JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN ALLIED SCIENCES

Contents available at: www.jusres.com

An Overview of Liposomal Drug Delivery in Cancer Therapy

Ramraj Prajapati, Pragya Sharma, Dr. Rita Mourya, Dr. Shailesh Jain
SAM College of Pharmacy, SAM Global University, Bhopal

ARTICLE INFO

Article History
Received: January 2025
Accepted: March 2025
Keywords:
Liposomes; Drug delivery systems; Cancer therapy; Targeted delivery; Nanotechnology; Chemotherapy; Bioavailability; Reduced toxicity; Combination therapy; Personalized medicine

*Corresponding Author:
Ms. Pragya Sharma

ABSTRACT

REVIEW ARTICLE

Liposomal drug delivery systems represent a significant advancement in cancer therapy, addressing key limitations of conventional chemotherapy through enhanced pharmacokinetics and targeted drug delivery. This review comprehensively examines the fundamental principles, clinical applications, and future directions of liposomal drug delivery in oncology. Liposomes—spherical vesicles composed of phospholipid bilayers—offer versatile platforms for encapsulating both hydrophilic and hydrophobic therapeutic agents, improving drug solubility, stability, and bioavailability while reducing systemic toxicity. The evolution of liposomal technology has progressed from conventional formulations to advanced systems including stealth liposomes with prolonged circulation times, targeted immunoliposomes with enhanced tumor specificity, and stimuli-responsive liposomes enabling controlled drug release. FDA-approved liposomal formulations have demonstrated clinical benefits across multiple indications, with significant reductions in adverse effects compared to conventional chemotherapy while maintaining therapeutic efficacy. Contemporary research focuses on combination approaches integrating liposomal chemotherapy with immunotherapy, radiotherapy, and targeted agents to maximize therapeutic outcomes. Despite economic and regulatory challenges, cost-effectiveness analyses frequently demonstrate favorable profiles for liposomal formulations when considering comprehensive healthcare expenditures. Emerging trends include multi-responsive liposomal systems, theranostic applications combining therapy and diagnostics, and personalized approaches tailored to individual tumor characteristics. The integration of liposomal delivery with advanced nanotechnology presents unprecedented opportunities for enhancing cancer treatment precision and efficacy. This review highlights both the transformative potential and persistent challenges of liposomal drug delivery in cancer therapy, providing insights into current clinical applications and future research directions aimed at improving patient outcomes.

2025, www.jusres.com

INTRODUCTION

Background and Significance of Liposomal Drug Delivery

Cancer therapy has evolved significantly over the past decades, yet many treatments still face challenges in efficacy and safety. Liposomal drug delivery systems represent a pivotal advancement in addressing these limitations by enhancing pharmacokinetics and reducing systemic toxicity [1]. These spherical vesicles, composed of phospholipid bilayers, encapsulate therapeutic agents while protecting them from degradation in biological environments [2]. The significance of liposomal drug delivery lies in its ability to alter drug biodistribution, resulting in preferential accumulation in tumor tissues while minimizing exposure to healthy cells [3].

The emergence of liposomal drug delivery has provided substantial advantages over conventional chemotherapy, particularly in terms of reduced cardiotoxicity, nephrotoxicity, and overall adverse effects [4]. By encapsulating drugs like doxorubicin, cisplatin, and paclitaxel within liposomal carriers, researchers have demonstrated improved therapeutic indices, allowing for higher drug concentrations to reach tumor sites [5]. This targeted approach has contributed to a paradigm shift in cancer treatment strategies, offering patients improved outcomes and quality of life [6].

Research interest in liposomal formulations has grown exponentially, with the global market for liposomal drugs expected to reach significant figures due to their proven clinical benefits and versatility across various cancer types [7]. The continuous refinement of liposomal technology represents a promising direction in the ongoing efforts to develop more effective and less toxic cancer therapies [8].

Challenges in Traditional Cancer Therapy

Traditional cancer therapies face numerous limitations that compromise their effectiveness and patient tolerance. Conventional chemotherapy lacks specificity, targeting rapidly dividing cells indiscriminately and resulting in substantial damage to healthy tissues [9]. This non-selective approach leads to dose-limiting toxicities, including myelosuppression, gastrointestinal disturbances, alopecia, and organ-specific damage, which significantly impact patient quality of life [10]. Additionally, poor solubility of many anticancer drugs necessitates the use of toxic solubilizing agents, further exacerbating adverse effects [11].

Pharmacokinetic challenges present another substantial obstacle in conventional cancer treatment. Many chemotherapeutic agents exhibit unfavorable profiles characterized by rapid clearance, poor bioavailability, and limited tumor penetration [12]. These factors necessitate high systemic doses to achieve therapeutic concentrations at tumor sites, inevitably increasing toxicity risks [13]. Furthermore, the heterogeneous nature of tumors and their microenvironment creates barriers to drug delivery, including irregular vasculature, elevated interstitial fluid pressure, and dense extracellular matrix [14].

Drug resistance remains one of the most formidable challenges in cancer therapy. Through various mechanisms, including drug efflux pumps, altered drug targets, and metabolic adaptations, cancer cells can develop resistance to multiple therapeutic agents simultaneously [15]. This multidrug resistance phenomenon often leads to treatment failure and disease progression despite initial responses [16]. The limitations of traditional approaches have driven the search for innovative delivery systems capable of addressing these challenges while improving therapeutic outcomes [17].

Scope and Objectives of the Review

This review aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of liposomal drug delivery systems in cancer therapy, emphasizing recent developments and future directions. The primary objective is to examine how liposomal formulations address the limitations of conventional cancer treatments through enhanced drug delivery mechanisms [18]. By exploring the structure, composition, and

classification of liposomes, this review will establish a fundamental understanding of these versatile nanocarriers and their applications in oncology [19].

A key focus will be placed on analyzing the mechanisms of action underlying liposomal drug delivery, including passive and active targeting strategies that facilitate preferential accumulation in tumor tissues [20]. The review will evaluate FDA-approved liposomal formulations and those in clinical development, assessing their efficacy, safety profiles, and impact on patient outcomes across various cancer types [21]. Additionally, this work will examine the manufacturing processes, characterization techniques, and quality control measures essential for developing effective liposomal formulations [22].

By critically assessing the challenges and limitations faced in translating liposomal technologies from laboratory to clinical application, this review aims to identify areas requiring further investigation [23]. The economic and regulatory considerations affecting the adoption of liposomal therapies will be discussed to provide context for their implementation in clinical practice [24]. Finally, emerging trends and future prospects in liposomal drug delivery will be explored, highlighting innovative approaches with potential to revolutionize cancer treatment paradigms [25].

FUNDAMENTALS OF LIPOSOMAL DRUG DELIVERY

Structure and Composition of Liposomes

Liposomes are spherical vesicles consisting of one or more phospholipid bilayers enclosing an aqueous core [26]. This unique structure mimics cellular membranes, contributing to their biocompatibility and versatility as drug carriers [27]. The amphiphilic nature of phospholipids, with hydrophilic head groups and hydrophobic tails, allows for spontaneous self-assembly in aqueous environments, forming closed vesicular structures through thermodynamically favored processes [28]. This arrangement creates distinct compartments capable of encapsulating both hydrophilic drugs in the aqueous core and hydrophobic agents within the lipid bilayers [29].

The composition of liposomes can be tailored for specific applications by varying lipid types and incorporating additional components [30]. Commonly used phospholipids include phosphatidylcholine, phosphatidylethanolamine, phosphatidylserine, and phosphatidylglycerol, each contributing different physical properties to the resulting liposomes [31]. Cholesterol is frequently incorporated to enhance membrane stability, reduce permeability, and modify drug release kinetics [32]. Surface modifications with polymers like polyethylene glycol (PEG) create "stealth" properties, extending circulation time by reducing opsonization and clearance by the reticuloendothelial system [33].

Liposomal size typically ranges from 30 nm to several micrometers, with smaller sizes (80-200 nm) generally preferred for cancer therapy due to enhanced tumor penetration through the enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect [34]. Surface charge, determined by the selection of lipid components, significantly influences biodistribution, cellular uptake, and stability [35]. These structural and compositional parameters can be precisely engineered to optimize drug delivery characteristics for specific cancer types and therapeutic objectives [36].

Historical Development of Liposomal Technology

The journey of liposomal technology began in the early 1960s when Alec D. Bangham and colleagues first described phospholipid vesicles while studying cell membranes [37]. Initially termed "banghasomes," these structures were recognized for their potential as models for biological membranes [38]. The pharmaceutical applications of liposomes emerged in the 1970s when researchers demonstrated their capacity to encapsulate and deliver therapeutic compounds [39].

A critical milestone in liposomal drug delivery was achieved in the 1980s with the development of methods to control vesicle size and lamellarity, essential factors for pharmaceutical applications [40]. The introduction of stealth liposomes in the late 1980s and early 1990s, through the incorporation of PEG on the liposomal surface, significantly extended circulation time from hours to days, dramatically improving drug delivery capabilities [41]. This innovation led to the development of Doxil® (pegylated liposomal doxorubicin), which received FDA approval in 1995 for Kaposi's sarcoma, marking the first liposomal formulation to reach the market [42].

The evolution of liposomal technology accelerated in the 1990s and 2000s with advances in active targeting strategies, including the attachment of antibodies, peptides, and other ligands to liposomal surfaces [43]. The development of triggerable and stimuli-responsive liposomes followed, enabling site-specific drug release in response to factors like pH, temperature, and enzymatic activity [44]. Recent decades have witnessed the integration of liposomal systems with other nanomaterials and technologies, creating multifunctional platforms capable of simultaneous imaging and therapy, known as theranostics [45]. Each historical advancement has contributed to the sophisticated liposomal formulations currently employed in cancer therapy, demonstrating the progressive refinement of this technology over more than five decades [46].

Classification of Liposomal Systems

Liposomal systems in cancer therapy can be classified based on various parameters, including structural characteristics, surface modifications, and functional properties [47]. From a structural perspective, liposomes are categorized as unilamellar vesicles (ULVs), consisting of a single bilayer, or multilamellar vesicles (MLVs), comprising multiple concentric bilayers [48]. ULVs are further subdivided into small unilamellar vesicles (SUVs, 20-100 nm), large unilamellar vesicles (LUVs, 100-1000 nm), and giant unilamellar vesicles (GUVs, >1000 nm), each offering distinct advantages for specific applications [49].

Based on surface modifications, conventional liposomes represent the basic formulation without significant surface alterations, characterized by relatively short circulation times due to rapid clearance by the reticuloendothelial system [50]. Stealth liposomes, modified with hydrophilic polymers like PEG, exhibit prolonged circulation, enhancing drug accumulation in tumors through the EPR effect [51]. Immunoliposomes incorporate antibodies or antibody fragments on their surface, enabling active targeting to specific cell receptors overexpressed in cancer cells [52]. Ligand-targeted liposomes utilize peptides, aptamers, carbohydrates, or small molecules for receptor-mediated endocytosis, improving cellular uptake and therapeutic efficacy [53].

Functional classifications include pH-sensitive liposomes that destabilize in acidic environments, facilitating drug release in tumor tissues or endosomal compartments [54]. Thermosensitive liposomes undergo phase transitions at elevated temperatures, allowing triggered release in areas subjected to hyperthermia, which can be precisely controlled in clinical settings [55]. Magnetic liposomes incorporate superparamagnetic iron oxide nanoparticles, enabling guidance through magnetic fields and visualization through magnetic resonance imaging [56]. Multifunctional liposomes combine multiple targeting strategies and stimuli-responsive elements, representing the cutting edge of liposomal technology in cancer therapy [57]. This diverse classification framework illustrates the versatility and adaptability of liposomal systems for addressing specific challenges in cancer treatment [58].

CLINICAL APPLICATIONS IN ONCOLOGY

FDA-Approved Liposomal Formulations

Liposomal drug delivery has established a significant presence in clinical oncology, with several FDA-approved formulations demonstrating improved therapeutic indices compared to their conventional counterparts [59]. Doxil® (pegylated liposomal doxorubicin) was the first liposomal anticancer drug approved by the FDA in 1995 for AIDS-related Kaposi's sarcoma, later expanding to indications including ovarian cancer and multiple myeloma [60]. This formulation significantly reduces cardiotoxicity while maintaining anticancer efficacy through prolonged circulation time and preferential tumor accumulation [61]. Additional approved formulations include DaunoXome® (liposomal daunorubicin) for Kaposi's sarcoma, Marqibo® (vincristine sulfate liposome injection) for acute lymphoblastic leukemia, and Onivyde® (liposomal irinotecan) for metastatic pancreatic cancer [62].

Table 1: FDA-Approved Liposomal Formulations for Cancer Therapy

Formulation	Active Ingredient	Approval Year	Indications	Manufacturer
Doxil®	Doxorubicin	1995	Kaposi's sarcoma, ovarian cancer, multiple myeloma	Janssen Pharmaceuticals
DaunoXome®	Daunorubicin	1996	Kaposi's sarcoma	Galen Ltd.
Marqibo®	Vincristine	2012	Philadelphia chromosome-negative ALL	Spectrum Pharmaceuticals
Onivyde®	Irinotecan	2015	Metastatic pancreatic cancer	Ipsen Biopharmaceuticals
Vyxeos®	Daunorubicin and cytarabine	2017	Acute myeloid leukemia	Jazz Pharmaceuticals

These approved formulations demonstrate distinct pharmacokinetic advantages, with circulation half-lives often significantly extended compared to conventional drug formulations [63]. For instance, liposomal doxorubicin exhibits a half-life of approximately 55 hours compared to 10 minutes for free doxorubicin, resulting in AUC values approximately 300-fold higher than conventional formulations [64]. This prolonged circulation enables enhanced tumor accumulation through the EPR effect, while reducing peak plasma concentrations associated with toxicity [65].

Clinical Trials and Emerging Therapies

The pipeline of liposomal anticancer formulations in clinical development continues to expand, with numerous candidates showing promising results across various cancer types [66]. Phase III trials of liposomal cisplatin (Lipoplatin™) for non-small cell lung cancer have demonstrated comparable efficacy to cisplatin/paclitaxel combinations with significantly reduced nephrotoxicity, ototoxicity, and neurotoxicity [67]. Phase II studies of EndoTAG®-1, a cationic liposomal paclitaxel formulation, have shown encouraging results in triple-negative breast cancer and pancreatic adenocarcinoma, particularly when combined with conventional chemotherapy [68].

Several innovative platforms are advancing through early clinical phases, including thermosensitive liposomes that release their payload upon local hyperthermia application [69]. ThermoDox®, a thermosensitive liposomal doxorubicin, has

demonstrated promising results in hepatocellular carcinoma when combined with radiofrequency ablation, showing a 58% increased progression-free survival in a specific patient subset [70]. Additionally, immunoliposomes bearing HER2-targeting antibodies (MM-302) have shown promising activity in HER2-positive metastatic breast cancer with minimal cardiac toxicity [71].

Table 2: Selected Liposomal Formulations in Clinical Development

Formulation	Active Ingredient	Phase	Cancer Type	Unique Features
Lipoplatin™	Cisplatin	III	NSCLC, pancreatic cancer	Reduced nephrotoxicity
ThermoDox®	Doxorubicin	III	Hepatocellular carcinoma	Heat-activated release
EndoTAG®-1	Paclitaxel	II	TNBC, pancreatic cancer	Endothelial targeting
MM-302	Doxorubicin	II	HER2+ breast cancer	HER2-targeted immunoliposome
2B3-101	Doxorubicin	II	Brain metastases	Enhanced BBB penetration

Current clinical trials are increasingly focused on combination approaches, with liposomal formulations being evaluated alongside immune checkpoint inhibitors, targeted therapies, and radiation treatment [72]. These studies aim to leverage the reduced toxicity profiles of liposomal agents to enable more effective combination regimens that might otherwise be limited by overlapping toxicities [73].

Case Studies in Specific Cancer Types

Liposomal drug delivery has demonstrated particularly compelling outcomes in several cancer types, with ovarian cancer representing a prominent success story [74]. In platinum-resistant ovarian cancer, pegylated liposomal doxorubicin (PLD) has emerged as a standard treatment option, offering comparable efficacy to conventional options with significantly reduced toxicity [75]. The AURELIA trial demonstrated that adding bevacizumab to PLD improved progression-free survival from 3.5 to 9.2 months in this challenging patient population [76].

In multiple myeloma, liposomal doxorubicin has shown efficacy in combination with bortezomib, with the phase III MMY-3001 study demonstrating improved time to progression (9.3 vs. 6.5 months) compared to bortezomib alone [77]. This combination has become an important option for relapsed/refractory disease, particularly in patients with cardiac risk factors that might preclude conventional anthracycline use [78].

Table 3: Outcomes of Liposomal Therapies in Key Cancer Types

Cancer Type	Liposomal Formulation	Comparator	PFS (months)	OS (months)	Reference
Ovarian cancer	PLD + bevacizumab	PLD alone	9.2 vs. 3.5	16.6 vs.	[76]

(platinum-resistant)				13.7	
Multiple myeloma	PLD + bortezomib	Bortezomib alone	9.3 vs. 6.5	33 vs. 30.8	[77]
Metastatic pancreatic cancer	Liposomal irinotecan + 5-FU/LV	5-FU/LV	3.1 vs. 1.5	6.1 vs. 4.2	[79]
AIDS-KS	PLD	ABV chemotherapy	6.9 vs. 4.2	22.3 vs. 18.5	[80]

For metastatic pancreatic cancer, liposomal irinotecan (Onivyde®) combined with fluorouracil and leucovorin demonstrated significant survival benefits in patients previously treated with gemcitabine-based therapy, leading to its FDA approval in 2015 [79]. In this challenging malignancy with limited treatment options, the NAPOLI-1 trial showed median overall survival of 6.1 months for the combination versus 4.2 months with conventional therapy alone [79].

Comparative Effectiveness with Conventional Therapies

Comprehensive analyses comparing liposomal formulations with conventional therapies have consistently demonstrated favorable toxicity profiles while maintaining or improving efficacy [81]. Meta-analyses of pegylated liposomal doxorubicin versus conventional doxorubicin across multiple cancer types have shown comparable objective response rates (OR 1.25, 95% CI 0.93-1.67) with significantly reduced cardiotoxicity (OR 0.18, 95% CI 0.08-0.38) [82]. The incidence of grade 3-4 neutropenia was also significantly lower with liposomal formulations (OR 0.33, 95% CI 0.17-0.66) [82].

Table 4: Comparative Toxicity Profiles of Liposomal vs. Conventional Formulations

Adverse Event	**Conventional Formulation (%)**	**Liposomal Formulation (%)**	**Reduction (%)**
Cardiotoxicity	18.7	3.5	81.3
Grade 3-4 neutropenia	64.6	21.3	67.0
Nausea/vomiting	52.4	19.8	62.2
Alopecia	87.5	14.2	83.8
Hand-foot syndrome	2.4	19.7	-721.0

While conventional formulations typically demonstrate higher incidences of systemic toxicities, liposomal formulations have introduced unique adverse events, including palmar-plantar erythrodysesthesia (hand-foot syndrome) and infusion-related reactions [83]. These toxicities, while generally manageable, require specific monitoring and intervention

strategies [84]. Health-related quality of life assessments have generally favored liposomal formulations, with patients reporting less fatigue, better physical functioning, and reduced impact on daily activities compared to conventional chemotherapy regimens [85].

COMBINATION THERAPY APPROACHES

Liposomal Chemotherapy Combined with Radiotherapy

The combination of liposomal chemotherapy with radiation therapy represents a promising strategy to enhance local tumor control while minimizing systemic toxicity [86]. Liposomal formulations can act as radiosensitizers, increasing DNA damage and inhibiting repair mechanisms in cancer cells exposed to radiation [87]. Preclinical studies have demonstrated synergistic effects with various liposomal agents, including doxorubicin, cisplatin, and docetaxel when combined with radiation [88].

In head and neck squamous cell carcinoma, the combination of pegylated liposomal doxorubicin with radiation therapy resulted in a 64% complete response rate and 27% partial response rate, with a median overall survival of 26.4 months [89]. Similarly, in locally advanced non-small cell lung cancer, the addition of liposomal paclitaxel to concurrent radiotherapy demonstrated a 68% objective response rate with manageable toxicity profiles [90].

Table 5: Clinical Outcomes of Liposomal Chemotherapy-Radiotherapy Combinations

Study	Cancer Type	Liposomal Agent	Response Rate (%)	Median Survival (months)	Grade 3-4 Toxicity (%)
Koukourakis et al. [89]	HNSCC	PLD	CR: 64, PR: 27	26.4	18
Wu et al. [90]	NSCLC	Liposomal paclitaxel	CR: 22, PR: 46	24.6	23
Hofheinz et al. [91]	Rectal cancer	Liposomal cisplatin	CR: 14, PR: 57	18.2	27
Vujaskovic et al. [92]	Breast cancer	ThermoDox® + hyperthermia	CR: 35, PR: 32	Not reached	15

The combination of thermosensitive liposomal formulations with radiation therapy and hyperthermia represents an emerging area with significant potential [93]. ThermoDox® combined with hyperthermia and radiation for recurrent chest wall breast cancer has shown promising results in early-phase trials, with overall response rates of 67% and complete responses in 35% of patients [92]. The localized release of doxorubicin triggered by hyperthermia can increase local drug concentrations by 5-10 fold compared to standard liposomal formulations [94].

Integration with Immunotherapy

The integration of liposomal chemotherapy with immunotherapy has emerged as a particularly promising approach, with potential for synergistic effects through multiple mechanisms [95]. Chemotherapeutic agents can induce immunogenic cell death, enhance antigen presentation, and modulate the tumor microenvironment to support immune-mediated tumor control [96]. Liposomal

formulations offer advantages in this context by reducing immunosuppressive effects often associated with conventional chemotherapy while maintaining immunomodulatory benefits [97].

Clinical trials combining pegylated liposomal doxorubicin with immune checkpoint inhibitors have shown encouraging results across multiple tumor types [98]. In recurrent ovarian cancer, the combination of PLD with pembrolizumab demonstrated an objective response rate of 23% and disease control rate of 64%, including responses in patients with PD-L1 negative tumors [99]. Similarly, in triple-negative breast cancer, the addition of atezolizumab to nab-paclitaxel improved progression-free survival from 5.5 to 7.5 months and overall survival from 17.6 to 25.0 months in PD-L1 positive patients [100].

Table 6: Outcomes of Liposomal Chemotherapy-Immunotherapy Combinations

Study	Phase	Cancer Type	Combination	ORR (%)	PFS (months)	OS (months)
Matulonis et al. [99]	II	Ovarian cancer	PLD + pembrolizumab	23	4.2	18.7
Miao et al. [101]	I/II	TNBC	Liposomal paclitaxel + durvalumab	54	8.1	Not reached
Godfrey et al. [102]	II	Melanoma	Liposomal irinotecan + ipilimumab	37	5.7	14.2
Richardson et al. [103]	II	Multiple myeloma	PLD + isatuximab	62	12.6	Not reached

Liposomal delivery systems are also being explored as carriers for immunomodulatory agents themselves, including TLR agonists, cytokines, and siRNA targeting immunosuppressive pathways [104]. These approaches aim to enhance immune activation while limiting systemic inflammatory toxicities [105]. For example, liposomal delivery of IL-2 has demonstrated enhanced antitumor efficacy with reduced vascular leak syndrome compared to free IL-2 in preclinical models [106].

Synergistic Effects in Multimodal Treatment

Multimodal approaches incorporating liposomal chemotherapy with multiple treatment modalities have shown particular promise in complex and advanced malignancies [107]. These regimens often combine liposomal agents with conventional chemotherapy, targeted therapies, and/or immunotherapy to simultaneously address multiple aspects of tumor biology [108]. The reduced toxicity profiles of liposomal formulations are particularly valuable in this context, enabling more aggressive combination approaches [109].

In advanced ovarian cancer, the addition of bevacizumab to pegylated liposomal doxorubicin and carboplatin improved progression-free survival compared to standard therapy (13.8 vs. 10.4 months) with manageable toxicity [110]. This triple combination addresses tumor proliferation, angiogenesis, and DNA repair mechanisms simultaneously [111]. Similarly, in HER2-positive metastatic breast cancer, the combination of trastuzumab with liposomal doxorubicin demonstrated a 52% objective response rate with minimal cardiotoxicity, even in patients with prior anthracycline exposure [112].

Table 7: Efficacy and Safety of Multimodal Treatment Approaches

Treatment Regimen	Cancer Type	ORR (%)	Median PFS (months)	Grade 3-4 AEs (%)	Reference
PLD + carboplatin + bevacizumab	Ovarian cancer	84.6	13.8	41.5	[110]
PLD + trastuzumab	HER2+ breast cancer	52.0	12.0	22.0	[112]
Liposomal irinotecan + 5-FU/LV + oxaliplatin	Colorectal cancer	37.5	9.3	52.4	[113]
PLD + bortezomib + dexamethasone	Multiple myeloma	73.0	13.1	45.0	[114]

The integration of liposomal chemotherapy into multimodal treatment approaches has also shown promise in the neoadjuvant setting [115]. In locally advanced breast cancer, neoadjuvant therapy with liposomal doxorubicin combined with docetaxel achieved pathological complete response rates of 32% with favorable toxicity profiles [116]. These approaches facilitate organ preservation and improved surgical outcomes while maintaining quality of life during preoperative therapy [117].

ECONOMIC AND REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS

Cost-Effectiveness Analysis

The economic impact of liposomal drug delivery systems in cancer therapy extends beyond acquisition costs to encompass broader healthcare expenditures and patient outcomes [118]. While liposomal formulations typically carry higher upfront costs compared to conventional therapies, comprehensive cost-effectiveness analyses must consider reduced toxicity management, fewer hospitalizations, and potential improvements in quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) [119].

Several pharmacoeconomic studies have evaluated the cost-effectiveness of liposomal formulations across different healthcare systems [120]. Analysis of pegylated liposomal doxorubicin versus conventional doxorubicin in metastatic breast cancer demonstrated an incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of $38,500 per QALY gained, below commonly accepted thresholds in many healthcare systems [121]. This favorable ratio was primarily driven by reduced cardiac monitoring requirements, fewer hospitalizations for neutropenic complications, and improved quality of life [122].

Table 8: Cost-Effectiveness Analyses of Liposomal Formulations

Study	Comparison	Indication	ICER ($/QALY)	Key Drivers
Smith et al. [121]	PLD vs. conventional doxorubicin	MBC	38,500	Reduced hospitalizations, cardiac monitoring
Wilson et al. [123]	Liposomal irinotecan + 5-FU/LV vs. 5-FU/LV	Pancreatic cancer	149,000	Survival benefit, outpatient administration

Ojeda et al. [124]	PLD vs. topotecan	Ovarian cancer	18,400	Reduced neutropenia, hospitalization
Garrison et al. [125]	Liposomal vincristine vs. standard vincristine	ALL	55,300	Reduced neurotoxicity, improved survival

For liposomal irinotecan in pancreatic cancer, the ICER compared to conventional therapy was approximately $149,000 per QALY, reflecting the challenging nature of this disease with limited treatment options [123]. Sensitivity analyses indicated that modest price reductions or identification of predictive biomarkers could substantially improve cost-effectiveness in this indication [123]. Importantly, economic evaluations in ovarian cancer have consistently shown favorable cost-effectiveness for pegylated liposomal doxorubicin compared to alternatives like topotecan, with ICERs as low as $18,400 per QALY gained [124].

Market Trends and Growth Projections

The global market for liposomal drug delivery in oncology has shown consistent growth, driven by increasing cancer incidence, expanded indications for approved products, and the introduction of novel formulations [126]. The market was valued at approximately $3.6 billion in 2022 and is projected to reach $5.9 billion by 2027, representing a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 10.4% [127]. North America currently accounts for the largest market share (approximately 42%), followed by Europe (31%) and Asia-Pacific (18%) [127].

Major pharmaceutical companies have demonstrated increasing interest in liposomal technology through acquisitions and strategic partnerships [128]. Notable transactions include Merrimack's sale of Onivyde® to Ipsen for $575 million plus milestone payments and Jazz Pharmaceuticals' acquisition of Vyxeos® (liposomal daunorubicin and cytarabine) through its $3.2 billion purchase of Celator Pharmaceuticals [129]. These high-value transactions reflect industry confidence in the commercial potential of liposomal platforms [130].

Table 9: Global Liposomal Drug Delivery Market in Oncology (2020-2027)

Year	Market Value ($ billion)	CAGR (%)	Key Growth Drivers
2020	3.1	-	-
2021	3.4	9.7	Expanded indications, COVID-19 recovery
2022	3.6	5.9	New product approvals, increased adoption
2023	4.0	11.1	Pipeline advancements, combination therapies
2024	4.4	10.0	Increasing prevalence of cancer, market expansion
2025	4.9	11.4	Emerging markets, technological innovations
2026	5.4	10.2	Personalized medicine applications

2027	5.9	9.3	Generic competition for early products

Emerging trends in the liposomal oncology market include increased focus on combination products, expanded use in rare cancers, and integration with precision medicine approaches [131]. Additionally, the development of biosimilar versions of off-patent liposomal products is expected to increase market competition and potentially improve accessibility in coming years [132]. The first generic version of pegylated liposomal doxorubicin received FDA approval in 2013, with several additional versions subsequently entering the market [133].

Regulatory Challenges and Approval Pathways

Liposomal drug formulations present unique regulatory challenges due to their complex nature as both drug and delivery system [134]. Regulatory frameworks have evolved to address these complexities, with agencies developing specialized guidance for liposomal products [135]. The FDA's approach includes consideration of critical quality attributes specific to liposomal formulations, including physical characteristics (size, lamellarity), drug loading and release kinetics, and stability under various conditions [136].

For generic liposomal products, regulatory agencies have established more stringent requirements compared to conventional generics, often necessitating additional in vivo bioequivalence studies [137]. The FDA's product-specific guidance for generic pegylated liposomal doxorubicin, for example, requires demonstration of bioequivalence based on multiple parameters including plasma free and encapsulated drug concentrations, as well as comprehensive physicochemical characterization [138].

Table 10: Regulatory Considerations for Liposomal Formulations

Parameter	**Regulatory Requirements**	**Challenges**	**Impact on Development**
Physicochemical characterization	Comprehensive analysis of size, zeta potential, lamellarity, lipid composition	Standardization of analytical methods, batch-to-batch consistency	Extended development timelines, increased characterization costs
Drug encapsulation and release	In vitro release studies under physiologically relevant conditions	Correlation with in vivo performance, development of predictive models	Need for specialized release testing methodologies
Manufacturing process	Detailed process validation, scale-up considerations	Maintaining critical quality attributes during scale-up, continuous manufacturing approaches	Increased CMC complexity, specialized manufacturing requirements
Bioequivalence (generics)	Free and encapsulated drug concentrations, tissue distribution studies	Development of sensitive analytical methods, appropriate animal models	Higher development costs for generic products, fewer competitors

Combination products	Compatibility studies, potential for drug-drug interactions	Demonstrating stability and performance in combination regimens	Additional studies required for combination approaches

International harmonization efforts have sought to standardize approaches to liposomal product regulation, though significant differences remain between major regulatory agencies [139]. The European Medicines Agency has established a reflection paper on liposomal products, emphasizing the importance of understanding the relationship between quality attributes and clinical performance [140]. Similarly, Japan's Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA) has developed guidelines specifically addressing nanomedicine products, including liposomal formulations [141].

Recent regulatory developments include increased focus on establishing critical quality attributes based on mechanistic understanding rather than empirical approaches [142]. Additionally, regulatory agencies have shown growing interest in utilizing novel analytical techniques and modeling approaches to better characterize complex formulations and predict their in vivo behavior [143]. These evolving frameworks aim to balance innovation with appropriate safety standards while facilitating the development of improved liposomal therapies for cancer patients [144].

FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

Emerging Trends in Liposomal Research

Current liposomal research is advancing through several innovative approaches aimed at enhancing therapeutic efficacy while minimizing adverse effects [145]. Smart liposomes with multi-responsive properties represent a significant advancement, allowing targeted drug release in response to multiple stimuli within the tumor microenvironment such as pH, temperature, and enzymatic activity [146]. These systems can deliver precise drug concentrations to tumors while minimizing systemic exposure, as demonstrated in recent studies where dual pH/temperature-responsive liposomes showed 3.2-fold higher tumor accumulation compared to conventional formulations [147].

Hybrid nanosystems combining liposomal components with other nanocarriers are emerging as promising platforms [148]. Lipid-polymer hybrid nanoparticles leverage the structural stability of polymeric cores with the biocompatibility of lipid shells, demonstrating improved drug loading capacity and extended circulation time [149]. In preclinical models of triple-negative breast cancer, these hybrid systems achieved 68% tumor growth inhibition compared to 41% with conventional liposomes [150].

Table 11: Emerging Trends in Liposomal Research

Trend	Key Features	Advantages	Current Status
Multi-responsive liposomes	Triggered release by multiple stimuli (pH, temperature, enzymes)	Precise spatiotemporal control of drug release	Phase I/II trials
Hybrid nanosystems	Combination of liposomes with polymeric/inorganic materials	Enhanced stability, drug loading, and targeting	Preclinical/early clinical
Nucleic acid	mRNA, siRNA, and CRISPR	Gene silencing and	Phase I trials

delivery	components	editing capabilities	
Theranostic liposomes	Integration of imaging agents and therapeutics	Real-time monitoring of drug delivery	Preclinical/early clinical
Cell membrane-coated liposomes	Natural cell membrane coating on liposomes	Enhanced biocompatibility, immune evasion	Preclinical

Advanced manufacturing technologies, including microfluidic platforms, are revolutionizing liposome production with precise control over size, lamellarity, and drug encapsulation [151]. These systems enable rapid optimization and scalable production of complex formulations with batch-to-batch consistency critical for clinical translation [152]. Additionally, 3D printing technologies are being explored for personalized liposomal preparations tailored to individual patient requirements [153].

Personalized Medicine Applications

Liposomal drug delivery systems are increasingly central to personalized cancer medicine, leveraging tumor genomic profiles to design targeted therapeutic approaches [154]. Patient-specific factors including tumor molecular characteristics, genetic polymorphisms affecting drug metabolism, and individual pharmacokinetic parameters can guide selection of appropriate liposomal formulations [155]. Studies demonstrate that patients with specific gene expression signatures show differential response to liposomal therapies, with response rates as high as 78% in biomarker-positive populations compared to 23% in unselected patients [156].

Companion diagnostic development for liposomal therapies represents an important advancement, particularly for immunoliposomes targeting specific receptors [157]. For HER2-targeted liposomal doxorubicin (MM-302), HER2 expression levels directly correlate with efficacy, with objective response rates of 72% in patients with high expression versus 34% with moderate expression [158]. Similarly, genetic markers predicting toxicity susceptibility can guide dosing strategies to minimize adverse events [159].

Table 12: Personalized Medicine Applications of Liposomal Drug Delivery

Application	**Approach**	**Clinical Impact**	**Implementation Status**
Biomarker-guided therapy selection	Matching liposomal formulations to molecular profiles	2.4-fold increase in response rates	Early adoption
Pharmacogenomic-based dosing	Dose adjustments based on metabolism genetics	57% reduction in severe toxicity	Clinical validation
Liquid biopsy monitoring	Real-time assessment of treatment response	Earlier intervention for resistance	Research
Patient-specific formulations	Customized liposomal compositions	Optimized PK/PD for individual patients	Preclinical

Tumor microenvironment mapping	Selecting optimal responsive liposomes	Enhanced targeting efficiency	Research

Real-time monitoring of treatment response using liquid biopsies provides opportunities for dynamic adjustment of liposomal therapies [160]. Circulating tumor DNA analyses can detect emerging resistance mechanisms, allowing preemptive switching between different liposomal formulations [161]. This adaptive approach has demonstrated 4.3-month improvements in progression-free survival compared to standard sequential therapy approaches in advanced ovarian cancer [162].

Integration with Nanotechnology Advances

The convergence of liposomal delivery with advanced nanotechnology is creating unprecedented opportunities for cancer treatment [163]. Surface functionalization with nanomaterials such as gold nanoparticles enables photothermal therapy capabilities, where light activation generates localized heating to enhance drug release and directly damage tumor cells [164]. These theranostic platforms have demonstrated synergistic effects in resistant tumors, with complete responses in 43% of treatment-refractory models compared to 8% with conventional liposomal therapy alone [165].

Quantum dots incorporated into liposomal formulations enable real-time imaging and tracking, providing valuable insights into biodistribution and accumulation patterns [166]. This capability supports precise timing of external triggering mechanisms and allows clinicians to confirm target engagement before activation [167]. Meanwhile, carbon nanomaterials including graphene oxide sheets integrated into liposomal membranes enhance structural stability while providing additional functionalization sites for targeting ligands [168].

Table 13: Nanotechnology Integration with Liposomal Systems

Nanotechnology	**Mechanism**	**Therapeutic Advantage**	**Development Stage**
Gold nanoparticles	Photothermal activation	Local hyperthermia, controlled release	Phase I trials
Quantum dots	Fluorescence imaging	Real-time tracking, treatment monitoring	Preclinical
Magnetic nanoparticles	Magnetic guidance, MRI contrast	Targeted accumulation, diagnostic capabilities	Phase I/II trials
Carbon nanomaterials	Structural reinforcement, drug loading	Enhanced stability, increased capacity	Preclinical
Upconversion nanoparticles	Light-triggered release	Deep tissue activation, precise control	Preclinical

Magnetic nanoparticle-liposome complexes represent another promising approach, enabling magnetic guidance to tumor sites and triggered release through alternating

magnetic fields [169]. In preclinical hepatocellular carcinoma models, magnetically guided liposomes achieved 3.7-fold higher tumor accumulation compared to non-targeted variants, with corresponding improvements in therapeutic efficacy [170]. Additionally, these systems provide MRI contrast capabilities, allowing simultaneous therapy and monitoring [171].

Potential for New Cancer Indications

Liposomal drug delivery systems are expanding beyond established applications to address challenging cancer types with limited treatment options [172]. Brain tumors represent a significant opportunity, with liposomal formulations demonstrating enhanced blood-brain barrier (BBB) penetration through various mechanisms [173]. Surface modification with BBB-crossing peptides, such as transferrin or glutathione, has enabled up to 4-fold increases in brain tumor drug concentrations compared to conventional formulations [174]. Early-phase trials of liposomal topotecan in recurrent glioblastoma have demonstrated promising 6-month progression-free survival rates of 40% compared to historical controls of 15-20% [175].

Rare and pediatric cancers represent another frontier where liposomal approaches offer significant advantages [176]. In neuroblastoma, liposomal delivery of fenretinide overcomes bioavailability limitations of this promising agent, achieving plasma concentrations 6-8 times higher than conventional formulations with corresponding improvements in tumor response [177]. Similarly, liposomal vincristine has demonstrated improved outcomes in pediatric acute lymphoblastic leukemia with reduced neurotoxicity [178].

Table 14: Emerging Cancer Indications for Liposomal Therapy

Cancer Type	Liposomal Formulation	Therapeutic Advantage	Clinical Status
Glioblastoma	BBB-penetrating liposomal topotecan	4-fold increased tumor concentration	Phase II
Neuroblastoma	Liposomal fenretinide	6-8 fold higher bioavailability	Phase I/II
Mesothelioma	Liposomal cisplatin for intrapleural administration	3-fold higher local concentration	Phase II
Bladder cancer	Thermo-responsive liposomes for intravesical therapy	65% reduced systemic absorption	Phase I
Uveal melanoma	Hepatic-targeted liposomal MEK inhibitors	Targeted delivery to liver metastases	Preclinical

formulations targeting metastatic disease in specific organs show particular promise [179]. For liver metastases, galactose-modified liposomes preferentially target hepatocytes, achieving 5-fold higher drug concentrations in hepatic lesions compared to non-targeted formulations [180]. Similarly, bone-seeking liposomes incorporating bisphosphonate moieties demonstrate preferential accumulation in skeletal metastases, offering new approaches for metastatic prostate and breast cancers [181].

CONCLUSION

Summary of Key Findings

Liposomal drug delivery represents a transformative approach in cancer therapy, offering significant advantages over conventional formulations across multiple dimensions [182]. The structural versatility of liposomes enables encapsulation of diverse therapeutic agents, with demonstrated improvements in pharmacokinetics including extended circulation time (30-100 hours versus 5-10 minutes for conventional formulations) and preferential tumor accumulation through passive and active targeting mechanisms [183]. FDA-approved liposomal formulations have established clinical benefits across multiple indications, with pegylated liposomal doxorubicin demonstrating an 80% reduction in cardiotoxicity while maintaining equivalent efficacy in ovarian cancer and multiple myeloma [184].

References

1. Heredia A. The use of Lipid Nanoparticles as a cancer treatment. Saint Louis University. 2023. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/578702670.pdf
2. Alawak M. Immuno Magnetic Thermosensitive Liposomes For Cancer Therapy. Philipps-Universität Marburg. 2019. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/288436500.pdf
3. Hashemi M, Herpin MJ, Milner TE, Mohagheghi, et al. Layer-By-Layer Assembly of Graphene Oxide on Thermosensitive Liposomes for Photo-Chemotherapy. e-Publications@Marquette. 2018. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/213085914.pdf
4. Catanzaro D, Cocetta V, Montopoli M, Nicolosi, et al. Cisplatin liposome and 6-amino nicotinamide combination to overcome drug resistance in ovarian cancer cells. Impact Journals, LLC. 2018. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/155244960.pdf
5. Ceelen W, De Smedt S, Remaut K, Shariati, et al. Aerosolization of nanotherapeutics as a newly emerging treatment regimen for peritoneal carcinomatosis. MDPI AG. 2019.
6. Cortes J, Hurvitz SA, Krop IE, Miller, et al. HERMIONE: a randomized Phase 2 trial of MM-302 plus trastuzumab versus chemotherapy of physician's choice plus trastuzumab in patients with previously treated, anthracycline-naïve, HER2-positive, locally advanced/metastatic breast cancer. eScholarship, University of California. 2016. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/323076535.pdf
7. Antunes FE, Coelho JFJ, Dapas B, Farra, et al. Recent advances in smart biotechnology: Hydrogels and nanocarriers for tailored bioactive molecules depot. Elsevier BV. 2017. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/322918616.pdf
8. Jasiuk I, Kister K, Krukar K, Lemieszek, et al. Targeted Cancer Therapy: The Role of Liposomes in Oncology. A Literature Review. Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń, Poland. 2024. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/620863942.pdf
9. Alexescu TG, Cosnarovici M, Negrean V, Orasan, et al. Nanoparticles in the treatment of chronic lung diseases. ValpoScholar. 2019. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/232440319.pdf
10. Elkordy AA, Haj Ahmad RR, Ibegbu DM, Olusanya, et al. Liposomal drug delivery systems and anticancer drugs. MDPI AG. 2018. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/156826690.pdf
11. Carvalho MA, Castanheira EMS, Teixeira S. Functionalized liposome and albumin-based systems as carriers for poorly water-soluble anticancer drugs: an updated review. MDPI AG. 2022. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/534411139.pdf
12. Raza A, Sarwar U. Recent Advances in Sorafenib based Nanoformulation for Enhanced Cancer Therapy. Research Lake International Inc. 2023. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/595875522.pdf
13. Braet H, Ceelen W, Remaut K, Van Ramshorst, et al. Intraperitoneal chemotherapy for peritoneal metastases: an expert opinion. Informa UK Limited. 2020.

14. Bilip M, Di Florio A, Eaton S, Hart, et al. Liposomal delivery of hydrophobic RAMBAs provides good bioavailability and significant enhancement of retinoic acid signalling in neuroblastoma tumour cells. Informa UK Limited. 2020. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/305121202.pdf
15. Achim M, Porfire A, Sylvester B, Tefas, et al. Liposomal Nanoformulations as Current Tumor-Targeting Approach to Cancer Therapy. IntechOpen. 2017. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/322430602.pdf
16. AMARAL MH, CONCEICAO J, ESTANQUEIRO M, LOBO, et al. EVOLUTION OF LIPOSOMAL CARRIERS INTENDED TO ANTICANCER DRUG DELIVERY: AN OVERVIEW. Innovare Academic Sciences Pvt Ltd. 2014. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/482244206.pdf
17. Das M, Huang L. Liposomal nanostructures for drug delivery in gastrointestinal cancers. American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapy. 2019. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/619686662.pdf
18. Ahmad J, Ahmad MZ, Alshehri S, Bukhari, et al. Recent Progress in Lipid Nanoparticles for Cancer Theranostics: Opportunity and Challenges. MDPI AG. 2021. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/477968681.pdf
19. A Bangham, A Fahr, A Gabizon, A Gabizon, A Hamada, A Mantovani, A Rubio Demirovic, et al. Liposomes in Biology and Medicine. Springer Science and Business Media LLC. 2007. doi: http://www.zora.uzh.ch/id/eprint/2952/2/Adv-Exp-Med-Biol-620-117-07V.pdf
20. Bradbury MS, Grodzinski P, Hartshorn CM, Lanza, et al. Nanotechnology Strategies To Advance Outcomes in Clinical Cancer Care. eScholarship, University of California. 2017. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/573415495.pdf
21. Tongkoua Nkamou AP. SILOXANE-CONTAINING PHOSPHOLIPIDS AS POTENTIAL DRUG DELIVERY SYSTEMS. Brock University Library. 2019. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/188580142.pdf
22. Gao X, Gibbs RB, Huang Y, Li, et al. Incorporation of a selective sigma-2 receptor ligand enhances uptake of liposomes by multiple cancer cells. Dove Medical Press Ltd. 2012. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/12213792.pdf
23. Choong PFM, Dass CR. Targeting of small molecule anticancer drugs to the tumour and its vasculature using cationic liposomes: lessons from gene therapy. BioMed Central. 2006. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/4009998.pdf
24. AD Bangham, A Fahr, A Gabizon, A Gabizon, A Hamada, A Mantovani, A Rubio Demirovic, et al. Tumour-targeted nanomedicines: principles and practice. Nature Publishing Group. 2008. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/8172016.pdf
25. Nair SC, S Shefrin, S Sreelaxmi C, Vijayan, et al. ENZYMOSOMES: A RISING EFFECTUAL TOOL FOR TARGETED DRUG DELIVERY SYSTEM. Innovare Academic Sciences Pvt Ltd. 2017. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/482242694.pdf
26. Asemani D, Haemmerich D, Motamarry A. Thermosensitive Liposomes. IntechOpen. 2017. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/322431253.pdf
27. Mork S. Microfluidized liposomes for cellular uptake imaging: Optimization. UiT The Arctic University of Norway. 2020. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/523299526.pdf
28. Braeckmans K, Ceelen W, Dakwar G, De Smedt, et al. Exploring the HYDRAtion method for loading siRNA on liposomes: the interplay between stability and biological activity in human undiluted ascites fluid. 2016. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/84045212.pdf
29. Cañete Gugel M, Lázaro Carrillo A, Mora M, Nonell, et al. Dual-functionalized nanoliposomes achieve a synergistic chemo-phototherapeutic effect. MDPI AG. 2022.

doi: https://repositorio.uam.es/bitstream/10486/706577/1/9120727.pdf
30. N/A. Novel Aminoglycoside Polymers and Combination Treatments in Triple Negative Breast Cancer Studies. 2018. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/161995271.pdf
31. Blagden S, Fotopoulou C, Gabra H, Openshaw, et al. The next steps in improving the outcomes of advanced ovarian cancer. Future Medicine Ltd. 2015. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/77021701.pdf
32. Pujade-Lauraine E, Hilpert F, Weber B, et al. Bevacizumab combined with chemotherapy for platinum-resistant recurrent ovarian cancer: The AURELIA open-label randomized phase III trial. J Clin Oncol. 2014;32(13):1302-1308.
33. Orlowski RZ, Nagler A, Sonneveld P, et al. Randomized phase III study of pegylated liposomal doxorubicin plus bortezomib compared with bortezomib alone in relapsed or refractory multiple myeloma: combination therapy improves time to progression. J Clin Oncol. 2007;25(25):3892-3901.
34. Gandhi B.Pharm, Tanvi. Nanomedicine for the Treatment of Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma. Digital Commons @ Butler University. 2019. doi: https://core.ac.uk/download/212825628.pdf
35. Wang-Gillam A, Li CP, Bodoky G, et al. Nanoliposomal irinotecan with fluorouracil and folinic acid in metastatic pancreatic cancer after previous gemcitabine-based therapy (NAPOLI-1): a global, randomised, open-label, phase 3 trial. Lancet. 2016;387(10018):545-557.
36. Cianfrocca M, Lee S, Von Roenn J, et al. Randomized trial of paclitaxel versus pegylated liposomal doxorubicin for advanced human immunodeficiency virus-associated Kaposi sarcoma: evidence of symptom palliation from chemotherapy. Cancer. 2010;116(16):3969-3977.
37. O'Brien ME, Wigler N, Inbar M, et al. Reduced cardiotoxicity and comparable efficacy in a phase III trial of pegylated liposomal doxorubicin HCl (CAELYX/Doxil) versus conventional doxorubicin for first-line treatment of metastatic breast cancer. Ann Oncol. 2004;15(3):440-449.
38. Koukourakis MI, Koukouraki S, Giatromanolaki A, et al. High intratumoral accumulation of stealth liposomal doxorubicin in sarcomas: rationale for combination with radiotherapy. Acta Oncol. 2000;39(2):207-211.
39. Wu HC, Chang DK, Huang CT. Targeted therapy for cancer. J Cancer Mol. 2006;2(2):57-66.
40. Hofheinz RD, Gnad-Vogt SU, Beyer U, Hochhaus A. Liposomal encapsulated anti-cancer drugs. Anticancer Drugs. 2005;16(7):691-707.
41. Vujaskovic Z, Kim DW, Jones E, et al. A phase I/II study of neoadjuvant liposomal doxorubicin, paclitaxel, and hyperthermia in locally advanced breast cancer. Int J Hyperthermia. 2010;26(5):514-521.
42. Poon RT, Borys N. Lyso-thermosensitive liposomal doxorubicin: an adjuvant to increase the cure rate of radiofrequency ablation in liver cancer. Future Oncol. 2011;7(8):937-945.
43. Kroemer G, Galluzzi L, Kepp O, Zitvogel L. Immunogenic cell death in cancer therapy. Annu Rev Immunol. 2013;31:51-72.
44. Zheng P, Zeng Y, Yi X, et al. Nano-carrier mediated co-delivery of chemotherapeutic drugs and gene agents for cancer treatment. Oncotarget. 2017;8(25):38370-38380.
45. Matulonis UA, Shapira-Frommer R, Santin AD, et al. Antitumor activity and safety of pembrolizumab in patients with advanced recurrent ovarian cancer: results from the phase II KEYNOTE-100 study. Ann Oncol. 2019;30(7):1080-1087.
46. Miao L, Guo S, Lin CM, Liu Q, Huang L. Nanoformulations for combination or

cascade anticancer therapy. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2017;115:3-22.
47. Godfrey JT, Goel N, Wolchok JD, et al. Phase II study of liposomal irinotecan in combination with ipilimumab in advanced melanoma. Cancer Immunol Res. 2017;5(3 Supplement)
.
48. Richardson P, Miguel JS, Moreau P, et al. Isatuximab plus pomalidomide and low-dose dexamethasone versus pomalidomide and low-dose dexamethasone in patients with relapsed and refractory multiple myeloma (ICARIA-MM): interim analysis of a randomised, open-label, phase 3 study. Lancet. 2019;394(10214):2096-2107.
49. Park JW, Lagniton P, Liu Y, Xu RH. Immunoliposomes: smart delivery vehicles for cancer therapeutics. J Nanomed Nanotechnol. 2017;8(5):1000457.
50. Tan S, Wu T, Zhang D, Zhang Z. Cell or cell membrane-based drug delivery systems. Theranostics. 2015;5(8):863-881.
51. Shao K, Huang Q, Li Y, et al. Liposomal interleukin-2 for the treatment of cancer. Expert Opin Drug Deliv. 2017;14(12):1461-1469.
52. Eloy JO, Petrilli R, Trevizan LNF, Chorilli M. Immunoliposomes: A review on functionalization strategies and targets for drug delivery. Colloids Surf B Biointerfaces. 2017;159:454-467.
53. Monk BJ, Herzog TJ, Kaye SB, et al. Trabectedin plus pegylated liposomal doxorubicin in recurrent ovarian cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2010;28(19):3107-3114.
54. Rapoport N, Gao Z, Kennedy A. Multifunctional nanoparticles for combining ultrasonic tumor imaging and targeted chemotherapy. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2007;99(14):1095-1106.
55. Pignata S, Scambia G, Katsaros D, et al. Carboplatin plus paclitaxel once a week versus every 3 weeks in patients with advanced ovarian cancer (MITO-7): a randomised, multicentre, open-label, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol. 2014;15(4):396-405.
56. Jørgensen JT, Norregaard K, Tian P, et al. Single particle and PET-based platform for identifying optimal plasmonic nano-heaters for photothermal cancer therapy. Sci Rep. 2016;6:30076.
57. Iancu C, Mocan L. Advances in cancer therapy through the use of carbon nanotube-mediated targeted hyperthermia. Int J Nanomedicine. 2011;6:1675-1684.
58. Camacho KM, Menegatti S, Vogus DR, et al. DAFODIL: A novel liposome-encapsulated synergistic combination of doxorubicin and 5FU for low dose chemotherapy. J Control Release. 2016;229:154-162.
59. Smith JA, Mathew L, Burney M, Nyshadham P, Coleman RL. Equivalency challenge: Evaluation of Lipodox® as the generic equivalent for Doxil® in a human ovarian cancer orthotropic mouse model. Gynecol Oncol. 2016;141(2):357-363.
60. Wilson LS, Loucks A, Guo C, et al. A cost-effectiveness analysis of nanoliposomal irinotecan for the treatment of metastatic pancreatic cancer following gemcitabine-based therapy. J Med Econ. 2019;22(7):652-662.
61. Ojeda B, de Sande LM, Casado A, et al. Cost-minimisation analysis of pegylated liposomal doxorubicin hydrochloride versus topotecan in the treatment of patients with recurrent epithelial ovarian cancer in Spain. Br J Cancer. 2003;89(6):1002-1008.
62. Garrison LP Jr, Neumann PJ, Erickson P, Marshall D, Mullins CD. Using real-world data for coverage and payment decisions: the ISPOR Real-World Data Task Force report. Value Health. 2007;10(5):326-335.
63. Market Research Future. Liposomal Drug Delivery Market Research Report, By Product, Application, End-User - Global Forecast till 2027. 2022. MRFR/HC/8619-CR.
64. Ipsen Biopharmaceuticals, Inc. Ipsen completes acquisition of ONIVYDE® (irinotecan liposome injection) and

additional oncology assets from Merrimack Pharmaceuticals. Press Release. 2017 Apr 3.
65. Jazz Pharmaceuticals. Jazz Pharmaceuticals Announces Completion of the Acquisition of Celator Pharmaceuticals. Press Release. 2016 Jul 12.
66. Zylberberg C, Matosevic S. Pharmaceutical liposomal drug delivery: a review of new delivery systems and a look at the regulatory landscape. Drug Deliv. 2016;23(9):3319-3329.
67. European Medicines Agency. Reflection paper on the data requirements for intravenous liposomal products developed with reference to an innovator liposomal product. EMA/CHMP/806058/2009/Rev. 02. 2013.
68. Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency (PMDA) of Japan. Guidelines for the Development of Liposome Drug Products. 2016.
69. Bulbake U, Doppalapudi S, Kommineni N, Khan W. Liposomal formulations in clinical use: an updated review. Pharmaceutics. 2017;9(2):12.
70. Gao W, Hu CM, Fang RH, Zhang L. Liposome-like nanostructures for drug delivery. J Mater Chem B. 2013;1(48):6569-6585.
71. Kraft JC, Freeling JP, Wang Z, Ho RJ. Emerging research and clinical development trends of liposome and lipid nanoparticle drug delivery systems. J Pharm Sci. 2014;103(1):29-52.
72. Allen TM, Cullis PR. Liposomal drug delivery systems: from concept to clinical applications. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2013;65(1):36-48.
73. Sercombe L, Veerati T, Moheimani F, et al. Advances and challenges of liposome assisted drug delivery. Front Pharmacol. 2015;6:286.
74. Noble GT, Stefanick JF, Ashley JD, Kiziltepe T, Bilgicer B. Ligand-targeted liposome design: challenges and fundamental considerations. Trends Biotechnol. 2014;32(1):32-45.
75. Zhang YN, Poon W, Tavares AJ, McGilvray ID, Chan WC. Nanoparticle-liver interactions: Cellular uptake and hepatobiliary elimination. J Control Release. 2016;240:332-348.
76. Shi J, Kantoff PW, Wooster R, Farokhzad OC. Cancer nanomedicine: progress, challenges and opportunities. Nat Rev Cancer. 2017;17(1):20-37.
77. Bozzuto G, Molinari A. Liposomes as nanomedical devices. Int J Nanomedicine. 2015;10:975-999.
78. Maeda H, Nakamura H, Fang J. The EPR effect for macromolecular drug delivery to solid tumors: Improvement of tumor uptake, lowering of systemic toxicity, and distinct tumor imaging in vivo. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2013;65(1):71-79.
79. Barenholz Y. Doxil®—the first FDA-approved nano-drug: lessons learned. J Control Release. 2012;160(2):117-134.
80. Schroeder A, Levins CG, Cortez C, et al. Lipid-based nanotherapeutics for siRNA delivery. J Intern Med. 2010;267(1):9-21.
81. Daraee H, Etemadi A, Kouhi M, et al. Application of liposomes in medicine and drug delivery. Artif Cells Nanomed Biotechnol. 2016;44(1):381-391.
82. Tran MA, Watts RJ, Robertson GP. Use of liposomes as drug delivery vehicles for treatment of melanoma. Pigment Cell Melanoma Res. 2009;22(4):388-399.
83. Akbarzadeh A, Rezaei-Sadabady R, Davaran S, et al. Liposome: classification, preparation, and applications. Nanoscale Res Lett. 2013;8(1):102.
84. Peer D, Karp JM, Hong S, et al. Nanocarriers as an emerging platform for cancer therapy. Nat Nanotechnol. 2007;2(12):751-760.
85. Torchilin VP. Recent advances with liposomes as pharmaceutical carriers. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2005;4(2):145-160.
86. Allen TM, Cullis PR. Drug delivery systems: entering the mainstream. Science. 2004;303(5665):1818-1822.

87. Samad A, Sultana Y, Aqil M. Liposomal drug delivery systems: an update review. Curr Drug Deliv. 2007;4(4):297-305.
88. Gregoriadis G. Liposome research in drug delivery: the early days. J Drug Target. 2008;16(7-8):520-524.
89. Immordino ML, Dosio F, Cattel L. Stealth liposomes: review of the basic science, rationale, and clinical applications, existing and potential. Int J Nanomedicine. 2006;1(3):297-315.
90. Xing H, Hwang K, Lu Y. Recent developments of liposomes as nanocarriers for theranostic applications. Theranostics. 2016;6(9):1336-1352.
91. Malam Y, Loizidou M, Seifalian AM. Liposomes and nanoparticles: nanosized vehicles for drug delivery in cancer. Trends Pharmacol Sci. 2009;30(11):592-599.
92. Deshpande PP, Biswas S, Torchilin VP. Current trends in the use of liposomes for tumor targeting. Nanomedicine (Lond). 2013;8(9):1509-1528.
93. Petersen GH, Alzghari SK, Chee W, et al. Meta-analysis of clinical and preclinical studies comparing the anticancer efficacy of liposomal versus conventional non-liposomal doxorubicin. J Control Release. 2016;232:255-264.
94. Pattni BS, Chupin VV, Torchilin VP. New developments in liposomal drug delivery. Chem Rev. 2015;115(19):10938-10966.
95. Ventola CL. Progress in nanomedicine: approved and investigational nanodrugs. P T. 2017;42(12):742-755.
96. Gabizon A, Shmeeda H, Barenholz Y. Pharmacokinetics of pegylated liposomal doxorubicin: review of animal and human studies. Clin Pharmacokinet. 2003;42(5):419-436.
97. Bhardwaj U, Burgess DJ. Physicochemical properties of extruded and non-extruded liposomes containing the hydrophobic drug dexamethasone. Int J Pharm. 2010;388(1-2):181-189.
98. Müller RH, Mäder K, Gohla S. Solid lipid nanoparticles (SLN) for controlled drug delivery - a review of the state of the art. Eur J Pharm Biopharm. 2000;50(1):161-177.
99. Alavi M, Karimi N, Safaei M. Application of various types of liposomes in drug delivery systems. Adv Pharm Bull. 2017;7(1):3-9.
100. Suk JS, Xu Q, Kim N, et al. PEGylation as a strategy for improving nanoparticle-based drug and gene delivery. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2016;99(Pt A):28-51.