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

OPEN ACCESS

Review Paper

The Evolution of Targeted Therapy: Defining Milestones in Precision Cancer Care

Anakha S. Kuttan*, Prasanth M. S., Nancy Varghese

Dept. of Pharmacy, College of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Govt. Medical College, Thiruvananthapuram.

ARTICLE INFO

Published: 12 May 2026
Keywords:
Precision oncology, Targeted therapy, Pharmacogenomics, Clinical pharmacy, Milestones.
DOI:
10.5281/zenodo.20132971

ABSTRACT

The oncology landscape has undergone a radical transformation, shifting from the traditional "one-size-fits-all" approach of cytotoxic chemotherapy to a well-defined, more refined area of molecularly targeted agents. As for the pharmacist community, this evolution represents more than just new drug approvals; it signifies a fundamental shift in dosing and therapeutic strategies, toxicity management and integration of pharmacogenomic data into clinical decision-making. In the pharmacological lineage of cancer treatment, beginning with the early endocrine manipulations of the 1970s and 1980s, the introduction of monoclonal antibodies in the late 1990s, and the revolution of small-molecule kinase inhibitors in the early 2000s, there is pivotal therapeutic shifts that transformed oncology from a discipline of systemic cytotoxicity into one of molecularly targeted precision. Among many other therapeutic agents, landmark agents such as Tamoxifen, Trastuzumab, and Imatinib have a high impact on the practice of pharmacy, including the management of drug-drug interactions and the implementation of companion diagnostics. These historical foundations further bridge with current scenarios, such as the rise of tissue-agnostic therapies and the utilization of Next-Generation Sequencing (NGS) to guide the therapy. This review article traces these historical milestones of targeted therapy, evaluating how past breakthroughs have shaped the current standards of care in precision medicine. Also, the article tries to explore how the role of the pharmacist has evolved from simply medication dispensing to serving as a critical member of multidisciplinary molecular tumour boards.

INTRODUCTION

The history of oncology was long defined by the 'search and destroy method of cytotoxic chemotherapy. For decades, the treatment goal was simple yet brutal: administer systemic toxins that targeted rapidly dividing cells, accepting "collateral damage" to healthy tissue as an

***Corresponding Author:** Anakha S. Kuttan
Address: *Dept. of Pharmacy, College of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Govt. Medical College, Thiruvananthapuram.*
Email ✉: kuttananakhas@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.

inevitable cost of treatment[1]. However, the last five decades have seen a radical evolution toward 'target and treat.' This review explores the pharmacological milestones that transformed cancer from a systemic battle into a molecular science[2].

The shift in Paradigm

This evolution represents a fundamental shift in how we perceive malignancy. We have moved away from treating cancer based solely on its anatomical site of origin- the "breast cancer" or "lung cancer" model- and toward a model defined by the molecular driver of the disease[3]. In this new era, the tumour's genetic profile often dictates the therapy more than the organ in which it resides. This "tissue agnostic" approach represents the culmination of decades of targeted drug development[4].

For the pharmacy profession, this transition has been transformative. The pharmacist's role has expanded beyond the sterile compounding of intravenous toxins to the clinical interpretation of pharmacogenomic data and the management of complex oral oncolytics[5]. Modern oncology pharmacotherapy now requires an intimate understanding of signal transduction pathways, companion diagnostics, and target-specific toxicities that differ vastly from the myelosuppression of traditional chemotherapy[6].

Signal Transduction Pathways: How small molecule inhibitors disrupt cellular messaging.

Companion Diagnostics: The necessity of confirming a biomarker before a single dose is dispensed.

Target-Specific Toxicities: Managing unique side effects, such as the cutaneous reactions of EGFR inhibitors.

While the rapid pace of current genomic discovery is breathtaking, the foundation of precision medicine rests upon a series of landmark milestones. By analysing the 'Evolution of Targeted Therapy in Oncology', a better understanding of the current therapies and strategies can be obtained. This article will detail the transition from early endocrine therapies to the birth of monoclonal antibodies and the kinase inhibitor explosion, ultimately bridging these historical successes with the current challenges of drug resistance and the rise of tissue-agnostic treatments.

The Dawn of Precision: Hormonal Manipulation(1970s-1980s)

The evolution of targeted therapy arguably began not with a complex genetic sequence, but with the realization that certain cancers are addicted to hormones. This period marked the first shift away from cytotoxic toward biologic modulation[7].

1. THE TAMOXIFEN MILESTONE

The landmark agent of this era is Tamoxifen. Originally synthesised as a potential contraceptive, its ability to act as a selective estrogen receptor modulator (SERM) revolutionised the treatment of Estrogen Receptor-positive (ER+) breast cancer[8]. Unlike chemotherapy, which destroys cells during division, Tamoxifen competes with estrogen for binding sites on the cancer cell. By locking the receptor, it prevents the proliferative signals that drive tumour growth. Tamoxifen introduced the concept of biomarker-driven therapy. It was the first time clinicians had to ask: "Does this specific patient's tumour express the target?" If the tumour was ER-negative, the drug was useless- a foundational principle of precision medicine[9].

Tamoxifen, initially known as compound ICI 46,474, was created in 1962 by Dora Richardson at the laboratories of Imperial Chemical Industries (ICI) in the UK. The compound was first developed as part of an initiative to produce a new oral contraceptive pill. Although it acted as an anti-estrogen, early clinical findings indicated a "puzzling" biological response: instead of inhibiting ovulation, it seemed to enhance it in women experiencing fertility issues. This initial setback in the contraceptive market, along with patent difficulties in the United States, nearly caused ICI to abandon the project. The continued development of Tamoxifen can be attributed largely to the dedication of Arthur Walpole, a biologist and cancer researcher who had been with ICI since 1938. Walpole hypothesized that synthetic anti-estrogens could be utilized to inhibit the growth of estrogen-dependent tumours. Despite the prevailing medical sentiment of the 1970s, which anticipated that combination cytotoxic chemotherapy would be the ultimate cure for all cancers, Tamoxifen was advanced as an "orphan drug" for the palliative treatment of advanced breast cancer. It was introduced in the United Kingdom in 1973, but it did not receive FDA approval for metastatic breast cancer in the United States until December 1977.

Mechanism of Action: Tamoxifen is a **Selective Estrogen Receptor Modulator (SERM)**. Its primary job is to compete with endogenous estrogen (estradiol) for binding sites on the Estrogen Receptor (ER) within breast cancer cells[10].

- **Binding:** Tamoxifen binds to the ER, but unlike estrogen, it induces a distinct conformational change in the receptor.
- **Transcriptional Blockade:** This altered shape prevents the recruitment of "co-activator" proteins that would normally start the process of DNA transcription. Instead, it recruits "co-repressors."
- **Cell Cycle Arrest:** Without the estrogen-driven signals, the cancer cell is "starved" of its growth stimulus. This leads to a shift from the G1 phase to the S phase of the cell cycle, ultimately resulting in **cytostasis** (stopping cell growth) rather than immediate cell death (cytotoxicity)[12].

The rise of Pharmacogenomics (PGx): For pharmacists, Tamoxifen is a classic study in metabolism. It is a prodrug that requires the hepatic enzyme CYP2D6 to be converted into its most active form, endoxifen. Endoxifen has a nearly **100-fold higher affinity** for the estrogen receptor than the parent drug, Tamoxifen[11].

This era taught that precision isn't just about the tumour; it's about the patient's genomics.

Table 1: Milestone phases of Tamoxifen

Milestone Phase	Time Period	Clinical Impact and Use
Palliative Introduction	1970s	Used for end-stage, metastatic disease; better tolerated than DES or androgens.
Adjuvant Breakthrough	1980s	Demonstrated reduction in recurrence when used post-surgery in early-stage disease.
Preventive Approval	1990s	First agent shown to reduce the incidence of primary breast cancer in high-risk populations.
Lifelong Management	2010s+	Trials like ATLAS/aTTom established the benefit of 10-year versus 5-year therapy.

Genetic polymorphisms in the CYP2D6 gene result in four distinct metabolic phenotypes, which can be categorized by an Activity Score (AS) that sums the function of individual alleles.

Pharmacists must account for these phenotypes when optimizing therapy, as individuals with low CYP2D6 activity—termed "Poor Metabolizers" (PMs)—exhibit lower endoxifen concentrations and a significantly higher risk of disease recurrence. A patient with a genetic "Normal Metabolizer" genotype behaves like a "Poor Metabolizer" due to the concurrent use of potent CYP2D6 inhibitors, such as paroxetine or fluoxetine. This requires vigilant screening for drug-drug interactions (DDIs) to ensure the clinical effectiveness of the horm

Table 2: Types of CYP2D6 phenotypesonal therapy[14].

CYP2D6 Phenotype	Activity Score (AS)	Clinical Implication and Recommendations
Ultrarapid Metabolizer (UM)	> 2.0	High endoxifen levels; standard 20 mg/day dose.
Normal Metabolizer (NM)	1.5 - 2.0	Therapeutic endoxifen levels; standard 20 mg/day dose.
Intermediate Metabolizer (IM)	0.5 - 1.0	Lower endoxifen; consider alternative therapy or dose adjustment.
Poor Metabolizer (PM)	0	Minimal endoxifen; avoid tamoxifen; use Aromatase Inhibitors (AI).

2. THE “MAB” REVOLUTION

While the 1980s focused on small molecules that blocked hormones, the late 1990s introduced an entirely new vehicle for precision: the Monoclonal Antibody(mAb).

The Trastuzumab (Herceptin) Breakthrough (1998): The newly developed molecule has a molecular target HER2 protein. About 20% of breast cancers overexpress HER2, leading to an aggressive disease course. This was the first therapy to successfully target a protein product of an oncogene. This milestone birthed the companion diagnostic. The FDA approved drug alongside the Hercep Test, ensured the professionals only prepares this high-cost biologic for patients with laboratory- confirmed HER2 overexpression.

The scientific journey of Trastuzumab began in the early 1980s with the identification of oncogenes such as *Ras* and *neu* (the rat homolog of HER2). In 1985, Axel Ullrich at Genentech successfully cloned the human HER2 (human epidermal growth factor receptor 2) gene. Subsequent research by Dennis Slamon at UCLA demonstrated that HER2 was amplified in approximately 20-25% of human breast cancers and was directly associated with shorter time to relapse and lower overall survival. This identified HER2 not merely as a prognostic marker, but as a pathogenic driver and a viable therapeutic target[15].

Early therapeutic antibodies were murine-derived, which limited their clinical utility due to the development of human anti-mouse antibodies (HAMA) and rapid clearance. Genentech scientists addressed this by "humanizing" the lead antibody, MuMAb4D5. This process involved grafting the mouse complementarity-determining regions (CDRs) onto a human IgG1 framework, creating Trastuzumab. This molecular engineering ensured the antibody selectively inhibited HER2-overexpressing cells while recruiting human immune effector cells via its Fc region, all while minimizing immunogenicity.

Mechanism of Action:

1. Inhibition of HER2 Receptor Dimerization

The HER2 (Human Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor 2) is a tyrosine kinase receptor that lacks a direct ligand-binding domain; instead, it stays in an "open" conformation, ready to pair (dimerize)

with other HER family members (HER1, HER3, or HER4).

- **The Action:** Trastuzumab binds specifically to **Subdomain IV** of the extracellular domain of the HER2 protein[15].
- **The Result:** This binding physically prevents the receptor from pairing with other HER receptors. By blocking dimerization, it halts the downstream "cascades"—specifically the **PI3K/Akt** and **MAPK** pathways—that normally tell the cancer cell to survive and proliferate[19].

2. Prevention of HER2 Extracellular Domain (ECD) Shedding

In aggressive HER2+ cancers, the extracellular portion of the receptor can be "shed" or cleaved by metalloproteinases, leaving behind a truncated, hyperactive protein called **p95HER2**.

- **The Action:** Trastuzumab sterically hinders these enzymes from cleaving the receptor.
- **The Result:** It prevents the formation of the p95 fragment, which is known to be a more potent driver of tumour growth and often resistant to standard therapies[18].

3. Antibody-Dependent Cellular Cytotoxicity (ADCC)

This is the "immunotherapy" component of the drug, which is often a key point for pharmacists discussing biologics.

- **The Action:** As an IgG1 kappa antibody, the "tail" (**Fc region**) of the Trastuzumab molecule hangs off the cancer cell after the "head" (Fab region) has bound to the HER2 receptor.
- **The Result:** Natural Killer (NK) cells recognise this Fc tail via their **FcγRIII receptors**. This recruits the NK cells to the tumour site, where they release perforins and granzymes to lyse the cancer cell[19].

The Landmark Co-Approval of HercepTest

A defining feature of the Trastuzumab milestone was the 1998 FDA decision to grant approval for the drug simultaneously with a diagnostic assay, the HercepTest (developed by Dako). This established the "Companion Diagnostic" (CDx) paradigm, requiring that the test essential for identifying the responder population be available at the moment of drug launch. While earlier trials had used a clinical trial assay (CTA), the HercepTest provided a standardized, reproducible immunohistochemical (IHC) method for scoring HER2 expression on a scale of 0 to 3+[20].

Table 3: IHC score chart

IHC Score	HER2 Protein Assessment	Staining Pattern	Clinical Interpretation
0	Negative	No membrane staining or in < 10% of cells.	Not a candidate for Trastuzumab.
1+	Negative	Faint/barely perceptible membrane staining in > 10%.	Not a candidate for Trastuzumab.
2+	Equivocal (Weakly Positive)	Weak to moderate complete membrane staining in > 10%.	Requires reflex testing (e.g., FISH).
3+	Strongly Positive	Strong complete membrane staining in > 10%.	Eligible for HER2 - targeted therapy.

This milestone shifted the oncology pharmacist's responsibility from simple preparation to a deeper involvement in the clinical verification of a patient's HER2 status before dispensing high-cost biologics. It also paved the way for subsequent generations of HER2 -targeted agents, including antibody-drug conjugates (ADCs) like Trastuzumab Deruxtecan, which has recently expanded into tissue-agnostic indications.

3. THE KINASE INHIBITOR ERA: IMATINIB AND THE BCR-ABL MILESTONE (2001)

If the 1990s belonged to large monoclonal antibodies, by the turn of millennium introduced small molecule revolution. The approval of Imatinib in 2001for Chronic Myeloid Leukemia is perhaps the most significant milestone in the history of targeted pharmacotherapy.

The Magic Bullet Mechanism

Before Imatinib, CML was a devastating disease with limited survival. The discovery of the Philadelphia Chromosome- a translocation between chromosomes 9 and 22 revealed a unique fusion protein called BCR-ABL. For Imatini, the molecular target became this fusion protein. It is a constitutively active tyrosine kinase that signals white blood cells to divide uncontrollably. Designed drug, Imatinib, fit perfectly in the ATP – binding pocket of fusion protein. By binding to the inactive conformation of the enzyme (a Type II inhibitor), Imatinib prevents ATP from binding, thereby halting the phosphorylation of downstream substrates and inducing apoptosis in leukemic cells. In a presentation at the 2000 American Society of Hematology (ASH) meeting, Brian Druker demonstrated that Imatinib induced complete hematologic responses in 53 of 54 patients—a result that fundamentally changed the treatment paradigm.

The shift this drug brought in clinical landscape were:

- The shift to Oral Therapy: oncology treatment migrated from hospital to patient's home. This created the need for Adherence Counselling.
- Pharmacokinetics and CYP3A4: Imatinib is a major substrate of CYP3A4 enzyme. This introduced active monitoring for DDIs (dug-drug interaction) involving common medications like statins, anti-epileptics and others.
- Monitoring Molecular Response: The role for pharmacist expanded here to include the interpretation of PCR testing to ensure the drug is working at molecular level.

Table 4: Shift in survival rates after Imatinib therapy in CML patients

Metric	Pre-Imatinib (Cytosine Arabinoside/Interferon)	Post-Imatinib Era
5-Year Survival Rate	~ 30% - 40%.	> 90 %.
Mortality Rate (Annual)	10 % - 20 %.	1 % - 2 %.
Primary Delivery Site	Inpatient/Infusion Clinic.	Patient's Home (Oral Therapy).
Monitoring Requirement	Bone Marrow Biopsy/Cytogenetics.	Peripheral Blood PCR (Molecular).

The Imatinib milestone also highlighted the challenge of acquired resistance. The most significant mechanism of resistance is the T315I mutation, also known as the "gatekeeper" mutation. In this mutation, a threonine residue is replaced by isoleucine at position 315, creating a steric hindrance that prevents most first- and second-generation TKIs (like Imatinib, Nilotinib, and Dasatinib) from binding. This necessitated the development of third-generation inhibitors like Ponatinib, which was specifically designed with a carbon-carbon triple bond to bypass the isoleucine side chain[21].

As the kinase inhibitor era progressed, the targeting of the Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor (EGFR) expanded from lung cancer to colorectal and head and neck malignancies. This milestone introduced healthcare professionals in

oncology to a unique class of adverse events: target-specific cutaneous toxicities. This is because, EGFR is highly expressed in the skin, particularly in the basal layer of the epidermis and sebaceous glands. Consequently, EGFR inhibitors (such as Erlotinib, Gefitinib, and Cetuximab) frequently induce a papulopustular (acneiform) rash. Crucially, clinical data have suggested a positive correlation between the severity of the rash and the anti-tumour efficacy of the therapy[22].

4. The Modern Frontier: Tissue-Agnostic Therapies and NGS (2017–2025)

The deployment of next-generation sequencing has expanded the scope of molecular diagnostics beyond single-gene testing. Modern oncology routinely employs comprehensive molecular profiling to identify actionable mutations, particularly in metastatic or chemo resistant settings where traditional algorithms have failed. The utility of this approach is exemplified by the success of tropomyosin receptor kinase (TRK) inhibitors in patients with neurotrophic receptor tyrosine kinase (NTRK) fusion-positive tumours. This represents a significant advancement toward diagnosis-agnostic therapy, where the presence of a specific genomic alteration, rather than the tumour's anatomical origin, dictates the treatment choice.

The contemporary landscape of precision oncology has reached a pinnacle with the emergence of tissue-agnostic therapies. This approach reclassifies cancer based on a molecular hallmark rather than the organ of origin, representing a "groundbreaking shift" in regulatory and therapeutic philosophy. In 2017, the FDA granted the first tissue-agnostic approval to Pembrolizumab (Keytruda) for any solid tumour that is Microsatellite Instability-High (MSI-H) or Mismatch Repair Deficient (dMMR)[23]. These biomarkers indicate a tumour with a high propensity for somatic mutations, leading to the expression of "neoantigens" that make the cancer highly susceptible to immune checkpoint inhibition. Subsequent tissue-agnostic approvals focused on rare gene fusions that occur across diverse histologies. Larotrectinib and Entrectinib were approved to target NTRK (Neurotrophic Tyrosine Receptor Kinase) fusions, which are found in common cancers (like lung or colorectal) at low frequencies, but in rare cancers (like infantile fibrosarcoma or secretory breast carcinoma) at very high frequencies[24]. This was followed by the approval of Selpercatinib and Repotrectinib for RET fusion-positive tumours[25].

The practical execution of tissue-agnostic therapy is entirely dependent on Next-Generation Sequencing (NGS). NGS platforms utilize massive parallel sequencing to screen hundreds of genes for mutations, amplifications, and fusions in a single assay. This provides a comprehensive molecular profile that informs not only the selection of FDA-approved drugs but also eligibility for "basket" trials—clinical trials that enroll patients based on mutation status rather than tumour type, such as the NCI-MATCH or TAPUR trials[25,26].

Table 5: Approved tissue-agnostic agents

Tissue-Agnostic Agent	Target / Biomarker	FDA Approval Year	Indications
Pembrolizumab	MSI-H / dMMR / TMB-H	2017 (Initial)	Any solid tumour meeting biomarker threshold.
Larotrectinib	NTRK Fusion	2018	Solid tumours with NTRK gene fusion.
Dabrafenib + Trametinib	BRAF V600E	2022	First combination agnostic therapy for BRAF mutations.
Trastuzumab Deruxtecan	HER2-Expressing	2024	HER2-positive (IHC 3+) solid tumours regardless of site.

Despite these successes, current precision oncology remains focused on a minority of patients who harbour clear, actionable mutations. Many tumours lack identifiable targets, and even when targets are present, inherent or acquired resistance often limits the durability of the response. The field is therefore moving toward "stratified cancer medicine," which refines population-level treatment through group-level biomarkers, but still falls short of the "N-of-1" ideal of personalized medicine. Achieving the latter requires an acknowledgment that the tumour genome exists within a complex biological context, where layers of transcriptomics, proteomics, and metabolomics attenuate the phenotypic expression of genomic changes.

To bridge the gap between stratified and personalized medicine, researchers are increasingly utilizing **multi-omics integration**. This approach captures the flow of biological information across multiple layers, providing a more granular understanding of tumour biology and the surrounding microenvironment. Transcriptomics complements genomic data by identifying dysregulated gene expression and pathway activation that may occur in the absence of primary DNA mutations. Proteomics offers insights into protein abundance and post-translational modifications, which are the functional mediators of cellular phenotype and the primary targets for most pharmacological interventions. Metabolomics, the study of small-molecule metabolites, reveals the immediate physiological state of the tumour, reflecting shifts in cellular metabolism—a hallmark of many cancer types.

The clinical utility of multi-omics integration is demonstrated in the management of hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC). By integrating genomic, transcriptomic, and proteomic data, clinicians have established proteomic subtypes of HCC that correlate with different metabolic reprogramming signatures. This stratification allows for more precise guidance in the selection of therapies such as sorafenib or mTOR inhibitors, based on the specific molecular vulnerabilities of the patient's tumour subtype[27]. The rise of liquid biopsy and the analysis of circulating tumour DNA (ctDNA) represent another transformative diagnostic advancement. Liquid biopsies offer a non-invasive means to monitor tumour evolution in real-time, bypassing the limitations of tissue heterogeneity and the risks associated with invasive repeat biopsies. In 2025, ctDNA is being used not only for detecting targetable mutations in metastatic disease but also as a tool for minimal residual disease (MRD) assessment. Detecting ctDNA after surgical resection can identify patients at high risk of recurrence who may benefit from early adjuvant intervention, such as personalized vaccines[28].

Table 6: Multi-omic biomarkers across major cancer types

Cancer Type	Multi-Omics Application	Identified Biomarkers or Targets
Breast Cancer (HER2+)	Genomics, Transcriptomics, Proteomics	HSD17B4 methylation as a predictor for trastuzumab response
Melanoma	Genomics, Immunomics	High TMB and specific neoantigens for ICI therapy outcomes
Colorectal Cancer	Genomics, Proteomics, Single-cell	TAPBP for PD-1 blockade; inter-patient heterogeneity via organoids
Ovarian Cancer	Single-cell RNA-seq, AI	Drug-resistance subtypes and prognosis modelling
Pancreatic Cancer	Genomics, Transcriptomics	Personalized mRNA vaccine neoantigens

The advent of messenger RNA (mRNA) technology has provided a rapid and scalable platform for personalized immunotherapy. Unlike traditional vaccines that target shared tumour

antigens, **personalized mRNA vaccines** are custom-built for the individual patient based on the unique mutational landscape of tumour. This involves the identification of neoantigens- new proteins resulting from somatic mutations- that the patient's immune system can be trained to recognize as foreign. A landmark application of this technology is the development of autogene cevumeran for pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC). Pancreatic cancer is notoriously resistant to conventional immunotherapy due to its immune-desert phenotype and dense stromal architecture. However, phase 1 trial results of a study[29] have shown that a personalized mRNA vaccine can prime multiple CD8- positive T-cell clones, creating de novo immune recognition where non existed. In this trial, patients who mounted a vaccine-induced T-cell response experienced significantly prolonged recurrence-free survival (RFS), with a medial RFS not reached in responders compared to 13.4 months in non-responders.

The durability of this immune response is particularly striking. Long term follow-up data from the autogene cevumeran trial indicates that vaccine-induced T-cells can persist into a memory phase with an estimated average lifespan of 7.7 years. Furthermore, subsequent adjuvant chemotherapy did not erase this vaccine-induced memory, suggesting that personalized vaccines can safely integrated with existing therapeutic standards[29].

Parallelly, the clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats (CRISPR)/Cas9 technology is revolutionizing both cellular therapy and direct oncogene targeting. CRISPR enables precise genetic alterations, such as the deletion of oncogenes or the restoration of tumour suppressor genes. In the context of chimeric antigen receptor T-cell (CAR-T) therapy, CRISPR is being used to create allogeneic, "off-the-shelf" products. By knocking out endogenous T-cell receptors and MHC class I molecules, researchers can reduce the risk of graft-versus-host disease and lower manufacturing costs from roughly $400,000 to under $100,000 per treatment. Furthermore, CRISPR is utilized to enhance T-cell persistence and reduce exhaustion by editing immune checkpoint genes such as PD-1 or CTLA-4 directly within the therapeutic cells[30].

Looking toward 2026, the field is expanding into in vivo gene editing, where CRISPR components are delivered directly into the patient's body rather than editing cells ex vivo. While challenges like delivery efficiency and off-target effects remain, early preclinical data in models of hypertension and alpha-1 antitrypsin deficiency suggest the potential for single-dose, functional cures. The FDA's 2026 draft guidance on "plausible mechanism frameworks" for platform therapies is expected to accelerate the clinical development of these personalized genetic interventions by allowing a single trial to test a delivery system that can be loaded with different, patient-specific guide RNAs[31].

The efficacy of personalized therapies is fundamentally dependent on the precise delivery of molecular cargo to the target tissue. Nanotechnology has emerged as a transformative force in this domain, providing engineered nanoparticles (NPs) that improve pharmacokinetics, reduce systemic toxicity, and facilitate the delivery of sensitive molecules like mRNA and CRISPR components. These nanocarriers can be tailored in terms of size, shape, and surface chemistry to optimize their interaction with tumour biology[32].

The "enhanced permeability and retention" (EPR) effect remains a primary mechanism for passive targeting, where leaky tumour vasculature and poor lymphatic drainage allow nanoparticles to accumulate preferentially within malignant tissues[33]. However, modern nanomedicine is moving beyond passive accumulation toward

active targeting and stimuli-responsive release. Active targeting involves functionalizing NP surfaces with ligands, such as antibodies or peptides, that bind specifically to receptors overexpressed on cancer cells. Stimuli-responsive platforms are designed to release their payload only in response to specific triggers in the tumour microenvironment, such as changes in pH (acidity), enzymatic activity, or external stimuli like near-infrared (NIR) light.

The sheer complexity of multi-omics data and the heterogeneity of patient responses necessitate the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) into clinical workflows. AI is currently being applied across the entire spectrum of oncology, from early target discovery to real-time treatment optimization. ML algorithms can identify complex biomarker signatures from disparate data sources, predicting drug responses with higher accuracy than traditional single-biomarker approaches[34].

A critical application of AI in personalized oncology is individualized dosing. Traditional dosing models often follow a "one-size-fits-all" approach based on body surface area, which fails to account for the dynamic changes in a patient's physiology or the tumour's response to therapy. Platforms like CURATE.AI use reinforcement learning to analyse a patient's longitudinal data, continuously recommending individualized dosage adjustments to maintain the optimal therapeutic window. This approach has been successfully applied in pancreatic cancer management, where it optimized dosing to reduce tumour markers while maintaining tolerable toxicity[35].

AI also accelerates the drug discovery pipeline by enabling virtual screening and de novo molecular design. For example, AI-driven platforms have identified novel inhibitors of QPCTL, a target involved in tumour immune evasion, and have modelled complex protein-ligand interactions using AlphaFold[36]. Furthermore, AI-assisted clinical trial designs use intelligent patient stratification to identify individuals most likely to benefit from a new agent, thereby reducing the time and cost of drug development.

Despite the advancement of precision therapies, the problem of resistance remains a significant barrier to long-term survival. Resistance can be pre-existing (intrinsic) or acquired during the course of treatment. The concept of the "resistance continuum" suggests that tumours adapt to therapeutic pressure through progressive cell-state transitions, phenotypic plasticity, and chromatin reprogramming. In non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC), for instance, "drug-tolerant persisted" cells survive targeted therapy through mechanisms such as the Hippo-YAP pathway or WNT/Beta-catenin signaling[37]. Identifying these mechanisms through dual clinical and experimental analysis allows for the development of combination therapies that can bypass or restore sensitivity to the primary drug.

Tumour heterogeneity—both spatial and temporal—further complicates the delivery of personalized care. Spatial heterogeneity means that a single biopsy may not represent the entire mutational landscape of a tumour, potentially missing aggressive subclones. Temporal heterogeneity refers to the changes in a tumour's genetics over time, particularly under the selective pressure of treatment. To address this, clinical practice is moving toward repeat liquid biopsies and the use of multi-modal predictors of response that combine genomic, transcriptomic, and immunomic data[37].

FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

The economic and clinical future of oncology is increasingly focused on prevention and early detection. Multi-cancer early detection (MCED) tests, which utilize liquid biopsy and DNA methylation patterns to detect multiple cancer

types from a single blood sample, are projected to reach a market size of $6.0 billion by 2030[38]. These tests aim to shift the diagnosis of cancer to earlier, more treatable stages, potentially reducing the massive economic burden of late-stage disease treatment, which is estimated to reach $246 billion in the US by 2030[39,40].

Table 7: Macro-Economic Trends and Clinical Milestones in Next-Generation Oncology

Economic/Clinical Outlook	Projected Impact by 2030
Cervical Cancer Prevention ROI	$3.20 return per $1 invested
Sequencing Cost (Moore's Law)	Potential reduction to ~$15.63 per genome
MCED Market Growth	CAGR exceeding 19% in Asia-Pacific
Medicare Adoption	Pathway for MCED coverage starting 2028
Gene Editing Market	Projected to exceed $25 billion by 2030

The transition toward 2030 will see genomics become a routine part of clinical practice, with large, interoperable longitudinal cohorts (such as the UK Biobank and the All of Us Research Program) providing the data needed for deep discovery across diverse populations. Pharmacogenomics (PGx) and microbiome assessments will also become standardized, allowing for treatments that are tailored not just to the tumour, but to the unique physiology and environment of the patient.

CONCLUSION

The current status of personalized cancer therapy is a dynamic interplay between technological breakthrough and clinical implementation. While the field has successfully moved from histology-based treatments to stratified medicine based on genomic biomarkers, the move toward true "personalized" care is the defining challenge of the next decade. This shift requires a departure from the "one-drug-one-target" mindset in favour of a holistic approach that integrates multi-omics diagnostics, AI-driven dosing, and advanced therapeutic platforms like personalized vaccines and gene editing.

To maximize the potential of these innovations, clinical workflows must evolve to accommodate high-resolution molecular assays and real-time data integration. The success of programs like "Profile" at Dana-Farber illustrates the value of routine genomic profiling in guiding therapy and reducing toxicity. However, the high cost of these technologies and the complexity of data interpretation remain significant hurdles, particularly in low-resource settings. Addressing these inequities through standardized testing, clear regulatory pathways for platform therapies, and the use of cost-effective screening tools like MCED will be essential for ensuring that the benefits of precision oncology reach all patients.

Ultimately, the future of cancer therapy lies in the ability to deliver "functional cures" through therapies that are as unique as the patients they treat. Whether through the 7.7-year persistence of vaccine-induced T-cells in pancreatic cancer or the 90% editing efficiency of CRISPR in animal models, the biological tools are now available to reshape the oncological landscape. The integration of these tools into a proactive, data-driven, and patient-centric model of care represents the most promising frontier in the global fight against cancer.

REFERENCES

1. DeVita VT, Chu E. A History of Cancer Chemotherapy. Cancer Research [Internet]. 2008 Oct 30;68(21):8643–53. Available from:

https://aacrjournals.org/cancerres/article/68/21/8643/541799/A-History-of-Cancer-Chemotherapy
2. Collins FS, Varmus H. A New Initiative on Precision Medicine. New England Journal of Medicine. 2015 Feb 26;372(9):793–5.
3. Hyman DM, Taylor BS, Baselga J. Implementing Genome-Driven Oncology. Cell. 2017 Feb;168(4):584–99.
4. Luoh SW, Flaherty KT. When Tissue Is No Longer the Issue: Tissue-Agnostic Cancer Therapy Comes of Age. Annals of Internal Medicine. 2018 Jul 24;169(4):233.
5. Holle LM, Harris CS, Chan A, Fahrenbruch RJ, Labdi BA, Mohs JE, et al. Pharmacists' roles in oncology pharmacy services: Results of a global survey. Journal of Oncology Pharmacy Practice. 2016 Jul 8;23(3):185–94.
6. Relling MV, Evans WE. Pharmacogenomics in the clinic. Nature [Internet]. 2015 Oct;526(7573):343–50. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4711261/
7. Craig Jordan V. The role of tamoxifen in the treatment and prevention of breast cancer. Current Problems in Cancer. 1992 May;16(3):134–76.
8. Cole MP, Jones CTA, Todd IDH. A New Anti-oestrogenic Agent in Late Breast Cancer: An Early Clinical Appraisal of ICI46474. British Journal of Cancer. 1971 Jun;25(2):270–5.
9. Shagufta, Ahmad I. Tamoxifen a pioneering drug: An update on the therapeutic potential of tamoxifen derivatives. European Journal of Medicinal Chemistry. 2018 Jan; 143:515–31
10. Lewis-Wambi JS, Jordan VC. Treatment of Postmenopausal Breast Cancer with Selective Estrogen Receptor Modulators (SERMs). Haslam SZ, Osuch JR, editors. Breast Disease. 2006 Jul 31;24(1):93–105.
11. Mürdter TE, Schroth W, Bacchus-Gerybadze L, Winter S, Heinkele G, Simon W, et al. Activity Levels of Tamoxifen Metabolites at the Estrogen Receptor and the Impact of Genetic Polymorphisms of Phase I and II Enzymes on Their Concentration Levels in Plasma. Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics. 2011 Mar 30;89(5):708–17.
12. Patel P, Jacobs TF. Tamoxifen [Internet]. PubMed. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2023. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK532905/
13. Hudis CA. Trastuzumab — Mechanism of Action and Use in Clinical Practice. New England Journal of Medicine. 2007 Jul 5;357(1):39–51.
14. Hongkaew Y, Gaedigk A, Wilffert B, Ngamsamut N, Kittitharaphan W, Limsila P, et al. Relationship between CYP2D6 genotype, activity score and phenotype in a paediatric Thai population treated with risperidone. Scientific Reports. 2021 Feb 18;11(1).
15. A Brief History Of Herceptin® and the Her2 Cancer Gene • The Center for Restorative Breast Surgery [Internet]. The Center for Restorative Breast Surgery. 2020. Available from: https://www.breastcenter.com/2020/03/04/a-brief-history-of-herceptin-and-the-her2-cancer-gene/
16. Chan AC, Martyn GD, Carter PJ. Fifty years of monoclonals: the past, present and future of antibody therapeutics. Nature Reviews Immunology [Internet]. 2025 Aug 7;25(10):745–65. Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41577-025-01207-9
17. Junttila Teemu T, Akita Robert W, Parsons K, Fields C, Lewis Phillips Gail D, Friedman Lori S, et al. Ligand-Independent

HER2/HER3/PI3K Complex Is Disrupted by Trastuzumab and Is Effectively Inhibited by the PI3K Inhibitor GDC-0941. Cancer Cell. 2011 Dec;20(6):818.

18. Molina MA, Codony-Servat J, Albanell J, Rojo F, ArribasJ, Baselga J. Trastuzumab (Herceptin), a Humanized Anti-HER2 Receptor Monoclonal Antibody, Inhibits Basal and Activated HER2 Ectodomain Cleavage in Breast Cancer Cells1. Cancer Research [Internet]. 2001 Jun;61(12):4744–9. Available from: https://aacrjournals.org/cancerres/article/61/12/4744/507562/Trastuzumab-Herceptin-a-Humanized-Anti-HER2
19. Clynes RA, Towers TL, Presta LG, Ravetch JV. Inhibitory Fc receptors modulate in vivo cytoxicity against tumour targets. Nature Medicine. 2000 Apr;6(4):443–6.
20. HercepTest TM Interpretation Manual Breast Cancer EDUCATION [Internet]. Available from: https://www.agilent.com/cs/library/usermanuals/public/28630_herceptest_interpretation_manual-breast_ihc_row.pdf
21. Iqbal N, Iqbal N. Imatinib: A Breakthrough of Targeted Therapy in Cancer. Chemotherapy Research and Practice. 2014 May 19;2014(1):1–9.
22. Yana Gvozdeva, Petya Georgieva, Plamen Katsarov. Imatinib in Targeted Therapy: Advances in Biomedical Applications and Drug Delivery Systems. Hemato. 2025 Nov 12;6(4):40–0.
23. Marcus L, Lemery SJ, Keegan P, Pazdur R. FDA Approval Summary: Pembrolizumab for the Treatment of Microsatellite Instability-High Solid Tumors. Clinical Cancer Research. 2019 Feb 20;25(13):3753–8.
24. Garcia-Foncillas J, Bokemeyer C, Italiano A, Keating K, Paracha N, Fellous M, et al. Indirect Treatment Comparison of Larotrectinib versus Entrectinib in Treating Patients with TRK Gene Fusion Cancers. Cancers. 2022 Mar 31;14(7):1793.
25. Subbiah V, Gouda MA, Ryll B, Burris HA, Razelle Kurzrock. The evolving landscape of tissue-agnostic therapies in precision oncology. Ca. 2024 May 30
26. Au TH, Wang K, Stenehjem D, Garrido-Laguna I. Personalized and precision medicine: integrating genomics into treatment decisions in gastrointestinal malignancies. Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology [Internet]. 2017 Jun 1;8(3):387–404. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28736627/
27. He J, Hu X, Chen L, Jiang Y. Application of multi-omics in hepatocellular carcinoma: new prospects for classification and precise diagnosis and treatment. Hepatoma Research. 2025 Jan 23
28. Oluseyi Abidoye, Ahn DH, Borad MJ, Wu C, Tanios Bekaii-Saab, Chakrabarti S, et al. Circulating Tumor DNA Testing for Minimal Residual Disease and Its Application in Colorectal Cancer. Cells. 2025 Jan 22;14(3):161–1.
29. Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, Genentech, Inc. Phase 1 Clinical Trial of Personalized Neoantigen Tumor Vaccines and Programmed Death-Ligand 1 (PD-L1) Blockade in Patients With Surgically Resected Pancreatic Cancer [Internet]. clinicaltrials.gov. 2023. Available from: https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT04161755
30. Ravichandran M, Maddalo D. Applications of CRISPR-Cas9 for advancing precision medicine in oncology: from target discovery to disease modeling. Frontiers in Genetics. 2023 Oct 16;14.
31. Center. Considerations for the use of the Plausible Mechanism Framework [Internet]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. 2026.

Available from: https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/considerations-use-plausible-mechanism-framework-develop-individualized-therapies-target-specific

32. Thakkar S, Sharma D, Kalia K, Tekade RK. Tumor microenvironment targeted nanotherapeutics for cancer therapy and diagnosis: A review. Acta Biomaterialia. 2020 Jan; 101:43–68.
33. Anderson NM, Simon MC. The Tumor Microenvironment. Current Biology. 2020 Aug;30(16): R921–5.
34. Shen Y, Zhang P, Luo J, Chen S, Gu S, Lin Z, et al. Artificial Intelligence Drives Advances in Multi-Omics Analysis and Precision Medicine for Sepsis. Biomedicines [Internet]. 2026 Autumn;14(2):261. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/41751160/
35. Tan BKJ, Teo CB, Tadeo X, Peng S, Soh HPL, Du SDX, et al. Personalised, Rational, Efficacy-Driven Cancer Drug Dosing via an Artificial Intelligence System (PRECISE): A Protocol for the PRECISE CURATE.AI Pilot Clinical Trial. Frontiers in Digital Health [Internet]. 2021 Apr 12;3. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8521832/
36. Fang Z, Ran H, Zhang Y, Chen C, Lin P, Zhang X, et al. AlphaFold 3 will be a new opportunity for drug development and biomedicine. Precision Clinical Medicine [Internet]. 2025 Jul 1; Available from: https://academic.oup.com/pcm/article/8/3/pbaf015/8180385
37. Taylor KE, Jacob H, Oladosu TA, Nwajiugo GK, Adigun MV, Nzunde MS, et al. Spatial Tumor Heterogeneity: The Next Frontier in Understanding Cancer Resistance. Oncology, Nuclear Medicine and Transplantology. 2025;1(2): onmt007. https://doi.org/10.63946/onmt/17300
38. Multi-Cancer Early Detection (MCED) Market Size ($6.0 Billion) 2030 [Internet]. Strategicmarketresearch.com. 2024. Available from: https://www.strategicmarketresearch.com/market-report/multi-cancer-early-detection-market
39. National Cost of Cancer Care in the United States Expected to Rise to Over $246 Billion by 2030 - The ASCO Post [Internet]. ascopost.com. Available from: https://ascopost.com/news/june-2020/national-cost-of-cancer-care-in-the-united-states-expected-to-rise-to-over-246-billion-by-2030/
40. McGarvey N, Gitlin M, Fadli E, Chung KC. Increased healthcare costs by later stage cancer diagnosis. BMC Health Services Research. 2022 Sep 13;22(1).

HOW TO CITE: Anakha S. Kuttan, Prasanth M. S., Nancy Varghese, The Evolution of Targeted Therapy: Defining Milestones in Precision Cancer Care, Int. J. of Pharm. Sci., 2026, Vol 4, Issue 5, 2731-2744, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20132971