and in vivo release kinetics.

6.3 Regulatory Frameworks

Regulatory agencies (FDA, EMA) face challenges evaluating modern NDDS because they often bridge classes, existing as complex "combination products" consisting of device, biologic, and drug components. Defining standardized characterization assays for identity, purity, and stability remains an ongoing hurdle, delaying the entry of novel investigational configurations into human clinical trials.

CONCLUSION

Advanced drug delivery systems and novel therapeutic modalities represent the vanguard of modern pharmacology, offering robust methodologies to overcome the systemic toxicity and pharmacokinetic deficits of traditional drugs. By exploiting the distinct physiological features of the tumor microenvironment and the inflamed or

ischemic cardiovascular system, active and smart nanocarriers achieve precise localization. Overcoming the highlighted industrial scale-up, immunological, and regulatory barriers through interdisciplinary collaboration will be imperative to transition these potent molecular systems from benchside innovations into transformative clinical realities.

REFERENCES

1. Bae, Y., Fukushima, S., Harada, A., & Kataoka, K. (2003). Design of environment-sensitive supramolecular assemblies for intracellular drug delivery: polymeric micelles that are responsive to intracellular pH change. Angewandte Chemie International Edition, 42(38), 4640-4643.
2. Chari, R. V., Miller, M. L., & Widdison, W. C. (2014). Antibody–drug conjugates: an emerging concept in cancer therapy.
3. Angewandte Chemie International Edition, 53(15), 3796-3827.
4. Christman, K. L., Fok, H. H., Sievers, R. E., Fang, Q., & Lee, R. J. (2004). Fibrin glue matrix injected into infarct substrates provides mechanical support, preserves matrix, and improves function. Circulation, 110(11), 138-142.
5. Dams, E. T., Laverman, P., Oyen, W. J., Storm, G., Scherphof, G. L., van Der Meer, J. W., & Boerman, O. C. (2000). Accelerated blood clearance of PEGylated liposomes upon repeated injection. Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, 292(3), 1071-1079.
6. Davis, M. E., Chen, Z. G., & Shin, D. M. (2008). Nanoparticle therapeutics: an emerging reality for cancer therapy. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 7(9), 771-782.
7. De Koker, S., Lambrecht, B. N., Grooten, J., & De Geest, B. G. (2011). Scaffolds for immunomodulation. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 63(9), 748-761.
8. Fang, R. H., Kroll, A. V., Gao, W., & Zhang, L. (2018). Cell membrane-coated nanoparticles: a biomimetic platform for drug delivery. Advanced Materials, 30(23), 1705041.
9. Farokhzad, O. C., & Langer, R. (2009). Impact of nanotechnology on drug delivery. ACS Nano, 3(1), 16-20. Ferrari, M. (2005). Cancer nanotechnology: opportunities and challenges. Nature Reviews Cancer, 5(3), 161-171.
10. Hu, C. M. J., Zhang, L., Aryal, S., Cheung, C., Fang, R. H., & Zhang, L. (2011). Erythrocyte membrane-camouflaged polymeric nanoparticles as a biomimetic delivery platform. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 108(27), 10980-10985.
11. Kamaly, N., Fredman, G., Subramanian, M., Gadde, S., Pesic, A., Cheung, L., ... & Farokhzad, O. C. (2016). Development of targeted inflammation-resolving nanomedicines that mitigate atherosclerosis. Science Translational Medicine, 8(326), 326ra22.
12. Langer, R. (1998). Drug delivery and targeting. Nature, 392(6679_suppl), 5-10.
13. Libby, P. (2021). The changing landscape of atherosclerosis. Nature, 592(7855), 524-533.
14. Maeda, H., Wu, J., Sawa, T., Matsumura, Y., & Hori, K. (2000). Tumor vascular permeability and the EPR effect in macromolecular therapeutics: a review. Journal of Controlled Release, 65(1-2), 271-284.
15. Matsumura, Y., & Maeda, H. (1986). A new concept for macromolecular therapeutics in cancer chemotherapy: mechanism of tumoritropic accumulation of proteins and the antitumor macromolecule smancs. Cancer Research, 46(12_Part_1), 6387-6392.

16. Meng, F., Hennink, W. E., & Zhong, Z. (2009). Reduction-sensitive polymers and bioconjugates for internalizing drug delivery.
17. Biomacromolecules, 10(2), 197-209.
18. Mitragotri, S., Burke, P. A., & Langer, R. (2014). Overcoming barriers to cell and drug delivery in oncology and diabetes. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 13(9), 655-672.
19. Mura, S., Nicolas, J., & Couvreur, P. (2013). Stimuli-responsive nanocarriers for drug delivery. Nature Materials, 12(11), 991-1003.
20. Nel, A. E., Mädler, L., Velegol, D., Xia, T., Hoek, E. M., Somasundaran, P., ... & Thompson, M. (2009). Understanding biophysicochemical interactions at the nano-bio interface. Nature Materials, 8(7), 543-557.
21. Peer, D., Karp, J. M., Hong, S., Farokhzad, O. C., Margalit, R., & Langer, R. (2007). Nanocarriers as an emerging platform for cancer therapy. Nature Nanotechnology, 2(12), 751-760.
22. Rane, A. A., & Christman, K. L. (2011). Biomaterials for the treatment of myocardial infarction: a 5-year update. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 58(25), 2615-2629.
23. Sahay, G., Alakhova, D. Y., & Kabanov, A. V. (2010). Endocytosis of nanomedicines. Journal of Controlled Release, 145(3), 182-195.
24. Sievers, E. L., & Senter, P. D. (2013). Antibody-drug conjugates in cancer therapy. Annual Review of Medicine, 64, 15-29.
25. Sung, Y. K., & Kim, S. W. (2020). Recent advances in polymeric nanoparticles for stroke and cardiovascular disease therapies.
26. Journal of Controlled Release, 321, 650-662.
27. Torchilin, V. P. (2005). Recent advances with liposomes as drug carriers. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 4(2), 145-160. Zelphati, O., & Szoka, F. C. (1996). Mechanism of oligonucleotide-mediated gene transfer by cationic liposomes.
28. Pharmaceutical Research, 13(9), 1367-1372.

HOW TO CITE: Aakanksha Pagar, Kajal Pansare, Nayana Pagar, Tejaswini Kulkarni, Dr. Chandrashekhar Patil, Advanced Therapeutic Modalities and Novel Drug Delivery Systems: A Comprehensive Review of Targeted Strategies in Cardiovascular and Oncological Pharmacology, Int. J. of Pharm. Sci., 2026, Vol 4, Issue 8, 2163-2170, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21917206