JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN ALLIED SCIENCES
ISSN NO. 2455-5800
Contents available at www.jusres.com

Current Advances in Targeted Drug Delivery Systems for Cancer Treatment: A Comprehensive Review

Abhishek Meena, Anshu Patel, Dr. Rita Mourya, Dr. Shailesh Jain
SAM College of Pharmacy, SAM Global University, Raisen

ARTICLE INFO

Article History
Received: April 2025
Accepted: May 2025

Keywords: targeted drug delivery, cancer nanomedicine, nanoparticles, antibody-drug conjugates, tumor targeting, precision oncology, drug carriers, therapeutic efficacy, clinical translation, personalized medicine

Corresponding Author
***Abhishek Meena**

ABSTRACT

REVIEW ARTICLE

Targeted drug delivery systems represent a paradigm shift in cancer therapeutics, offering the promise of enhanced therapeutic efficacy while minimizing systemic toxicity. This review examines the latest advances in targeted drug delivery technologies for cancer treatment, including passive and active targeting strategies, novel nanocarrier platforms, and emerging therapeutic approaches. We discuss the evolution from conventional chemotherapy to precision nanomedicine, highlighting key developments in liposomal formulations, polymeric nanoparticles, antibody-drug conjugates, and next-generation delivery vehicles. The review critically analyzes the clinical translation challenges, regulatory considerations, and future perspectives in the field. Recent clinical trials demonstrate significant improvements in therapeutic outcomes, with several targeted delivery systems achieving FDA approval and many more in advanced clinical phases. Current research focuses on overcoming biological barriers, enhancing tumor penetration, and developing personalized delivery strategies based on tumor microenvironment characteristics and patient-specific factors.

1. INTRODUCTION

Cancer remains one of the leading causes of mortality worldwide, with traditional chemotherapy approaches limited by poor selectivity, systemic toxicity, and the development of drug resistance. The concept of targeted drug delivery has emerged as a revolutionary approach to address these limitations by preferentially delivering therapeutic agents to tumor sites while sparing healthy tissues. This targeted approach leverages unique characteristics of cancer cells and the tumor microenvironment to achieve enhanced therapeutic efficacy with reduced adverse effects.

The development of targeted drug delivery systems has evolved significantly over the past two decades, transitioning from simple passive targeting strategies to sophisticated active targeting mechanisms. Modern approaches incorporate advanced nanotechnology, molecular targeting, and personalized medicine principles to create highly specific and effective therapeutic platforms.

2. MECHANISMS OF TARGETED DRUG DELIVERY

2.1 Passive Targeting Strategies

Passive targeting exploits the pathophysiological characteristics of solid tumors, particularly the enhanced

permeability and retention (EPR) effect. This phenomenon results from the leaky vasculature and impaired lymphatic drainage commonly found in tumor tissues, allowing nanocarriers to accumulate preferentially in tumor sites.

The EPR effect is influenced by several factors including nanoparticle size, surface properties, circulation time, and tumor vascularization patterns. Optimal nanoparticle size ranges typically fall between 10-200 nm, with particles in this range demonstrating prolonged circulation and enhanced tumor accumulation. Surface modifications with hydrophilic polymers such as polyethylene glycol (PEG) help evade immune recognition and extend circulation half-life.

2.2 Active Targeting Mechanisms

Active targeting involves the specific recognition and binding of delivery vehicles to molecular targets overexpressed on cancer cells or within the tumor microenvironment. This approach utilizes targeting ligands such as antibodies, peptides, aptamers, or small molecules that bind specifically to receptors or antigens associated with cancer cells.

Common molecular targets include the epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR), human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2), folate receptors, transferrin receptors, and various tumor-associated antigens. The selection of appropriate targeting moieties depends on the cancer type, stage, and expression profile of the target molecules.

3. CURRENT NANOCARRIER PLATFORMS

3.1 Liposomal Drug Delivery Systems

Liposomes represent one of the most clinically successful nanocarrier platforms for cancer drug delivery. These phospholipid-based vesicles can encapsulate both hydrophilic and lipophilic drugs, providing protection from degradation and controlled release properties. Doxil (pegylated liposomal doxorubicin) was among the first FDA-approved nanomedicines and remains a cornerstone therapy for various cancers.

Recent advances in liposomal technology include the development of stimulus-responsive formulations that release their payload in response to specific tumor microenvironment conditions such as low pH, elevated temperature, or specific enzymatic activity. These "smart" liposomes offer improved targeting specificity and reduced off-target effects.

3.2 Polymeric Nanoparticles

Polymeric nanoparticles offer versatile platforms for drug delivery with tunable properties including size, surface characteristics, drug loading capacity, and release kinetics. Both biodegradable and non-biodegradable polymers have been utilized, with biodegradable options such as poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA) and poly(lactic acid) (PLA) being preferred for clinical applications.

The ability to modify polymer properties allows for the creation of multifunctional nanoparticles that can simultaneously carry multiple therapeutic agents, imaging contrast agents, and targeting ligands. This multifunctionality enables theranostic applications where diagnosis and therapy are combined in a single platform.

3.3 Antibody-Drug Conjugates (ADCs)

ADCs represent a highly sophisticated targeting approach that combines the specificity of monoclonal antibodies with the potency of cytotoxic drugs. These conjugates consist of three key components: a targeting antibody, a cytotoxic payload, and a chemical linker that connects them.

The success of ADCs depends on several factors including target antigen selection, antibody internalization efficiency, linker stability, and payload potency. Recent developments focus on improving linker technology to achieve better stability in circulation while ensuring efficient drug release within target cells.

4. EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES AND NOVEL APPROACHES

4.1 Cell-Based Delivery Systems

Cell-based delivery systems utilize living cells as carriers for therapeutic agents, offering unique advantages such as natural

biocompatibility, ability to navigate biological barriers, and potential for real-time therapeutic monitoring. Various cell types including stem cells, immune cells, and engineered bacteria have been explored as delivery vehicles.

Mesenchymal stem cells have shown particular promise due to their natural tumor-homing properties and ability to differentiate into various cell types within the tumor microenvironment. These cells can be loaded with therapeutic nanoparticles or genetically modified to produce therapeutic proteins directly at tumor sites.

4.2 Biomimetic Nanoparticles

Biomimetic approaches involve coating synthetic nanoparticles with natural biological membranes to improve biocompatibility and targeting efficiency. Cell membrane-coated nanoparticles inherit the surface properties of the source cells, enabling immune evasion and enhanced targeting capabilities.

Cancer cell membrane-coated nanoparticles can exhibit homotypic targeting, where nanoparticles preferentially accumulate in tumors of the same cancer type from which the membrane was derived. This approach leverages natural cell-cell recognition mechanisms for improved targeting specificity.

4.3 Stimuli-Responsive Drug Delivery

Stimuli-responsive or "smart" drug delivery systems are designed to release their therapeutic payload in response to specific environmental triggers present in the tumor microenvironment. These triggers include pH changes, temperature variations, enzymatic activity, redox conditions, and externally applied stimuli such as light or magnetic fields.

pH-responsive systems are particularly attractive for cancer therapy due to the slightly acidic environment of tumor tissues and the more significantly acidic conditions within cellular compartments such as endosomes and lysosomes.

5. CLINICAL TRANSLATION AND REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 Clinical Trial Outcomes

The translation of targeted drug delivery systems from laboratory to clinic has shown significant progress, with numerous formulations entering clinical trials and several achieving regulatory approval. Clinical trials have demonstrated improved therapeutic outcomes including enhanced efficacy, reduced toxicity, and better patient quality of life.

However, clinical translation also reveals challenges not apparent in preclinical studies, including interpatient variability in EPR effect, heterogeneity in target expression, and complex tumor microenvironment factors that can influence delivery efficiency.

5.2 Regulatory Pathways

The regulatory approval of targeted drug delivery systems requires comprehensive evaluation of safety, efficacy, and manufacturing quality. Regulatory agencies have developed specific guidelines for nanomedicine evaluation, considering the unique properties and potential risks associated with nanocarrier systems.

The characterization requirements for nanomedicines are more extensive than traditional drugs, including detailed analysis of particle size distribution, surface properties, drug loading and release profiles, and potential immunogenicity.

6. Data Analysis: Current Market and Clinical Pipeline

Table 1: FDA-Approved Targeted Drug Delivery Systems for Cancer Treatment

Product Name	Active Ingredient	Delivery System	Target Cancer	Approval Year	Mechanism
Doxil/Caely	Doxorubicin	PEGylated	Ovarian,	1995	Passive

x		liposomes	breast, multiple myeloma		targeting (EPR)
DaunoXome	Daunorubicin	Liposomes	Kaposi's sarcoma	1996	Passive targeting (EPR)
Abraxane	Paclitaxel	Albumin nanoparticles	Breast, lung, pancreatic	2005	Albumin receptor targeting
Kadcyla	Trastuzumab-DM1	Antibody-drug conjugate	HER2+ breast cancer	2013	HER2 targeting
Marqibo	Vincristine	Liposomes	Acute lymphoblastic leukemia	2012	Passive targeting (EPR)
Vyxeos	Daunorubicin/Cytarabine	Liposomal combination	Acute myeloid leukemia	2017	Synergistic ratio maintenance
Onivyde	Irinotecan	PEGylated liposomes	Pancreatic cancer	2015	Passive targeting (EPR)
Adcetris	Brentuximab vedotin	Antibody-drug conjugate	Hodgkin lymphoma, ALCL	2011	CD30 targeting
Enhertu	Trastuzumab deruxtecan	Antibody-drug conjugate	HER2+ breast/gastric cancer	2019	HER2 targeting
Trodelvy	Sacituzumab govitecan	Antibody-drug conjugate	Triple-negative breast cancer	2020	Trop-2 targeting

Table 2: Emerging Targeted Delivery Systems in Clinical Development (Phase II/III Trials)

Product/Technology	Delivery Platform	Target/Mechanism	Cancer Type	Clinical Phase	Key Advantage
MM-302	HER2-targeted liposomes	HER2 receptor	Breast cancer	Phase II	Targeted liposomal delivery
BIND-014	PSMA-targeted nanoparticles	PSMA receptor	Prostate cancer	Phase II	Prostate-specific targeting
SGT-53	Lipid nanoparticles	p53 gene therapy	Solid tumors	Phase II	Gene therapy delivery
CriPec docetaxel	Polymeric micelles	EPR effect	Solid tumors	Phase II	Enhanced drug solubility
NK012	Polymeric micelles	Passive targeting	Multiple solid tumors	Phase II	SN-38 delivery
NC-6004	Polymeric micelles	Passive targeting	Pancreatic cancer	Phase III	Cisplatin delivery
Rexin-G	Retroviral nanoparticles	Collagen targeting	Sarcoma, carcinoma	Phase II	Targeted gene therapy
AGuIX	Gadolinium nanoparticles	Radiosensitization	Brain metastases	Phase II	Theranostic approach
CRLX101	Cyclodextrin nanoparticles	Passive targeting	Renal cell carcinoma	Phase II	Camptothecin delivery
Genexol-PM	Polymeric micelles	Passive targeting	Multiple cancers	Phase III	Paclitaxel solubilization

7. CHALLENGES AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

7.1 Biological Barriers

Despite significant advances, several biological barriers continue to limit the effectiveness of targeted drug delivery systems. The tumor microenvironment presents multiple challenges including dense extracellular matrix, elevated interstitial pressure, abnormal vasculature, and immunosuppressive conditions.

The heterogeneity of the EPR effect across different tumor types and individual patients represents a significant challenge for passive targeting strategies. Recent research focuses on developing methods to predict and enhance the EPR effect through vascular normalization strategies and personalized treatment approaches.

7.2 Resistance Mechanisms

Cancer cells can develop resistance to targeted therapies through various mechanisms including target downregulation, efflux pump upregulation, and activation of alternative signaling pathways. Combination therapy approaches using multiple targeting strategies or combining targeted delivery with immunotherapy show promise in overcoming resistance.

7.3 Personalized Medicine Integration

The future of targeted drug delivery lies in the integration of personalized medicine

approaches that consider individual patient characteristics, tumor biology, and treatment history. Companion diagnostics and biomarker identification are crucial for selecting patients most likely to benefit from specific targeted delivery systems.

7.4 Manufacturing and Scalability

The commercial success of targeted delivery systems requires robust, scalable manufacturing processes that ensure consistent product quality and regulatory compliance. Advanced manufacturing technologies including continuous processing and automated quality control systems are being developed to address these challenges.

8. CONCLUSIONS

Targeted drug delivery systems have revolutionized cancer treatment by offering improved therapeutic efficacy with reduced systemic toxicity. The field has evolved from simple passive targeting strategies to sophisticated multifunctional platforms that combine targeting, imaging, and therapeutic functions. The clinical success of several targeted delivery systems validates the potential of this approach and encourages continued innovation.

Current research focuses on overcoming biological barriers, enhancing targeting specificity, and developing personalized treatment strategies. The integration of advanced nanotechnology, molecular targeting, and precision medicine principles promises to further improve therapeutic outcomes for cancer patients.

The future of targeted drug delivery will likely involve increasingly sophisticated systems that can adapt to changing tumor conditions, overcome resistance mechanisms, and provide real-time therapeutic monitoring. As our understanding of cancer biology and tumor microenvironment continues to advance, targeted delivery systems will become even more precise and effective, ultimately leading to improved survival and quality of life for cancer patients.

The continued collaboration between researchers, clinicians, regulatory agencies, and pharmaceutical companies will be essential for translating promising laboratory discoveries into clinically meaningful therapies that can benefit cancer patients worldwide.

REFERENCES

1. Shi, J., Kantoff, P. W., Wooster, R., & Farokhzad, O. C. (2017). Cancer nanomedicine: progress, challenges and opportunities. *Nature Reviews Cancer*, 17(1), 20-37.
2. Mitchell, M. J., Billingsley, M. M., Haley, R. M., Wechsler, M. E., Peppas, N. A., & Langer, R. (2021). Engineering precision nanoparticles for drug delivery. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery*, 20(2), 101-124.
3. Barenholz, Y. (2012). Doxil®—the first FDA-approved nano-drug: lessons learned. *Journal of Controlled Release*, 160(2), 117-134.
4. Nakamura, Y., Mochida, A., Choyke, P. L., & Kobayashi, H. (2016). Nanodrug delivery: is the enhanced permeability and retention effect sufficient for curing cancer? *Bioconjugate Chemistry*, 27(10), 2225-2238.
5. Senapati, S., Mahanta, A. K., Kumar, S., & Maiti, P. (2018). Controlled drug delivery vehicles for cancer treatment and their performance. *Signal Transduction and Targeted Therapy*, 3(1), 7.
6. Cheng, Z., Al Zaki, A., Hui, J. Z., Muzykantov, V. R., & Tsourkas, A. (2012). Multifunctional nanoparticles: cost versus benefit of adding targeting and imaging capabilities. *Science*, 338(6109), 903-910.
7. Hare, J. I., Lammers, T., Ashford, M. B., Puri, S., Storm, G., & Barry, S. T. (2017). Challenges and strategies in anti-cancer nanomedicine development: an industry perspective. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews*, 108, 25-38.
8. Torchilin, V. P. (2014). Multifunctional, stimuli-sensitive nanoparticulate systems for drug delivery. *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery*, 13(11), 813-827.
9. Drago, J. Z., Modi, S., & Chandarlapaty, S. (2021). Unlocking the potential of antibody–drug conjugates for cancer

therapy. *Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology*, 18(6), 327-344.
10. Fang, J., Islam, W., & Maeda, H. (2020). Exploiting the dynamics of the EPR effect and strategies to improve the therapeutic effects of nanomedicines by using EPR effect enhancers. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews*, 157, 142-160.
11. Rosenblum, D., Joshi, N., Tao, W., Karp, J. M., & Peer, D. (2018). Progress and challenges towards targeted delivery of cancer therapeutics. *Nature Communications*, 9(1), 1410.
12. Wilhelm, S., Tavares, A. J., Dai, Q., Ohta, S., Audet, J., Dvorak, H. F., & Chan, W. C. (2016). Analysis of nanoparticle delivery to tumours. *Nature Reviews Materials*, 1(5), 16014.
13. Mura, S., Nicolas, J., & Couvreur, P. (2013). Stimuli-responsive nanocarriers for drug delivery. *Nature Materials*, 12(11), 991-1003.
14. Patra, J. K., Das, G., Fraceto, L. F., Campos, E. V. R., Rodriguez-Torres, M. D. P., Acosta-Torres, L. S., ... & Shin, H. S. (2018). Nano based drug delivery systems: recent developments and future prospects. *Journal of Nanobiotechnology*, 16(1), 71.
15. Danhier, F., Ansorena, E., Silva, J. M., Coco, R., Le Breton, A., & Préat, V. (2012). PLGA-based nanoparticles: an overview of biomedical applications. *Journal of Controlled Release*, 161(2), 505-522.
16. Allen, T. M., & Cullis, P. R. (2013). Liposomal drug delivery systems: from concept to clinical applications. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews*, 65(1), 36-48.
17. Blanco, E., Shen, H., & Ferrari, M. (2015). Principles of nanoparticle design for overcoming biological barriers to drug delivery. *Nature Biotechnology*, 33(9), 941-951.
18. Kataoka, K., Harada, A., & Nagasaki, Y. (2001). Block copolymer micelles for drug delivery: design, characterization and biological significance. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews*, 47(1), 113-131.
19. Peer, D., Karp, J. M., Hong, S., Farokhzad, O. C., Margalit, R., & Langer, R. (2007). Nanocarriers as an emerging platform for cancer therapy. *Nature Nanotechnology*, 2(12), 751-760.
20. Zhang, L., Gu, F. X., Chan, J. M., Wang, A. Z., Langer, R. S., & Farokhzad, O. C. (2008). Nanoparticles in medicine: therapeutic applications and developments. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics*, 83(5), 761-769.
21. Maeda, H., Wu, J., Sawa, T., Matsumura, Y., & Hori, K. (2000). Tumor vascular permeability and the EPR effect in macromolecular therapeutics: a review. *Journal of Controlled Release*, 65(1-2), 271-284.
22. Gao, W., Hu, C. M. J., Fang, R. H., & Zhang, L. (2013). Surface functionalization of gold nanoparticles with red blood cell membranes. *Advanced Materials*, 25(26), 3549-3553.
23. Bertrand, N., Wu, J., Xu, X., Kamaly, N., & Farokhzad, O. C. (2014). Cancer nanotechnology: the impact of passive and active targeting in the era of modern cancer biology. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews*, 66, 2-25.
24. Matsumura, Y., & Maeda, H. (1986). A new concept for macromolecular therapeutics in cancer chemotherapy: mechanism of tumoritropic accumulation of proteins and the antitumor agent smancs. *Cancer Research*, 46(12), 6387-6392.
25. Vicent, M. J., & Duncan, R. (2006). Polymer conjugates: nanosized medicines for treating cancer. *TRENDS in Biotechnology*, 24(1), 39-47.
26. Farokhzad, O. C., & Langer, R. (2009). Impact of nanotechnology on drug delivery. *ACS Nano*, 3(1), 16-20.
27. Lammers, T., Kiessling, F., Hennink, W. E., & Storm, G. (2012). Drug targeting to tumors: principles, pitfalls and (pre-) clinical progress. *Journal of Controlled Release*, 161(2), 175-187.
28. Dawidczyk, C. M., Kim, C., Park, J. H., Russell, L. M., Lee, K. H., Pomper, M. G., & Searson, P. C. (2014). State-of-

the-art in design rules for drug delivery platforms: lessons learned from FDA-approved nanomedicines. *Journal of Controlled Release*, 187, 133-144.

29. Kamaly, N., Xiao, Z., Valencia, P. M., Radovic-Moreno, A. F., & Farokhzad, O. C. (2012). Targeted polymeric therapeutic nanoparticles: design, development and clinical translation. *Chemical Society Reviews*, 41(7), 2971-3010.
30. Shi, J., Votruba, A. R., Farokhzad, O. C., & Langer, R. (2010). Nanotechnology in drug delivery and tissue engineering: from discovery to applications. *Nano Letters*, 10(9), 3223-3230.
31. Moghimi, S. M., Hunter, A. C., & Murray, J. C. (2001). Long-circulating and target-specific nanoparticles: theory to practice. *Pharmacological Reviews*, 53(2), 283-318.
32. Langer, R. (1998). Drug delivery and targeting. *Nature*, 392(6679), 5-10.
33. Bae, Y. H., & Park, K. (2011). Targeted drug delivery to tumors: myths, reality and possibility. *Journal of Controlled Release*, 153(3), 198-205.
34. Jain, R. K., & Stylianopoulos, T. (2010). Delivering nanomedicine to solid tumors. *Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology*, 7(11), 653-664.
35. Cabral, H., Matsumoto, Y., Mizuno, K., Chen, Q., Murakami, M., Kimura, M., ... & Kataoka, K. (2011). Accumulation of sub-100 nm polymeric micelles in poorly permeable tumours depends on size. *Nature Nanotechnology*, 6(12), 815-823.
36. Wang, A. Z., Langer, R., & Farokhzad, O. C. (2012). Nanoparticle delivery of cancer drugs. *Annual Review of Medicine*, 63, 185-198.
37. Wicki, A., Witzigmann, D., Balasubramanian, V., & Huwyler, J. (2015). Nanomedicine in cancer therapy: challenges, opportunities, and clinical applications. *Journal of Controlled Release*, 200, 138-157.
38. Sindhwani, S., Syed, A. M., Ngai, J., Kingston, B. R., Maiorino, L., Rothschild, J., ... & Chan, W. C. (2020). The entry of nanoparticles into solid tumours. *Nature Materials*, 19(5), 566-575.
39. Miller, M. A., Zheng, Y. R., Gadde, S., Pfirschke, C., Zope, H., Engblom, C., ... & Weissleder, R. (2015). Tumour-associated macrophages act as a slow-release reservoir of nano-therapeutic Pt (IV) pro-drug. *Nature Communications*, 6(1), 8692.
40. Rizvi, S. A. A., & Saleh, A. M. (2018). Applications of nanoparticle systems in drug delivery technology. *Saudi Pharmaceutical Journal*, 26(1), 64-70.
41. Tran, S., DeGiovanni, P. J., Piel, B., & Rai, P. (2017). Cancer nanomedicine: a review of recent success in drug delivery. *Clinical and Translational Medicine*, 6(1), 44.
42. Suk, J. S., Xu, Q., Kim, N., Hanes, J., & Ensign, L. M. (2016). PEGylation as a strategy for improving nanoparticle-based drug and gene delivery. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews*, 99, 28-51.
43. Sawant, R. R., & Torchilin, V. P. (2012). Challenges in development of targeted liposomal therapeutics. *The AAPS Journal*, 14(2), 303-315.
44. Youn, Y. S., & Bae, Y. H. (2018). Perspectives on the past, present, and future of cancer nanomedicine. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews*, 130, 3-11.
45. Park, K. (2013). Facing the truth about nanotechnology in drug delivery. *ACS Nano*, 7(9), 7442-7447.
46. Hrkach, J., Von Hoff, D., Ali, M. M., Andrianova, E., Auer, J., Campbell, T., ... & Summa, J. (2012). Preclinical development and clinical translation of a PSMA-targeted docetaxel nanoparticle with a differentiated pharmacological profile. *Science Translational Medicine*, 4(128), 128ra39.
47. Poon, R. T., Borys, N. (2009). Lyso-thermosensitive liposomal doxorubicin: a novel approach to enhance efficacy of thermal ablation of liver cancer. *Expert*

Opinion on Pharmacotherapy, 10(2), 333-343.

48. Gabizon, A., Shmeeda, H., & Barenholz, Y. (2003). Pharmacokinetics of pegylated liposomal doxorubicin. *Clinical Pharmacokinetics*, 42(5), 419-436.
49. Lee, H., Fonge, H., Hoang, B., Reilly, R. M., & Allen, C. (2010). The effects of particle size and molecular targeting on the intratumoral and subcellular distribution of polymeric nanoparticles. *Molecular Pharmaceutics*, 7(4), 1195-1208.
50. Lyon, P. C., Griffiths, L. F., Lee, J., Chung, D., Carlisle, R., Wu, F., ... & Coussios, C. C. (2018). Clinical trial protocol for TARDOX: a phase I study to investigate the feasibility of targeted release of lyso-thermosensitive liposomal doxorubicin (ThermoDox®) using focused ultrasound in patients with liver tumours. *Journal of Therapeutic Ultrasound*, 6(1), 28.