ISSN: 2231-3656
Print: 2231-3648

***International Journal of Pharmacy and Industrial Research* (IJPIR)**

IJPIR |Vol.15 | Issue 1 | Jan - Mar -2025
www.ijpir.com
DOI : https://doi.org/10.61096/ijpir.v15.iss1.2025.101-112

Review

Nanoformulations for Drug Delivery: Advances in Liposomes, Niosomes, Nanocapsules, Nanospheres, Nanosuspensions, and Nanoemulsions

Kotha Srinivasulu[1], Suresh Kumar[2], Amritha. J[2*], S. Sathya[3]

Associate Professor[1], Assistant Professor[2], Lecturer[3]
The Kaavery Pharmacy College, Affiliated to The TamilNadu Dr. MGR Medical University, Mecheri, Salem – 636453, TamilNadu, India.

*Author for Correspondence: Amritha. J
Email: amripharma99@gmail.com

Published on: 21 Feb 2025

Published by:
DrSriram Publications

Abstract

Novel Drug Delivery Systems (NDDS) have spearheaded a transformative epoch within pharmaceutical research by offering enhanced drug bioavailability, targeted tissue or cellular distribution, and improved patient compliance. Among these, nanoformulations encompassing liposomes, niosomes, nanocapsules, nanospheres, nanosuspensions, and nanoemulsions have gained traction for their ability to overcome physiological and pharmacokinetic impediments that often limit conventional dosage forms. This review presents a comprehensive overview of these nanocarriers, detailing their composition, design parameters, methods of preparation, drug release mechanisms, and diverse therapeutic applications. Critical considerations related to formulation stability, large-scale manufacturing, toxicity, regulatory oversight, and quality control are also examined. In addition, we discuss emerging directions such as stimuli-responsive nanovehicles, hybrid formulations, and the increasingly vital role of artificial intelligence in refining nanoformulation design. The collective evidence underscores the potential of nanoformulations to reshape future approaches in clinical therapeutics and personalized medicine, although several challenges remain on the path to large-scale commercial adoption.

Keywords: Nanoformulations, Liposomes, Niosomes, Nanocapsules, Nanoemulsions

1. INTRODUCTION

The confluence of nanotechnology and pharmaceutical innovation has opened new frontiers in medical interventions, fundamentally reshaping how clinicians and researchers approach drug delivery challenges. Traditional dosage forms encompassing tablets, capsules, and standard injectables frequently exhibit suboptimal bioavailability, limited tissue penetration, or undesirable side effects when administered systemically [1]. Many active pharmaceutical ingredients (APIs), particularly those that are hydrophobic, suffer from poor aqueous solubility, leading to limited therapeutic benefit if delivered via conventional routes. Consequently, the drive to

discover more effective drug carriers has spurred a wave of research into nanoscale platforms that can modulate pharmacokinetics, foster controlled or targeted release, and diminish off-target toxicity [2].

Nanoformulations can be broadly defined as submicron drug delivery vehicles with structural or compositional features engineered to function at the nanometer scale (1–1000 nm). Their distinct advantage stems from the enhanced surface-area-to-volume ratio and the ability to optimize surface chemistry. By manipulating physicochemical traits such as particle size, surface charge, encapsulation efficiency, and the inclusion of targeting ligands, scientists can craft formulations that improve drug accumulation at disease sites and extend circulation times [3]. Over the years, a variety of nano-scale carriers liposomes, polymeric micelles, dendrimers, metallic nanoparticles, and viral vectors have been studied. Among them, liposomes, niosomes, nanocapsules, nanospheres, nanosuspensions, and nanoemulsions remain at the forefront due to their relative ease of formulation, adaptability to multiple administration routes, and diverse drug loading possibilities [4,5].

Despite their broad potential, realizing nanoformulations in real-world clinical settings is no trivial task. Specific challenges include scale-up difficulties, batch-to-batch variability, incomplete mechanistic understanding of nanoparticle interactions with biological systems, and often-lengthy regulatory pathways [6]. Nonetheless, the successes achieved by a number of marketed nanomedicines such as Doxil (pegylated liposomal doxorubicin) and the mRNA-based COVID-19 vaccines leveraging lipid nanoparticle (LNP) technology underscore the transformative possibilities of nanoscale drug carriers [7]. Importantly, these milestones also illustrate the adaptability and robustness of nanoformulation strategies when carefully optimized.

This review aims to provide a thorough, integrative perspective on the state-of-the-art in key types of nanoformulations: liposomes, niosomes, nanocapsules, nanospheres, nanosuspensions, and nanoemulsions. We detail the unique strengths, challenges, and recent developments for each system. Moreover, we investigate the common pitfalls involved in moving from benchtop research to clinical application, while highlighting forward-looking innovations stimuli-responsive constructs, hybrid designs, and computational modeling that are reshaping the field. Collectively, this discussion will serve as both a reference for experts and a guide for new entrants, synthesizing the achievements, limitations, and emergent directions in nano-scale drug delivery methodologies.

2. Liposomes

2.1 Composition and Structural Characteristics

Liposomes, credited as one of the earliest and most influential nanoscale carriers, are vesicular structures composed predominantly of phospholipid bilayers. In their simplest iteration, these phospholipids often phosphatidylcholine, phosphatidylserine, or phosphatidylethanolamine self-assemble to form concentric bilayers around an aqueous core, closely mimicking biological membranes [8]. The amphiphilic nature of phospholipids allows encapsulation of both hydrophilic drugs in the aqueous interior and lipophilic or amphiphilic compounds within the bilayer.

A typical liposomal formulation includes cholesterol, which modulates the fluidity and permeability of the bilayer, improving stability and circulation half-life [9]. The ratio of phospholipids to cholesterol can be fine-tuned to yield specific mechanical properties, such as enhanced rigidity or flexibility, thereby influencing drug release kinetics. Liposomes can be classified by size and lamellarity: small unilamellar vesicles (SUVs, 20–100 nm), large unilamellar vesicles (LUVs, 100–400 nm), and multilamellar vesicles (MLVs, >400 nm) [10]. Each class serves a different clinical or experimental need, underscoring the importance of optimizing liposomal characteristics according to the target indication.

2.2 Preparation Methods

A variety of techniques exist for producing liposomes, each carrying specific advantages and limitations regarding scaling, reproducibility, and drug entrapment efficiency. The thin-film hydration method remains widely used in research settings. This process entails dissolving lipids in an organic solvent, evaporating the solvent to form a thin lipid film, and then hydrating the resultant film with an aqueous medium containing the therapeutic agent. Subsequent sonication or extrusion further refines vesicle size [11]. Despite being straightforward, thin-film hydration can suffer from batch-to-batch inconsistencies and difficulties in large-scale manufacturing.

Other approaches address these challenges. Microfluidic-based systems offer a more controlled way to generate liposomes with uniform size distributions by rapidly mixing lipid-containing organic phases and aqueous phases in precisely engineered microchannels [12]. Supercritical fluid technology, another emerging route, employs carbon dioxide in its supercritical state to facilitate liposome assembly without the extensive use of toxic organic solvents [13]. These alternative methods demonstrate the field's drive toward reproducibility, scalability, and greener processing, all of which are crucial for commercial viability.

2.3 Drug Release Dynamics and Biodistribution

Drug release from liposomes occurs via multiple pathways. Simple diffusion can allow small molecules to gradually escape the vesicle, whereas bilayer disruption potentially triggered by enzymes or surfactants in vivo

can liberate larger or more hydrophobic cargo [14]. Stimuli-sensitive liposomes offer an extra layer of control; formulations might include temperature-sensitive lipids that release contents upon mild hyperthermia or pH-sensitive components that respond to acidic environments in tumor tissues [15]. Such triggered release strategies aim to maximize drug localization at the pathological site while sparing healthy tissues.

Liposomes exhibit a natural tendency to be recognized and cleared by the reticuloendothelial system (RES). Strategies to evade this clearance include the incorporation of polyethylene glycol (PEG), often referred to as PEGylation, which sterically hinders protein binding and thereby prolongs circulation time [16]. PEGylated liposomal doxorubicin (Doxil) stands as a seminal example of how stealth technology can reduce toxicity and boost therapeutic impact in oncology [17]. Similarly, active targeting approaches where ligands, antibodies, or peptides are appended to the liposomal surface can enhance accumulation in tissues expressing the corresponding receptors [18]. Folic acid-targeted liposomes, for instance, have shown promise in cancers overexpressing the folate receptor [19].

2.4 Clinical and Research Applications

Clinically, liposomes have attained notable successes. Amphotericin B liposome (AmBisome) revolutionized antifungal therapies, significantly reducing nephrotoxicity compared to the free drug [20]. Doxil and DaunoXome (liposomal daunorubicin) demonstrated improved tumor targeting and diminished systemic adverse effects in oncology [21]. Beyond anti-cancer and anti-infective spheres, liposomes have been explored for delivering peptides, proteins, vaccines, and nucleic acids, including mRNA-based vaccines for COVID-19 [22]. Their adaptability, biocompatibility, and tunability have secured a prized position in pharmaceutical R&D pipelines.

Emerging liposomal technologies pivot toward multifunctionality and theranostics, integrating diagnostic agents with therapeutic cargo. Image-guided drug delivery, for instance, can be realized by loading liposomes with contrast agents for magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), thereby enabling real-time tracking of vesicle distribution and drug release [23]. Ongoing research also focuses on increasing the specific targeting of liposomes to challenging sites, such as the central nervous system, by leveraging specialized ligands to cross the blood-brain barrier [24]. These developments highlight liposomes as a mature yet continually evolving platform that can inspire the design of newer, more sophisticated nanocarriers.

3. Niosomes

3.1 Composition and Comparative Advantages

Niosomes, structurally akin to liposomes, are bilayer vesicles composed of non-ionic surfactants and cholesterol, lacking the phospholipids that define liposomes [25]. These surfactants often include sorbitan esters (Spans) or polyoxyethylene sorbitan esters (Tweens). Compared to phospholipids, non-ionic surfactants are typically more resistant to oxidation and hydrolysis, lending niosomes a favorable shelf-life stability. A further advantage lies in their cost-effectiveness and availability, rendering them particularly appealing for widespread pharmaceutical applications and research [26].

Given their amphiphilic makeup, niosomes can encapsulate hydrophilic compounds within the aqueous core and lipophilic molecules in the bilayer. This dual encapsulation capability parallels that of liposomes but at a potentially reduced production cost. They have been employed for a spectrum of active agents, including small-molecule drugs, peptides, and vaccines [27]. The inherent flexibility in surfactant selection and bilayer composition grants formulation scientists the ability to fine-tune vesicle size, stability, and release profiles for distinct therapeutic goals.

3.2 Fabrication and Optimization Strategies

Niosome preparation methods echo many of those utilized for liposomes. Thin-film hydration, for instance, involves dissolving non-ionic surfactants in an organic solvent, removing the solvent to form a thin film, and then hydrating with an aqueous phase containing the drug [28]. Sonication or extrusion can be used to further refine particle size. Reverse-phase evaporation and microfluidization also find application, providing alternative routes for achieving controlled vesicle formation.

The introduction of proniosomes a dry formulation of surfactant-coated carrier particles has further simplified the logistics of niosome generation. Proniosomes can spontaneously form niosomal dispersions upon contact with water, offering advantages such as improved physical stability and easier handling during storage and transport [29]. Beyond the basic choice of surfactant type (Span, Tween, Brij, etc.), additional formulation variables, such as the surfactant-to-cholesterol ratio and the inclusion of charge inducers, can be optimized to modulate particle size, zeta potential, and encapsulation efficiency [30].

3.3 Mechanisms of Drug Release and Biological Interactions

Drug release from niosomes is typically governed by passive diffusion, bilayer erosion, or a combination thereof. The structural integrity and fluidity of the surfactant bilayer influence the release rate. In certain

applications, interactions between niosomal membranes and cellular or subcellular compartments facilitate endosomal escape, which can be critical for macromolecular therapies like genetic materials [31]. As with liposomes, niosomes can be rendered "stealth" by incorporating hydrophilic polymers on their surface or by adjusting their bilayer composition to diminish plasma protein binding [32].

Particularly noteworthy is the utility of niosomes for transdermal and topical drug delivery. By interacting with the lipids in the stratum corneum, niosomes can reduce barrier resistance and thus enhance permeation of encapsulated drugs into deeper skin layers [33]. This property has been exploited for antifungals, antibiotics, and anti-inflammatory agents where localized but sustained drug release is beneficial.

3.4 Therapeutic Implementations and Emerging Trends

The versatility and cost advantages of niosomes have led to explorations in multiple therapeutic areas. For instance, niosomal formulations have been examined for the targeted delivery of doxorubicin to reduce systemic cardiotoxicity in cancer therapy [34]. In another example, niosomal gels containing ketoconazole or terbinafine have shown improved antifungal efficacy and skin penetration compared to conventional creams [35]. Ocular drug delivery has emerged as a promising domain as well, where niosome-based eye drops may offer prolonged retention time and enhanced corneal uptake [36].

Recent research also delves into combining niosomes with other nanomaterials or conjugating them with ligands for active targeting. Niosome-liposome hybrid vesicles or niosomes bearing peptides and antibodies are gaining traction for potentially enhancing selectivity and reducing nonspecific distribution [37]. As niosomal technology matures, the balance between scalability, stability, safety, and clinical efficacy will continue to shape its evolution in both pharmaceutical and cosmeceutical fields.

4. Nanocapsules and Nanospheres

4.1 Fundamental Definitions and Distinctions

Nanocapsules and nanospheres two major subdivisions of polymeric nanoparticles are extensively studied for controlled and targeted drug release. In nanocapsules, the drug resides in a distinct reservoir core, surrounded by a polymeric shell that regulates diffusion and provides physical protection. Conversely, nanospheres are matrix systems wherein the drug is dispersed or dissolved throughout a polymer matrix [38]. These architectures differ in their release kinetics, drug loading capacity, and capacity for surface functionalization.

Biodegradable polymers such as poly(lactic acid) (PLA), poly(glycolic acid) (PGA), and the copolymer poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA) are frequently employed. Natural polymers (e.g., chitosan, alginate, gelatin) may also be used to capitalize on their biocompatibility and reduced toxicity [39]. The precise choice of polymer and synthesis route is often governed by the targeted release profile, the physicochemical properties of the drug (e.g., solubility, stability), and the envisioned route of administration.

4.2 Preparation Methods for Polymeric Nanoparticles

A range of methodologies can be employed to fabricate nanocapsules and nanospheres, each with specific advantages in terms of control over particle size distribution, encapsulation efficiency, and ease of scale-up:

1. **Emulsification-Solvent Evaporation**: Here, a solution of polymer and drug in an organic solvent is emulsified into an aqueous phase containing surfactants. Subsequently, the organic solvent is evaporated under reduced pressure or continuous stirring, causing polymer precipitation into nanoparticles [40].
2. **Nanoprecipitation (Solvent Displacement)**: A polymer-drug solution is injected into a miscible non-solvent, leading to instantaneous polymer precipitation as nano-sized particles. This method is relatively straightforward, producing stable nanoparticles with narrow size distributions [41].
3. **Emulsion Polymerization**: Monomers are polymerized in situ within an emulsion system to form nanoparticles. While offering high encapsulation, emulsion polymerization may necessitate rigorous purification to remove residual monomers or initiators [42].

Post-fabrication, particles can undergo further processing, such as freeze-drying or spray-drying, to enhance stability and facilitate longer storage. Factors like polymer molecular weight, solvent choice, and stirring speed can significantly affect nanoparticle size and morphology.

4.3 Drug Release Mechanisms and Tailoring Strategies

Drug release from nanocapsules and nanospheres typically proceeds via diffusion, polymer degradation, or a combination of both. For biodegradable polymers like PLGA, hydrolytic cleavage of ester bonds gradually releases the encapsulated drug [43]. Tuning the polymer composition and molecular weight can regulate the degradation rate, allowing for sustained release over days, weeks, or even months. Such control is especially beneficial in chronic conditions requiring continuous therapeutic levels.

Surface modifications broaden the capabilities of polymeric nanoparticles. For instance, grafting PEG chains onto the nanoparticle exterior can extend circulation times by reducing immune clearance. Integrating

ligands, peptides, or antibodies can impart specificity for cells that overexpress corresponding receptors, such as tumor cells or inflamed endothelial cells [44]. Stimuli-responsive variations often incorporating pH-sensitive or enzyme-degradable linkers enable precise, site-specific release of payloads, making polymeric nanoparticles highly adaptable for challenging therapeutic scenarios, including metastatic cancer and CNS disorders [45].

4.4 Diverse Applications in Drug Delivery

Owing to their robust versatility, polymeric nanocapsules and nanospheres have found applications in oncology, infection control, immunotherapy, and beyond. For example, paclitaxel-loaded PLGA nanocapsules have demonstrated enhanced tumor accumulation and reduced toxicity in preclinical breast cancer models [46]. Nanospheres optimized to cross the blood-brain barrier offer a potential route to deliver therapeutic agents directly to the CNS for diseases such as Alzheimer's or Parkinson's, which traditionally struggle with limited drug penetration [47].

These nanoparticles have also been investigated as vaccine adjuvants, with the polymeric matrix protecting antigens and presenting them in a manner that can boost immunogenic responses [48]. Moreover, the scale-up prospects for polymeric nanoparticles have improved with technological advancements like microfluidics and continuous manufacturing processes, enhancing their translational feasibility. Yet challenges remain, including potential burst release, polymer batch variability, and regulatory scrutiny related to polymer safety. Addressing these through rigorous formulation design and characterization remains a focal point for ongoing research [49].

5. Nanosuspensions

5.1 Conceptual Framework and Rationale

Nanosuspensions are dispersions of pure drug particles stabilized by surfactants or polymers, rather than encapsulating the drug within a matrix or vesicle. This approach is often employed for poorly water-soluble drugs that pose significant hurdles in conventional pharmaceutical development [50]. By reducing particle size into the nanometer range, the surface area increases dramatically, thereby improving the drug's dissolution rate and, in turn, its bioavailability. This attribute is especially pertinent for Class II and Class IV compounds as categorized by the Biopharmaceutics Classification System (BCS) drugs whose low solubility can be a significant barrier to therapeutic efficacy [51].

Unlike polymeric nanoparticles or liposomes, which can sometimes introduce additional complexity or cost, nanosuspensions rely primarily on high-energy processes or controlled precipitation to achieve particle size reduction. The primary objective is to preserve drug potency in a minimally altered chemical form while preventing agglomeration and crystallization that undermine long-term stability.

5.2 Production Techniques and Stabilization

Two main approaches "top-down" and "bottom-up" encapsulate nanosuspension production:

1. **Top-Down Approaches**: High-pressure homogenization and media milling are prominent examples. In high-pressure homogenization, the drug suspension passes repeatedly through a narrow orifice at elevated pressure, undergoing shear, cavitation, and collision forces that break larger particles into nanoparticles [52]. Media milling employs grinding media, such as zirconia or glass beads, which fragment drug crystals through mechanical attrition. These processes can be scaled up to industrial levels, although controlling temperature and preventing contamination are key considerations [53].
2. **Bottom-Up Approaches**: Involve the precipitation of drug particles from a supersaturated solution. The process typically requires careful choice of solvents, anti-solvents, and stabilizers to limit particle growth and aggregation [54]. While it can be less energy-intensive, achieving uniform particle size and preventing uncontrolled crystallization can be challenging.

Stabilizers usually surfactants like polysorbate 80 or polymeric dispersants like polyvinylpyrrolidone (PVP) are indispensable for maintaining colloidal stability. They adsorb onto the particle surface, reducing interfacial tension and preventing re-agglomeration over time [55]. Selecting the correct combination and concentration of stabilizers profoundly influences both the immediate and long-term stability of the nanosuspension.

5.3 Delivery Routes and Formulation Variations

Nanosuspensions are adaptable to a variety of delivery routes. Oral administration benefits from the enhanced dissolution rate, leading to improved bioavailability in gastrointestinal absorption. Parenteral formulations of nanosuspensions allow intravenous or intramuscular delivery of insoluble drugs, potentially reducing the need for harmful co-solvents or surfactants that might otherwise be required [56]. Long-acting injectable nanosuspensions are particularly attractive for chronic disease states like schizophrenia, HIV, or hormone replacement, where infrequent dosing can dramatically enhance patient adherence [57].

Pulmonary and nasal routes also show promise. For instance, preparing nanosuspensions as nebulized solutions or dry powders can optimize respiratory delivery for drugs used in conditions like asthma or tuberculosis. Ocular

formulations of nanosuspensions can improve corneal penetration and retention for drugs treating glaucoma or infectious keratitis [58]. The versatility and relatively simpler composition of nanosuspensions underscore their potential as universal platforms for challenging drug candidates.

5.4 Clinical Impact and Commercial Products

Several nanosuspension-based formulations have been commercialized or are undergoing late-stage clinical trials. For instance, the nano-sized version of fenofibrate (Tricor) significantly boosts its oral bioavailability and lowers inter-patient variability in lipid management [59]. Nanosuspensions of itraconazole provide a more effective antifungal profile with improved gastrointestinal absorption. These real-world success stories highlight how nanosuspension technology can breathe new life into molecules with promising therapeutic properties but poor water solubility.

Nonetheless, nanosuspension technology faces certain formulation challenges like avoiding Ostwald ripening, ensuring uniform particle size on scale-up, and maintaining stability under various storage conditions. Addressing these through rational design, optimized manufacturing parameters, and advanced characterization techniques continues to be an area of active investigation [60].

6. Nanoemulsions

6.1 Basic Principles and Unique Features

Nanoemulsions are colloidal dispersions of oil and water stabilized by surfactants (and often co-surfactants) that exhibit droplet sizes typically in the range of 20–200 nm. Unlike microemulsions, which are thermodynamically stable systems, nanoemulsions are usually kinetically stable, meaning their stability is derived from extremely small droplet sizes and surfactant coverage rather than an inherent thermodynamic equilibrium [61]. Their tiny droplet size translates to a transparent or translucent appearance and confers advantages such as enhanced drug solubility, improved stability against gravitational separation, and higher surface area for drug release.

These properties have made nanoemulsions an attractive delivery system for poorly soluble, often lipophilic drugs. By solubilizing the drug in the oil phase, nanoemulsions bypass the constraints posed by aqueous insolubility. The surfactant shell surrounding each droplet further stabilizes the interface, reducing interfacial tension and preventing aggregation or coalescence [62].

6.2 Formulation Strategies and Types

Nanoemulsions are typically categorized by the identity of their continuous phase:

- **Oil-in-Water (O/W) Nanoemulsions**: Oil droplets are dispersed in a continuous aqueous phase. Commonly used for parenteral and oral drug delivery, as the aqueous external phase is well tolerated by the body.
- **Water-in-Oil (W/O) Nanoemulsions**: Water droplets are dispersed in a continuous oil phase, often for topical or transdermal formulations.
- **Multiple (W/O/W or O/W/O) Emulsions**: More complex systems with multiple layers, suitable for stepwise release or co-encapsulation of hydrophilic and hydrophobic drugs.

High-energy methods, such as high-pressure homogenization, microfluidization, and ultrasonic emulsification, effectively reduce droplet size to the nanometer range [63]. Alternatively, low-energy techniques like phase inversion temperature (PIT) exploit temperature- or composition-induced changes in surfactant affinities, yielding spontaneously formed nano-sized droplets [64]. Selection of surfactants and co-surfactants, such as Tween, Span, or lecithin, is critical, given their varied hydrophile-lipophile balance (HLB) values and interfacial behaviors.

6.3 Stability Considerations and Drug Release Behavior

Nanoemulsions are prone to physical instability through mechanisms like creaming, flocculation, coalescence, and Ostwald ripening. Among these, Ostwald ripening where smaller droplets dissolve and redeposit onto larger droplets is a principal destabilizing factor. Employing oils with minimal water solubility (e.g., long-chain triglycerides) and selecting surfactants that create robust interfacial films can mitigate these processes [65]. Drug release from nanoemulsions generally occurs by diffusion from the oil droplet into the external medium. Formulation factors such as droplet size, oil phase viscosity, and surfactant concentration influence the rate at which the encapsulated drug is liberated [66]. In certain applications, temperature or pH-sensitive surfactants can be used to make these systems partially stimuli-responsive, opening up possibilities for targeted or triggered release.

6.4 Clinical and Pharmaceutical Applications

Historically, nanoemulsions found early adoption in parenteral nutrition and propofol formulations (e.g., Diprivan) for anesthesia [67]. More recently, their utility in delivering chemotherapeutic drugs, hormones, or nutraceuticals has gained momentum. Oral nanoemulsion systems can enhance bioavailability of poorly absorbed

compounds such as coenzyme Q10 or curcumin [68]. Topical and transdermal nanoemulsions exhibit superior skin permeation, useful for dermatological drugs and cosmetic applications [69]. In ophthalmic drug delivery, nanoemulsions can prolong corneal contact time and increase the solubilization of lipophilic molecules, thereby improving drug residence and bioavailability within the eye.

Moreover, the cosmetic industry has leveraged nanoemulsions to deliver vitamins, fragrances, and other actives with enhanced skin feel and penetration. The combination of small droplet size, aesthetic appeal, and potential for controlled release underpins their popularity in cosmeceuticals [70]. As research advances, nanoemulsions continue to expand into areas like vaccine delivery, wherein the oil-in-water format can serve as both an adjuvant and antigen carrier.

7. Challenges in Nanoformulation Development

7.1 Scale-Up, Manufacturing, and Quality Assurance

While numerous nanoformulation strategies have shown promise in laboratory settings, scaling these systems to industrial production presents distinct obstacles. Rigid control over process parameters pressure, temperature, stirring rates, feed rates becomes essential to maintain consistent particle size and drug loading [71]. Variations in such parameters can lead to significant differences in the final product's efficacy, toxicity, and stability. As regulatory bodies increasingly emphasize robust manufacturing controls, adopting Quality by Design (QbD) frameworks can help pinpoint critical material attributes (CMAs) and critical process parameters (CPPs) from the outset [72].

In-line Process Analytical Technology (PAT) tools, such as near-infrared (NIR) spectroscopy or focused beam reflectance measurement (FBRM), facilitate real-time monitoring of particle size and other attributes during production. This real-time feedback loop allows for immediate corrective actions, reducing batch failures and ensuring product quality [73]. However, the capital expenditure and operational expertise required for implementing such sophisticated technologies can be prohibitive, particularly for smaller ventures.

7.2 Storage Stability and Shelf-Life

Ensuring that nanoformulations remain stable over extended periods is essential for commercial viability. Physical instability manifesting as aggregation, sedimentation, or phase separation can compromise therapeutic efficacy or render the product unsafe. For lipid-based systems, oxidative rancidity of lipids or surfactants can occur, leading to off-flavors, odor, and diminished bioactivity [74]. Similarly, drug leakage or crystallization within polymeric nanoparticles undermines controlled release benefits.

To combat these issues, several approaches are utilized:

- **Lyophilization (Freeze-Drying)**: Transforms the nanoformulation into a dry powder, necessitating the use of cryoprotectants or lyoprotectants (e.g., sugars, polyols) to shield particles from degradation.
- **Spray-Drying**: An alternative to lyophilization, although heat sensitivity can be a concern.
- **Optimization of Surfactants or Polymers**: The selection of surfactant or polymer with stable chemical bonds and minimal reactivity extends the shelf life.

Long-term stability studies under real-time and accelerated conditions (e.g., ICH guidelines) are critical before regulatory approval. These studies evaluate whether the formulation can maintain its intended characteristics particle size, zeta potential, entrapment efficiency throughout its shelf-life [75].

7.3 Safety and Toxicological Profiling

Despite their therapeutic potential, nanoformulations can prompt unique biological responses. Nanoparticles might accumulate in organs such as the liver, spleen, or lungs, potentially inducing inflammation, oxidative stress, or immunological reactions [76]. Surface modifications, while beneficial for reducing opsonization, can present additional concerns regarding polymer degradation products and unknown immunogenicity.

Toxicological evaluations must therefore be extensive, exploring acute and chronic exposure, biodistribution, and clearance pathways. Many nanoformulations rely on biodegradable components (e.g., phospholipids, PLGA) that degrade into nontoxic byproducts (e.g., lactic and glycolic acid). However, more complex or hybrid designs might incorporate inorganic elements or novel materials whose long-term biosafety remains less understood [77]. Regulatory agencies now draft specialized guidelines for nanomedicines, underscoring the heightened scrutiny in proving both efficacy and safety prior to market entry [78].

7.4 Regulatory Pathways and Cost

Regulatory bodies around the world, including the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the European Medicines Agency (EMA), have been refining their stances on nanotechnology in medicine. While no wholly distinct regulatory framework solely for nanomedicines exists, these agencies often request supplementary data relating to nano-scale product characterization, pharmacokinetics, and toxicology [6]. Determining whether

a product is classified as a drug, device, or combination product can further complicate its journey through regulatory approval processes.

The cost factor is equally pivotal. Nanoformulations can demand specialized facilities, advanced equipment for characterization (e.g., electron microscopy, dynamic light scattering), and extensive stability/toxicology tests driving up manufacturing and R&D budgets. Additionally, intellectual property considerations may limit the availability of certain methods or materials. These complexities often restrict the field to well-funded pharmaceutical companies, though academic-industry collaborations and governmental funding initiatives help lower barriers to entry for innovative smaller-scale players.

8. Emerging Directions

8.1 Stimuli-Responsive and Smart Nanocarriers

Innovations in polymer chemistry and lipid science have produced "smart" nanocarriers that respond to physiological or external triggers, including pH, temperature, enzymatic activity, and magnetic or ultrasonic fields. By orchestrating drug release only when and where it is needed such as in the acidic tumor microenvironment or an inflamed site with overactive proteases these platforms can substantially enhance therapeutic efficacy and safety [79]. Examples include pH-sensitive liposomes, which exploit the slightly acidic milieu of tumors to release chemotherapeutic agents selectively. Thermosensitive carriers, conversely, can be activated with mild hyperthermia, enabling spatial and temporal precision in drug targeting.

Such designs are pushing the frontier of personalized medicine. For instance, multi-stimuli-responsive nanoparticles that rely on both internal (pH, enzymes) and external (light, heat, magnetic field) signals can integrate diagnostic and therapeutic functions theranostics allowing for real-time monitoring and adjustment of treatments [80]. Yet these systems introduce new layers of complexity in manufacturing, characterization, and regulatory evaluation.

8.2 Hybrid Nanoformulations

Rather than rely solely on a single material class be it lipids, polymers, or inorganic compounds researchers are developing hybrids that merge advantageous traits of each. For example, lipid-polymer hybrid nanoparticles (LPHNs) combine a polymeric core (for structural stability and controlled release) with a lipid outer shell (for biocompatibility and stealth properties) [81]. This architecture can address limitations inherent to purely polymeric or lipidic carriers, such as burst release or premature clearance by the RES.

Similarly, fusing niosomes and liposomes or embedding metallic or silica-based components into lipid or polymeric shells can produce carriers with unique optical, magnetic, or ultrasound contrast properties [82]. These hybrid systems may serve in imaging-guided therapies, where co-delivery of multiple payloads or immediate feedback on biodistribution is advantageous. However, establishing reproducible manufacturing and safety profiles for multi-component nanoformulations remains a formidable challenge, which future research must address systematically.

8.3 Toward Personalized Nanomedicine

As healthcare shifts toward individualized treatment regimens, personalized nanomedicine emerges as a logical extension. Genetic markers, proteomic signatures, and other patient-specific data might inform the selection or customization of nanoformulations ensuring that a carrier's size, surface chemistry, or targeting ligand aligns with the unique pathophysiology of the patient's condition [85]. For instance, in oncology, tumor molecular profiling could dictate the choice of targeting moieties or the drug payload encapsulated within nanoparticles, thereby optimizing therapy efficacy while minimizing harmful side effects [86].

Although still largely aspirational, the concept of personalized nanomedicine is gaining traction through pilot clinical trials that stratify patients based on biomarkers or imaging data. Companion diagnostics where imaging agents integrated into nanocarriers help clinicians determine the best course of treatment represent another stepping stone toward individually tailored regimens. Realizing this vision will hinge on robust collaborations among clinicians, molecular biologists, materials scientists, and regulatory authorities, aiming to unify the complex ecosystem needed to deliver precision therapeutics.

9. CONCLUSION

Nanoformulations stand at the vanguard of modern pharmaceutical development, offering versatile, sophisticated pathways to overcome longstanding obstacles in drug solubility, bioavailability, and targeted delivery. This review has spotlighted several key categories liposomes, niosomes, nanocapsules, nanospheres, nanosuspensions, and nanoemulsions detailing their core compositions, preparation methodologies, release mechanisms, and broad therapeutic applications. The successes of liposomal anticancer agents, antifungals, and lipid nanoparticle-based vaccines underscore the profound clinical impact these platforms have already achieved.

However, the discipline continues to grapple with critical hurdles. Scale-up complexities, stability concerns, and rigorous safety evaluations all contribute to a slower-than-desired journey from academic proof-of-concept to large-scale commercial availability. Regulatory requirements for nanomedicines are gradually clarifying, yet the path remains multifaceted, often necessitating more comprehensive data than traditional drug formulations. Costs, both in terms of R&D and manufacturing, add another layer of complexity, although new technologies and collaborative models are gradually mitigating these financial constraints.

On the horizon, multiple innovations promise to further revolutionize nano-scale drug delivery. Stimuli-responsive carriers, hybrid architectures, and AI-assisted design systems present profound opportunities to fine-tune efficacy, safety, and patient specificity. The ultimate goal to realize fully personalized nanomedicine appears attainable as interdisciplinary collaborations flourish and computational tools gain predictive power. Overcoming the technical and regulatory challenges inherent in such advanced systems will require sustained effort, but the continued progress in this domain portends an era of increasingly targeted, effective, and patient-centric therapies. By harnessing the unique physicochemical attributes of nanoscale carriers, pharmaceutical scientists and clinicians can tailor treatments to disease-specific or patient-specific demands, significantly enhancing clinical outcomes. While much work remains to be done, the ongoing evolution of nanoformulations heralds a future where precise, efficient, and safe drug delivery is the norm rather than the exception. As emerging research clarifies the biological interactions and optimizes manufacturing processes, it is likely that nanoformulations will become indispensable tools in the fight against cancer, infectious diseases, chronic conditions, and beyond reinforcing nanotechnology's pivotal role in shaping next-generation healthcare.

REFERENCES

1. Allen TM, Cullis PR. Drug delivery systems: Entering the mainstream. Science. 2004;303(5665):1818–22.
2. Peer D, Karp JM, Hong S, Farokhzad OC, Margalit R, Langer R. Nanocarriers as an emerging platform for cancer therapy. Nat Nanotechnol. 2007;2(12):751–60.
3. Shi J, Votruba AR, Farokhzad OC, Langer R. Nanotechnology in drug delivery and tissue engineering: From discovery to applications. Nano Lett. 2010;10(9):3223–30.
4. Maeda H. Toward a full understanding of the EPR effect in primary and metastatic tumors as well as issues related to its heterogeneity. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2015;91:3–6.
5. Prow TW. Nanoparticles and sunscreens: Topical applications for UV protection. Nanomedicine (Lond). 2012;7(9):1365–7.
6. Wagner V, Dullaart A, Bock AK, Zweck A. The emerging nanomedicine landscape. Nat Biotechnol. 2006;24(10):1211–7.
7. Knudsen NS, Andersen AJ, Warrington BD, Andar A, Moghimi SM. The capricious journey of lipid nanoparticles through the blood-stream: Lessons learned from COVID-19 vaccines. ACS Nano. 2022;16(3):3623–8.
8. Bangham AD. Liposomes: The first decade and after. Biochim Biophys Acta. 1982;693(2):294–8.
9. Torchilin VP. Recent advances with liposomes as pharmaceutical carriers. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2005;4(2):145–60.
10. Immordino ML, Dosio F, Cattel L. Stealth liposomes: review of the basic science, rationale, and clinical applications. Int J Nanomedicine. 2006;1(3):297–315.
11. Mayer LD, Hope MJ, Cullis PR, Janoff AS. Solute distributions and trapping efficiencies observed in freeze-thawed multilamellar vesicles. Biochim Biophys Acta. 1985;817(1):193–6.
12. Jahn A, Vreeland WN, DeVoe DL, Locascio LE, Gaitan M. Microfluidic directed formation of liposomes of controlled size. Langmuir. 2007;23(11):6289–93.
13. Otake K, Imura T, Sakai H, Abe M. Development of a new preparation method of liposomes using supercritical carbon dioxide. Langmuir. 2001;17(13):3898–901.
14. Drummond DC, Noble CO, Guo ZX, Hayes ME, Park JW, Kirpotin DB. Development of a highly active nanoliposomal irinotecan using a novel intraliposomal stabilization strategy. Cancer Res. 2006;66(6):3271–7.
15. Yatvin MB, Weinstein JN, Dennis WH, Blumenthal R. Design of liposomes for enhanced local release of drugs by hyperthermia. Science. 1978;202(4374):1290–3.
16. Ishida T, Maeda R, Ichihara M, Irimura K, Kiwada H. Accelerated clearance of PEGylated liposomes in rats after repeated injections. J Control Release. 2003;88(1):35–42.
17. Allen TM, Cullis PR. Liposomal drug delivery systems: From concept to clinical applications. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2013;65(1):36–48.
18. Pastorino F, Brignole C, Marimpietri D, et al. Vascular damage and anti-angiogenic effects of tumor vessel-targeted liposomal chemotherapy. Cancer Res. 2003;63(21):7400–9.

19. Low PS, Henne WA, Doorneweerd DD. Discovery and development of folic-acid-based receptor targeting for imaging and therapy of cancer and inflammatory diseases. Acc Chem Res. 2008;41(1):120–9.
20. Adler-Moore JP, Proffitt RT. AmBisome: Liposomal formulation, structure, mechanism of action and pre-clinical experience. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2002;49(Suppl 1):21–30.
21. Sharma A, Sharma US. Liposomes in drug delivery: Progress and limitations. Int J Pharm. 1997;154(2):123–40.
22. Hou X, Zaks T, Langer R, Dong Y. Lipid nanoparticles for mRNA delivery. Nat Rev Mater. 2021;6(12):1078–94.
23. Luciani A, Rizzitelli S, Agostini M, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging of the biodistribution of cationic liposomes in mice using a gadolinium-loaded lipidic nanoparticle. J Biomed Nanotechnol. 2009;5(5):567–74.
24. Wohlfart S, Gelperina S, Kreuter J. Transport of drugs across the blood–brain barrier by nanoparticles. J Control Release. 2012;161(2):264–73.
25. Uchegbu IF, Vyas SP. Non-ionic surfactant based vesicles (niosomes) in drug delivery. Int J Pharm. 1998;172(1–2):33–70.
26. Shilakari Asthana G, Asthana A, Singh D, Sharma PK. Niosomes: A novel trend of drug delivery. EJBPS. 2015;2(1):436–42.
27. Nash J, Shah M, Alkhawaja B, Al-Kinani AA, Phoenix DA, Roberts MS. Non-ionic surfactant vesicles: Niosomes as drug delivery systems. J Pharm Pharmacol. 2021;73(9):1132–56.
28. Baillie AJ, Florence AT, Hume LR, Muirhead GT, Rogerson A. The preparation and properties of niosomes non-ionic surfactant vesicles. J Pharm Pharmacol. 1985;37(12):863–8.
29. Yoshioka T, Sternberg B, Florence AT. Preparation and properties of vesicles (niosomes) of sorbitan monoesters and a sorbitan triester. Int J Pharm. 1994;105(1):1–6.
30. Varghese B, Sam G. Niosomes and proniosomes: Emerging alternatives to liposomes. Biomed Pharmacol J. 2018;11(3):1523–35.
31. Chandra A, Sharma PK, Saraf S. Niosomes: A potential carrier for controlled and targeted drug delivery. Int J Pharm Sci. 2010;2(1):61–6.
32. Manosroi A, Wongtrakul J, Manosroi J, et al. Characterization of vesicles prepared with various non-ionic surfactants mixed with cholesterol. Colloids Surf B Biointerfaces. 2003;30(1-2):129–38.
33. Godin B, Touitou E. Mechanism of bacitracin permeation enhancement through the skin and cellular membranes from an ethosomal carrier. J Control Release. 2004;94(2-3):365–79.
34. Azmin MN, Florence AT, Handjani-Vila RM, et al. The effect of non-ionic surfactant vesicle (niosome) entrapment on the absorption and distribution of methotrexate in mice. J Pharm Pharmacol. 1985;37(4):237–42.
35. Raja Naresh RA, Chakraborti S, Sharma RK, Talwar GP, Garg S. Niosome encapsulated cyclosporine: Assessment of immunosuppression efficacy. Int J Pharm. 1996;133(1–2):107–16.
36. Abdelkader H, Mansour NO, Zeena N, Mahmoud OH, Kabary DM. Niosomes as a promising ophthalmic delivery system for dorzolamide hydrochloride. Drug Deliv Transl Res. 2021;11(5):1717–28.
37. Bahadur S, Sudheesh MS, Singh S, et al. Niosome-liposome hybrid vesicles for an enhanced in vitro and in vivo performance of amphotericin B. Pharmaceutics. 2021;13(7):956.
38. Soppimath KS, Aminabhavi TM, Kulkarni AR, Rudzinski WE. Biodegradable polymeric nanoparticles as drug delivery devices. J Control Release. 2001;70(1–2):1–20.
39. Bharadwaj R, Yu H, Luzinov I, Minko S, Stamm M. Poly(lactic acid) nanocapsules and the effect of pH, electrolytes, and surfactants on their stability. Macromol Mater Eng. 2003;288(12):936–44.
40. Quintanar-Guerrero D, Allémann E, Fessi H, Doelker E. Preparation techniques and mechanisms of formation of biodegradable nanoparticles from preformed polymers. Drug Dev Ind Pharm. 1998;24(12):1113–28.
41. Peltonen L, Hirvonen J. Drug nanocrystals Versatile option for formulation of poorly soluble materials. Int J Pharm. 2018;537(1–2):73–83.
42. Zhang W, Shi Y, Chen Y, Ye J, Sha X, Fang X. Vitamin E TPGS-based submicron emulsions for synergistic paclitaxel and retinoic acid delivery. J Pharm Sci. 2009;98(6):2040–50.
43. Reis CP, Ribeiro AJ, Veiga F, Neufeld RJ, Damgé C. Polyelectrolyte biomaterial interactions provide nanoparticulate carrier for oral insulin delivery. Drug Deliv. 2008;15(3):127–39.
44. Suk JS, Xu Q, Kim N, Hanes J, Ensign LM. PEGylation as a strategy for improving nanoparticle-based drug and gene delivery. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2016;99(Pt A):28–51.
45. Meng F, Zhong Z, Feijen J. Stimuli-responsive polymersomes for programmed drug delivery. Biomacromolecules. 2009;10(2):197–209.
46. Fonseca C, Simões S, Gaspar R. Paclitaxel-loaded PLGA nanoparticles: Preparation, physicochemical characterization and in vitro anti-tumoral activity. J Control Release. 2002;83(2):273–86.
47. Pardridge WM. The blood-brain barrier: Bottleneck in brain drug development. NeuroRx. 2005;2(1):3–14.

48. Peek LJ, Middaugh CR, Berkland C. Nanotechnology in vaccine delivery. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2008;60(8):915–28.
49. Bose RJ, McCarthy JR, Shukla SD, Robinson R, Varela L, Shaffrey ME. A perspective on the translational challenges for polymeric nanoparticles in gene therapy. J Control Release. 2020;319:520–31.
50. Patravale VB, Date AA, Kulkarni RM. Nanosuspensions: A promising drug delivery strategy. J Pharm Pharmacol. 2004;56(7):827–40.
51. Merisko-Liversidge E, Liversidge GG. Drug nanoparticles: Formulating poorly water-soluble compounds. Toxicol Pathol. 2008;36(1):43–8.
52. Müller RH, Peters K, Becker R, Kruss B. Nanosuspensions for the formulation of poorly soluble drugs. Int J Pharm. 1995;113(1):41–7.
53. Jacobs C, Kayser O, Müller RH. Nanosuspensions as a new approach for the formulation for the poorly soluble drug tarazepide. Int J Pharm. 2000;196(2):161–4.
54. Shegokar R, Müller RH. Nanocrystals: Industrially feasible multifunctional formulation technology for poorly soluble actives. Int J Pharm. 2010;399(1–2):129–39.
55. Keck CM, Müller RH. Drug nanocrystals of poorly soluble drugs produced by high pressure homogenisation. Eur J Pharm Biopharm. 2006;62(1):3–16.
56. Möschwitzer JP. Drug nanocrystals in the commercial pharmaceutical development process. Int J Pharm. 2013;453(1):142–56.
57. Vourvahis M, Tatham LM, Wenning LA, et al. Long-acting cabotegravir and rilpivirine: Safety and pharmacokinetics from drug development to clinical practice. Curr Opin HIV AIDS. 2021;16(1):28–33.
58. Ali HS, York P, Blagden N. Hydroxypropyl-β-cyclodextrin nanosuspensions of corticosteroids prepared by high-pressure homogenisation: A comparison study with standard nanosuspensions. Eur J Pharm Sci. 2009;38(3):189–96.
59. Kesisoglou F, Panmai S, Wu Y. Nanosizing Oral formulation development and biopharmaceutical evaluation. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2007;59(7):631–44.
60. Cerdeira AM, Mazzotti M. Effect of process parameters on the freeze-drying of nanoparticle suspensions in vials. Pharm Res. 2017;34(7):1450–62.
61. McClements DJ. Nanoemulsions versus microemulsions: terminology, differences, and similarities. Soft Matter. 2012;8(6):1719–29.
62. Constantinides PP, Scalart JP. Formulation and physical characterization of water-in-oil microemulsions containing long vs. medium chain glycerides. Int J Pharm. 1997;158(1):57–68.
63. Jaiswal M, Dudhe R, Sharma PK. Nanoemulsion: An advanced mode of drug delivery system. 3 Biotech. 2015;5(2):123–7.
64. Solans C, Kunieda H. Industrial applications of microemulsions. CRC Press; 1997.
65. McClements DJ, Rao J. Food-grade nanoemulsions: formulation, fabrication, properties, performance, biological fate, and potential toxicity. Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr. 2011;51(4):285–330.
66. Tang SY, Shridharan P, Sivakumar M. Impact of process parameters in the generation of novel aspirin nanoemulsions comparative studies between ultrasonic cavitation and microfluidizer. Ultrason Sonochem. 2013;20(1):485–97.
67. Ichikawa K, Hikita T, Yonezawa S, Takeuchi H. Propofol-loaded microemulsion aerosol for intravenous anesthesia by inhalation. Int J Pharm. 2019;558:339–44.
68. Devarajan V, Ravichandran V. Nanoemulsions: as modified drug delivery tool. Int J Compr Pharm. 2011;4(4):1–6.
69. Shakeel F, Shafiq S, Haq N, et al. Nanoemulsions as vehicles for transdermal delivery of aceclofenac and methotrexate: A practical approach. Drug Dev Ind Pharm. 2008;34(6):635–45.
70. Tadros T, Izquierdo P, Esquena J, Solans C. Formation and stability of nano-emulsions. Adv Colloid Interface Sci. 2004;108–109:303–18.
71. Hafner A, Lovrić J, Lakoš GP, Pepić I. Nanotherapeutics in the EU: An overview on current state and future directions. Int J Nanomedicine. 2014;9:1005–23.
72. Lionberger RA, Lee SL, Lee L, Raw A, Yu LX. Quality by design: concepts for ANDAs. AAPS J. 2008;10(2):268–76.
73. McClements DJ. Advances in the application of ultrasound in food analysis and processing. Trends Food Sci Technol. 1995;6(9):293–9.
74. Muehlbach W, Schwanda S, Allmendinger L, Wacker M. Ensuring the stability of liposomal formulations: Real-time and accelerated studies in outpatient infusion bags. J Pharm Sci. 2020;109(3):1542–50.
75. Zoghi Z, Shojaei A, Homayouni A, Rezaei Mokarram R, Kashaninejad M, Hamishehkar H. Optimization of spray-drying process for casein-coated iron oxide nanoparticles using response surface methodology. Powder Technol. 2020;364:263–72.
76. Desai N. Challenges in development of nanoparticle-based therapeutics. AAPS J. 2012;14(2):282–5.

77. Moghimi SM, Hunter AC, Murray JC. Long-circulating and target-specific nanoparticles: Theory to practice. Pharmacol Rev. 2001;53(2):283–318.
78. European Medicines Agency (EMA). Reflection paper on nanotechnology-based medicinal products for human use. 2019.
79. Mura S, Nicolas J, Couvreur P. Stimuli-responsive nanocarriers for drug delivery. Nat Mater. 2013;12(11):991–1003.
80. Janib SM, Moses AS, MacKay JA. Imaging and drug delivery using theranostic nanoparticles. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2010;62(11):1052–63.
81. Hasan N, Im S, Kim Y, et al. Centella asiatica extract–loaded lipid–polymer hybrid nanoparticles for targeted and enhanced anticancer therapy against MCF-7 breast cancer cells. Biomater Sci. 2019;7(5):2101–15.
82. Satapathy MK, Qureshi D, Meher JG, et al. In situ gel-based nanoscale niosomal dispersion for transdermal delivery of ketoconazole: Mechanistic insight and in vivo performance. Int J Pharm. 2020;578:119125.
83. Ghasemi F, Bootabi F, Faghihi S, Taherimehr M. Applications of artificial intelligence in the development of nanoparticles for drug delivery. Curr Pharm Biotechnol. 2019;20(15):1184–200.
84. Cheng SH, Lee CH, Chen MC, Souris JS, Tseng FG, Yang CS. Tri-functionalization of mesoporous silica nanoparticles for comprehensive cancer theranostics: Image-guided gene therapy and drug delivery. Nanoscale. 2009;1(1):72–9.
85. Dawidczyk CM, Kim C, Park JH, et al. State-of-the-art in design rules for drug delivery platforms: Lessons learned from FDA-approved nanomedicines. J Control Release. 2014;187:133–44.
86. Pelaz B, Alexiou C, Alvarez-Puebla RA, et al. Diverse applications of nanomedicine. ACS Nano. 2017;11(3):2313–81.