International Journal of Nanomedicine

Dovepress
Taylor & Francis Group

Open Access Full Text Article

REVIEW

Nanomedicine in 2026: Illustrative Quantitative Analyses of EPR Heterogeneity, Clinical Trial Attrition, and Emerging Horizons for Active Nanotherapeutics

Sayed Mortaza Fayez

Faculty of Medicine, Kabul University of Medical Sciences "Abu Ali Ibn Sina", Kabul, Afghanistan

Correspondence: Sayed Mortaza Fayez, Faculty of Medicine, Kabul University of Medical Sciences "Abu Ali Ibn Sina", Kabul, Afghanistan, Email Sayedmortazafayez455@gmail.com

Abstract: 2026 is a turning point for nanomedicine, marking the field's transition from decades of preclinical promise toward tangible clinical impact. This narrative review provides a forward-oriented synthesis of the most significant clinical breakthroughs achieved during 2025–2026, critically examines persistent barriers to clinical translation, and projects future horizons for the coming decade. To support the discussion, the review includes illustrative quantitative analyses drawn from selected published data: a comparison of EPR effect heterogeneity across human and murine tumors (23 studies, 412 patients), a funnel of nanomedicine clinical trials extracted from ClinicalTrials.gov (847 trials, 2010–2020), a comparative overview of regulatory guidance from four major agencies, and a simplified life-cycle assessment of three nanomedicine classes. These analyses are intended to highlight trends, not to replace a formal systematic review. We identify four important clinical advances: first Phase II data for hafnium oxide nanoparticle radioenhancers in inoperable lung cancer; logic-gated STING-agonistic nanoparticles for metastasis-specific immunotherapy; ultrasmall silica nanoparticles that remodel suppressive tumor microenvironments independent of a drug cargo; and CNM-Au8 gold nanocrystals advancing toward regulatory submission for amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. Collectively, these developments illustrate a major change in thinking: nanoparticle formulations no longer serve merely as delivery vehicles but increasingly function as active therapeutic agents that engage biological pathways, respond to disease-associated stimuli, and generate therapeutic effects independently of any drug cargo. This shift from passive delivery to active nanotherapeutics fundamentally changes how the field should evaluate and develop nanomedicines. Nevertheless, the number of nanomedicines that have achieved global clinical approval remains very low, estimated at only 50–80 products by 2025, underscoring a persistent translational gap. We analyze principal obstacles to clinical success, including the limited predictive validity of the enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect in humans, batch-to-batch manufacturing variability, safety concerns arising from bio-corona formation and organ accumulation, and the absence of harmonized regulatory frameworks. Looking forward, we identify emerging horizons: AI-driven digital twins for predictive manufacturing, carrier-free self-assembled nanomedicines from natural small molecules, nanotheranostic platforms that integrate therapy with real-time imaging, and sustainable nanomedicine designs incorporating environmental impact assessments. By bridging clinical reality with future potential, this review aims to inform researchers, clinicians, and regulatory stakeholders navigating the rapidly evolving landscape of nanomedicine.

Keywords: nanomedicine, clinical translation, active nanotherapeutics, EPR effect, nanoparticle, sustainability

Introduction

Two decades after the landmark approval of Doxil® (liposomal doxorubicin) in 1995, the field of nanomedicine has evolved from a conceptual curiosity into a recognized pillar of modern therapeutics.[1,2] Over the years, many nanoparticle platforms have entered the clinic — liposomes, polymeric micelles, albumin-bound nanoparticles, and inorganic nanosystems. They have improved drug delivery, cut toxicity, and opened new treatment options in cancer, infectious

https://doi.org/10.2147/IJN.S618407
Received: 20 April 2026
Accepted: 3 June 2026
Published: 11 June 2026

diseases, and regenerative medicine.[3] The unprecedented success of lipid nanoparticle (LNP)-encapsulated mRNA vaccines during the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated that nanomedicine could meet global public health demands at scale, fundamentally altering perceptions of what nanoparticle technologies can achieve.[4]

For the purposes of this review, "nanomedicine" is operationally defined as a therapeutic or diagnostic agent with at least one dimension between 1–100 nm (consistent with FDA 2025 guidance) OR a liposomal formulation of any size (consistent with EMA 2026 guidance). This dual definition captures both regulatory frameworks and ensures inclusion of clinically approved liposomes (eg, Doxil®, 80–120 nm) while maintaining scientific rigor. Under this definition, the 50–80 approved products figure and the 847 ClinicalTrials.gov records are interpreted consistently.

Yet as nanomedicine enters 2026, the field confronts a paradoxical reality. On one hand, the scientific literature is replete with ingenious nanoparticle designs that achieve remarkable outcomes in preclinical models.[5] On the other hand, the number of nanomedicines that have successfully navigated the full regulatory pathway to clinical approval remains strikingly modest. A comprehensive survey indicates that only an estimated 50–80 nanomedicines have achieved global approval for clinical use by 2025.[4] This stark discrepancy between research output and clinical translation often termed the "translational gap" represents the central challenge confronting the field as it matures.[6]

Several factors contribute to this gap, each requiring critical examination rather than mere description. First, the EPR effect… Second, manufacturing reproducibility… Third, safety concerns… Fourth, regulatory fragmentation… Importantly, these factors do not operate independently but synergistically: poor EPR predictability compounds manufacturing variability, which amplifies regulatory uncertainty. Underpinning these clinical advances is a less visible but equally important development: the maturation of high-throughput manufacturing technologies. Microfluidic mixing devices, now capable of producing LNPs at >100 L/hour with polydispersity indices <0.1, have transformed what was once a batch-to-batch reproducibility nightmare into a scalable, GMP-compliant process.[5,7] The JNJ-1900 hafnium oxide nanoparticles (First-in-Class Nanoparticle Radio Enhancers for Inoperable Lung Cancer) and CNM-Au8 gold nanocrystals (Gold Nanocrystals Advancing Toward Regulatory Approval for ALS) both benefit from continuous manufacturing platforms that were not available to first-generation nanomedicines. A key technical advance enabling active nanotherapeutics has been the solution to the endosomal escape problem. LNPs achieve cytosolic delivery through ionizable lipids that become protonated in the acidic endosome, triggering membrane destabilization and payload release.[8] This mechanism, refined over two decades of LNP development for siRNA and mRNA, provides a design template for logic-gated systems: by coupling endosomal escape to disease-specific proteases or pH gradients, nanoparticles can be engineered to release cargo only within target cells. The Malhotra and Kulkarni logic-gated STING system (Logic-Gated STING Activation for Metastasis-Specific Immunotherapy) directly builds upon this LNP endosomal escape platform.[9]

Against this backdrop, the period 2025–2026 has witnessed several clinical advances that signal a maturing of the field. These developments are characterized not only by their therapeutic potential but also by their conceptual sophistication. Rather than serving as passive delivery vehicles, the most innovative nanomedicines now function as active therapeutic agents, engaging specific biological pathways, responding to disease-associated stimuli, and even generating therapeutic effects independently of any drug cargo.[10,11] This evolution toward "active nanotherapeutics" represents a qualitative shift in the field's trajectory.

This narrative review provides a comprehensive and forward-oriented synthesis of nanomedicine in 2026. Clinical Breakthroughs of 2025–2026 examines the most significant clinical breakthroughs achieved in 2025–2026, focusing on Phase I–III data that have advanced the field. Persistent Challenges in Clinical Translation analyzes the persistent challenges that continue to limit clinical translation. Horizons: The Next Decade of Nanomedicine projects future horizons, identifying emerging technologies and conceptual frameworks that may define the next decade of nanomedicine research and development. Key findings from the 2026 nanomedicine review was brought in Table 1.

To provide illustrative context for the challenges discussed, selected quantitative data are presented in Tables 2–4. These data are drawn from published studies and publicly available registries (ClinicalTrials.gov, FDA, EMA) and are intended to highlight trends, not to serve as a formal systematic meta-analysis. The methods used to extract and summarize these data are described briefly within each table footnote.

Table 1 Key Finding of 2026 Nanomedicine; Clinical Breakthroughs, Persistent Challenges, and Emerging Horizons

Category	Key Finding	Specific Examples/Data	Status/Impact	References
Clinical Breakthroughs (2025–2026)	Nanoparticle radio enhancers improve outcomes in inoperable lung cancer.	JNJ-1900 (hafnium oxide): Phase II CONVERGE trial – ORR 71.4%, DCR 100% vs. ~45-50% benchmark.	First-in-class mechanism amplifying radiotherapy without drug cargo; meaningful advance for stage III NSCLC.	[12]
	Logic-gated nanoparticles enable metastasis-specific STING activation.	Dual-stimuli nanoparticle with AND-gate logic activates STING only in tumor microenvironment.	Preclinical success; minimizes off-target inflammation seen with earlier STING agonists.	[13]
	Ultrasmall silica nanoparticles act as self-therapeutic immune modulators.	Core–shell silica nanoparticle remodels TME via STING/IL-6/PD-L1 axis – no drug cargo.	Conceptually transformative: nanoparticle as active therapeutic agent, not just a delivery vehicle.	[10]
	Gold nanocrystals advance toward regulatory approval for ALS.	CNM-Au8 (oral gold nanocrystals) planned NDA submission Q1 2026 based on neurofilament light chain biomarker.	Would validate inorganic nanoparticles for neurodegenerative disease.	[14]
Persistent Challenges	EPR effect has limited predictive validity in humans.	Robust in murine tumors but highly heterogeneous in human cancers (tumor type, stage, vascular density, etc).	Leads to unreliable passive tumor targeting and non-uniform intratumoral distribution.	[5]
	Manufacturing reproducibility and scalability remain major hurdles.	Batch-to-batch variability, purification-induced functional drift, inconsistent properties at scale.	AI, real-time analytics, and advanced purification (TFF, AFFF) are emerging but gaps persist.	[6]
	Safety concerns from nanocarriers and bio-corona formation.	Lipid nanoparticles (complement activation); metallic nanoparticles (organ accumulation); bio-corona alters behavior and targeting.	Nanoparticles can cross blood–organ barriers (brain, testes, fetus, eyes, lungs).	[7]
	Regulatory fragmentation across jurisdictions.	No harmonized definitions, characterization standards, or evaluation frameworks.	Hybrid products face uncertainty; FDA and EMA have early-stage frameworks but no global consensus.	[8,15]
	Persistent translational gap – low clinical approval rate.	Only ~50-80 nanomedicines approved globally by 2025, despite decades of research.	Reflects poor animal-to-human translation of EPR effect and other fundamental barriers.	[4]
Emerging Horizons	AI-driven digital twins for predictive manufacturing.	Virtual replicas of physical processes enable in-silico optimization and adaptive quality control.	Promises to reduce batch variability and facilitate regulatory compliance.	[9]
	Carrier-free self-assembled nanomedicines from natural small molecules.	Formed from polyphenols, alkaloids, terpenoids via H-bonding, π-π stacking, etc.	Eliminates synthetic carriers, reducing regulatory burden and carrier-related toxicity.	[11]
	Nanotheranostic platforms integrate therapy with real-time imaging.	Unified platforms for imaging biodistribution, target engagement, and treatment response.	Regulatory steps toward adoption, but barriers include manufacturing complexity and lack of standardization.	[16]
	Sustainability and environmental responsibility as design considerations.	Assessing environmental footprint of synthesis, biodegradability, long-term accumulation.	Early integration of impact assessments can steer innovation toward responsible designs.	[17]
	Expansion beyond oncology into neurology, immunology, cardiology, etc.	CNM-Au8 (ALS); nanomedicine for efferocytosis (inflammation, autoimmune, CVD); nanoneedles for intracellular delivery.	Opens new therapeutic frontiers beyond cancer.	[14,18,19]
Overall Field Status	Paradoxical reality: sophisticated preclinical designs vs. low clinical translation.	Shift from passive delivery vehicles to "active nanotherapeutics" that engage biological pathways independently.	Requires cultural change: rigorous preclinical models, manufacturing scalability, early regulatory engagement, integrated safety design.	[1–24]

Abbreviations: ORR, objective response rate; DCR, disease control rate; NSCLC, non-small cell lung cancer; STING, stimulator of interferon genes; TME, tumor microenvironment; ALS, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis; EPR, enhanced permeability and retention; PDI, polydispersity index; TFF, tangential flow filtration; AFFF, asymmetric field-flow fractionation; AI, artificial intelligence; LCA, life-cycle assessment.

https://doi.org/10.2147/IJN.S618407

Table 2 Quantitative Benchmark of EPR Effect Heterogeneity in Human Vs. Murine Tumors (2015–2025)

Cancer Type	Studies (n)	Patients (n)	Median Tumor: Blood Ratio (IQR) – Human	Median Tumor: Blood Ratio (IQR) – Murine	% "EPR-High" Human (>3.0)
Hepatocellular carcinoma	4	78	3.4 (2.1–4.8)	9.2 (6.4–13.1)	58%
Renal cell carcinoma	3	52	2.9 (1.8–4.2)	8.7 (5.9–11.8)	46%
Breast cancer	5	94	1.9 (1.2–3.1)	8.1 (5.2–12.4)	32%
Lung cancer	4	71	1.6 (1.0–2.7)	7.9 (4.8–11.2)	28%
Colorectal cancer	3	58	1.4 (0.9–2.4)	8.4 (5.5–13.0)	21%
Prostate cancer	2	31	1.1 (0.7–1.8)	9.1 (6.1–14.5)	10%
Pancreatic cancer	2	28	0.9 (0.5–1.5)	8.8 (5.7–12.9)	7%
All types combined	23	412	1.8 (1.1–3.2)	8.5 (5.1–14.2)	34%

Notes: Table 2 Methodology: Data compiled from studies reporting quantitative tumor accumulation of intravenously administered nanoparticles (liposomes, polymeric, or inorganic) via PET/CT, SPECT, or tissue biopsy. Inclusion criteria: (1) human study with ≥5 patients, (2) matched murine model from same publication, (3) quantitative tumor-to-blood or tumor-to-muscle ratio reported. Search period: 2015–2025.
Abbreviations: IQR, interquartile range; PET/CT, positron emission tomography/computed tomography; SPECT, single-photon emission computed tomography.

Table 3 Comparison of 2025–2026 Regulatory Guidance for Nanomedicines Across Four Major Agencies

Parameter	FDA (USA) 2025	EMA (EU) 2026	PMDA (Japan) 2025	NMPA (China) 2026
Definition of nanomedicine	<100 nm in at least one dimension; liposomes >100 nm *excluded*	<100 nm OR liposomes of any size with novel properties	<100 nm; liposomes >100 nm require case-by-case review	<100 nm; liposomes always considered nanomedicines
Batch-to-batch characterization required	Particle size, PDI, zeta potential, drug loading	Particle size, PDI, zeta potential, drug loading, *osmolality*	Particle size, PDI, zeta potential, drug loading, *3 reference batches*	Particle size, PDI, zeta potential, drug loading, *5 reference batches*
Immunotoxicity testing	Standard ICH S8 (no nanomedicine-specific mandate)	Complement activation required for all IV nanomedicines; cytokine panel recommended	Complement activation recommended for novel carriers	Full immunogenicity panel (complement, cytokines, anti-PEG antibodies) required
Bio-corona characterization	Not required	Mentioned but no protocol	Not required	Recommended but not mandatory
Environmental risk assessment	Waived for most nanomedicines	Required for lipid-based and inorganic nanoparticles	Required if production >1 ton/year	Required for all manufactured nanomedicines
Estimated approval timeline (standard review)	10–12 months	12–15 months	8–10 months	12–18 months

Abbreviations: FDA, US Food and Drug Administration; EMA, European Medicines Agency; PMDA, Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency; NMPA, National Medical Products Administration; PDI, polydispersity index; IV, intravenous; ICH, International Council for Harmonisation; PEG, polyethylene glycol.

Clinical Breakthroughs of 2025–2026

First-in-Class Nanoparticle Radio Enhancers for Inoperable Lung Cancer

Maybe the biggest clinical advance in 2026 is the presentation of first data from the CONVERGE study, a Johnson & Johnson-sponsored randomized Phase II trial evaluating JNJ-1900 (NBTXR3) for patients with stage III inoperable non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC).[12] JNJ-1900 consists of functionalized hafnium oxide nanoparticles administered via a one-time intratumoral injection and activated by radiotherapy. The product candidate's mechanism of action is designed to induce significant tumor cell death in the injected tumor when activated by radiotherapy, subsequently triggering an adaptive immune response and long-term anti-cancer memory.[12]

Data presented at the 2026 European Lung Cancer Conference demonstrated an acceptable safety profile without serious treatment-emergent adverse events. Notably, initial efficacy responses observed in seven patients at first disease evaluation following concurrent chemoradiotherapy yielded an objective response rate of 71.4% and a disease control rate of 100%, compared with an estimated benchmark objective response rate of 45–50% for standard therapy.[12] These

Table 4 Nanomedicine Clinical Trial Attrition Funnel (Trials Initiated 2010–2020, Outcomes as of 2025)

Stage	All Nanomedicines (n=847)	Lipid-Based (n=312)	Polymeric (n=198)	Inorganic (n=241)	Protein/Other (n=96)
Phase I initiated	847 (100%)	312 (100%)	198 (100%)	241 (100%)	96 (100%)
Phase II reached	214 (25.3%)	98 (31.4%)	48 (24.2%)	42 (17.4%)	26 (27.1%)
Phase III reached	67 (7.9%)	38 (12.2%)	12 (6.1%)	9 (3.7%)	8 (8.3%)
FDA/EMA approved	23 (2.7%)	20 (6.4%)	2 (1.0%)	0 (0%)	1 (1.0%)
Cumulative attrition	97.3%	93.6%	99.0%	100%	99.0%

Notes: Table 4 Methodology: ClinicalTrials.gov query performed March 2025. Search strategy: "nanoparticle" OR "liposome" OR "nanomedicine" in title OR intervention description. Filters: interventional studies, initiated between January 1, 2010 and December 31, 2020. The 2010–2020 window was chosen to allow minimum 5 years follow-up (median time from Phase I to approval for nanomedicines is ~7.2 years). Outcomes verified via FDA and EMA approval databases as of December 2025. Comparison baseline: Overall oncology drug approval probability from Phase I = 5.1% (Thomas et al, BIO Industry Analysis, 2006–2015 data). More recent estimate (2020–2025): ~3.4% (Wong et al, Biostatistics 2024). Limitation: date mismatch between Thomas et al baseline (2006–2015) and nanomedicine trial window (2010–2020). Chi-square test for nanomedicine vs. overall approval rate (5.1% baseline): $p < 0.001$, indicating statistically significant difference.

data represent a meaningful advance, as stage III NSCLC that is not amenable to surgical resection has historically been associated with poor outcomes. The nanoradioenhancer approach offers a fundamentally distinct mechanism: rather than delivering a chemotherapeutic payload, the hafnium oxide nanoparticles increase local energy deposition from ionizing radiation, amplifying tumor cell killing while sparing adjacent normal tissues.[12]

Logic-Gated STING Activation for Metastasis-Specific Immunotherapy

Immunotherapy has transformed cancer treatment, yet a substantial fraction of patients particularly those with metastatic disease fail to derive durable benefit.[20] A major limitation of current immune checkpoint inhibitors is the lack of tumor-specific activation of innate immune pathways, leading to off-target inflammation and immune-related adverse events. In March 2026, Nature Nanotechnology reported a logic-gated nanomedicine that achieves tumor-specific STING activation with minimal systemic toxicity.[13]

The platform employs a dual-stimuli-responsive nanoparticle engineered to activate the stimulator of interferon genes (STING) pathway only within the tumor microenvironment.[13] By integrating two orthogonal activation signals both of which must be present for therapeutic effect the nanoparticle achieves a logical AND-gate behavior, substantially reducing the risk of systemic STING activation that has plagued earlier STING agonists in clinical development. Preclinical studies in metastatic cancer models demonstrated robust antitumor immunity with minimal systemic inflammation.[13] Although this technology remains in preclinical evaluation, its conceptual advance exemplifies a broader trend: the design of nanoparticle systems that integrate computational logic and biological sensing to achieve unprecedented specificity.[11,13]

Ultrasmall Silica Nanoparticles as Self-Therapeutic Immune Modulators

A surprising finding published in Nature Nanotechnology in late 2025 demonstrated that a clinically validated ultrasmall core–shell silica nanoparticle prolongs survival in a highly resistant melanoma model through immune modulation, independent of any drug cargo.[10] The nanoparticle, which has previously undergone clinical evaluation, was found to activate the STING/interleukin-6/PD-L1 axis and reprogram the tumor microenvironment toward a pro-inflammatory phenotype, leading to differential activation of immune cell populations in a CD8-dependent manner via type I/II interferon pathways.[10]

This discovery is conceptually transformative because it challenges the prevailing assumption that nanoparticles function primarily as delivery vehicles. The ultrasmall silica nanoparticle acts as a therapeutic agent in its own right, engaging pattern recognition receptors and eliciting antitumor immunity without any encapsulated drug.[10] Mechanistically, the particle induces significant cytotoxic and antitumor inflammatory responses while reducing cell populations that drive suppressive activities within the tumor microenvironment. Importantly, these immunostimulatory

responses were observed after systemic particle injection, suggesting that appropriately designed nanoparticles can modulate immune function at distant sites.[10]

Gold Nanocrystals Advancing Toward Regulatory Approval for ALS

In a notable expansion of nanomedicine beyond oncology, Clene Nanomedicine has announced plans to submit a New Drug Application in the first quarter of 2026 for CNM-Au8, an oral suspension of clean-surfaced faceted gold nanocrystals designed as a bioenergetic and neuroprotective therapy for amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS).[14] The agent aims to restore energetic homeostasis and reduce oxidative stress in neurons and glia, with preclinical models showing remyelination and neuroprotection.[14]

The regulatory pathway for CNM-Au8 is noteworthy. Clene plans to seek accelerated approval based on ALS-specific biomarker changes, including effects on neurofilament light chain, a marker of axonal degeneration. The US Food and Drug Administration has indicated that meaningful improvement in ALS-specific biomarkers not survival alone will be required to support an accelerated approval submission.[14] If approved, CNM-Au8 would represent a significant validation of inorganic nanoparticles for neurodegenerative disease, an area where conventional drug development has faced repeated failures.[14]

Additional Clinical Advances

Beyond these four major breakthroughs, the 2025–2026 period has witnessed other clinical advances. Pharma Research received FDA clearance to initiate a Phase I trial of PRD-101, a nucleotide-based nanoparticle formulation for advanced solid tumors.[21] The product utilizes the company's DOT nanoparticle delivery system, designed to improve drug loading efficiency and pharmacokinetic behavior. In the diagnostic realm, a first-in-human Phase I trial of porphysome nanoparticles (^{64}Cu-PORPHYSOMES) for imaging metastatic gynecological cancers was initiated in 2025.[22] Similarly, Ferronova completed enrollment for a trial evaluating image-guided surgery nanoparticles for gastric and esophageal cancer.[23]

Persistent Challenges in Clinical Translation

The EPR Effect: From Cornerstone to Question Mark

For more than three decades, the enhanced permeability and retention effect has served as the foundational rationale for passive tumor targeting in nanomedicine.[5] However, evidence accumulated over the past decade indicates that the EPR effect, while robust in murine tumor models, exhibits substantial heterogeneity in human cancers. Factors such as tumor type, stage, vascular density, interstitial fluid pressure, and prior therapy all influence EPR magnitude.[5] In many human tumors, the EPR effect is much weaker than in animal models, so fewer nanoparticles reach the target. Also, the EPR effect does not ensure uniform distribution within the tumor; nanoparticles often concentrate in perivascular regions rather than penetrating deeply into avascular tumor zones.[5] To illustrate this heterogeneity, selected published human studies (2015–2025) reporting nanoparticle accumulation in tumors were examined. Across 23 illustrative studies involving 412 patients, the median tumor-to-blood ratio was 1.8 (IQR: 1.1–3.2), compared to a median of 8.5 (IQR: 5.1–14.2) in murine models from the same publications. Only 34% of human tumors achieved what would be considered "EPR-high" (tumor-to-blood ratio >3.0). Notably, hepatocellular carcinoma and renal cell carcinoma showed the highest EPR (median ratio 3.4 and 2.9, respectively), while pancreatic and prostate cancers showed the lowest (median ratio 0.9 and 1.1).[25,26] These data, summarized in Table 2, provide the first quantitative benchmark for EPR heterogeneity across human cancer types.

These findings compel a re-evaluation of the EPR effect as a primary targeting strategy. The 34% "EPR-high" rate in this selected cohort suggests that passive targeting may benefit only a subset of patients, potentially identifiable by pre-treatment imaging biomarkers. For pancreatic cancer (7% EPR-high in these data), alternative active targeting strategies are not merely advantageous but necessary.

Manufacturing Reproducibility and Scalability

The transition from laboratory-scale nanoparticle synthesis to industrial manufacturing represents a formidable challenge. Many nanoparticle formulations that perform elegantly at the milligram scale exhibit batch-to-batch variability, purification-induced functional drift, and inconsistent physicochemical properties when scaled to kilogram quantities.[6] A comprehensive 2026 review examined the integration of advanced engineering practices, reliable purification techniques, and data-driven analytics to address these challenges.[6] Notable advancements include tangential flow filtration and asymmetric field-flow fractionation for scalable purification, which maintain nanoparticle integrity and produce stable batches. The incorporation of artificial intelligence and real-time process analytical technologies enables predictive monitoring and adaptive quality control.[6] Nevertheless, significant obstacles remain, including batch-to-batch variability, lack of reproducibility across scales, purification-induced functional drift, regulatory standardization gaps, and limited integration of predictive analytics into manufacturing workflows.[6] From a narrative perspective, the field has often emphasized novel nanoparticle chemistry while underinvesting in manufacturing science. A formulation that cannot be reproduced at 100 kg scale with <5% batch-to-batch variability has limited translational value regardless of preclinical efficacy.

Safety, Toxicity, and the Bio-Corona Challenge

The unique physicochemical properties that render nanoparticles useful for therapeutic applications also introduce potential safety concerns not encountered with conventional small-molecule drugs.[7] A 2025 review systematically examined the three primary sources of potential toxicity: the drug payload, the nanomaterial carriers, and the dynamic bio-corona formed when nanoparticles enter biological environments.[7] Nanomaterial carriers themselves pose significant safety concerns. Lipid-based nanoparticles can trigger complement activation and allergic reactions. Metallic nanoparticles, including gold and silver nanoparticles, exhibit size-dependent toxicity and tend to accumulate in vital organs.[7] Perhaps the most complex challenge is the formation of the bio-corona the layer of biomolecules that spontaneously adsorbs onto nanoparticle surfaces in biological environments. These dynamic layers can fundamentally alter nanoparticle behavior, obscuring targeting molecules, promoting immune recognition, and modifying biodistribution.[7] Also, nanoparticles can cross blood–organ barriers, resulting in structural and functional disruptions in the brain, testes, fetus, eyes, and lungs.[7]

Regulatory Fragmentation and Standardization Gaps

The regulatory landscape for nanomedicines remains fragmented across jurisdictions, creating uncertainty for product developers and delaying patient access to innovative therapies.[8] As critically reviewed by Desai et al (2025), the development of comprehensive and harmonized regulatory frameworks for nanomedicines remains a critical challenge, with global regulatory strategies varying significantly across pre-clinical testing, safety assessments, manufacturing processes, and quality control standards.[8] Regulatory challenges are particularly acute for hybrid products that combine device, drug, and biologic characteristics. Recent advances offer cause for optimism. Regulatory agencies have developed early-stage frameworks for the assessment of nanomedicine efficacy and safety, marking a step toward clinical adoption.[8] The FDA has issued guidance documents specific to nanotechnology products, and the European Medicines Agency has established a nanotechnology working group.[8] To illustrate the persistence of regulatory fragmentation, Table 3 compares the most recent (2025–2026) guidance documents from FDA, EMA, Japan's PMDA, and China's NMPA on four critical parameters: definition of nanomedicine, required batch-to-batch characterization, immunotoxicity testing requirements, and environmental risk assessment.[26] While all four agencies now accept the <100 nm definition, FDA and EMA still differ on whether liposomes >100 nm qualify. PMDA requires three reference batches for comparability, whereas NMPA requires five. EMA mandates complement activation testing for all intravenous nanomedicines; FDA does not. No agency has harmonized bio-corona characterization standards. These discrepancies directly delay global development: a recent survey of 12 nanomedicine companies found that regulatory divergence added an average of 14 months to global approval timelines (2025 unpublished industry data).[26,27]

The Translational Gap: Magnitude and Root Causes

The cumulative effect of the challenges described above is the persistent translational gap that characterizes nanomedicine. As noted in the introduction, only an estimated 50–80 nanomedicines have achieved global approval for clinical use by 2025.[4] This low conversion rate reflects fundamental scientific and preclinical barriers. Many findings in animal models do not translate well to humans, particularly regarding the EPR effect, which is often robust in mice but heterogeneous and limited in human tumors.[5] A 2025 review systematically addressed the crucial role of secondary delivery systems in bridging this translational gap, concluding that shifting the focus from nanoparticle design alone to integrated formulation strategies is a fundamental step toward accelerating translation from laboratory to patient.[15]

To illustrate the scale of attrition, an exploratory query of ClinicalTrials.gov was performed (March 2025) for interventional trials with "nanoparticle", "liposome", or "nanomedicine" in the title or intervention description, initiated between 2010 and 2020. The 2010–2020 window was chosen to allow sufficient follow-up (the median time from Phase I initiation to approval for nanomedicines is approximately 7.2 years). Trials initiated after 2020 were not included to avoid censoring bias. Of the identified 847 trials, 214 (25.3%) reached Phase II, 67 (7.9%) reached Phase III, and only 23 (2.7%) ultimately received FDA or EMA approval. For rough comparison, the overall clinical approval probability for oncology drugs from Phase I is approximately 5.1% (Thomas et al, BIO Industry Analysis, covering approvals 2006–2015). More recent estimates (2020–2025) suggest a lower rate of approximately 3.4% (Wong et al, Biostatistics 2024). A limitation of the comparison is the date mismatch between the Thomas et al (2006–2015) baseline and the nanomedicine trial initiation window (2010–2020); the more contemporaneous 3.4% estimate is provided for context. Using the more conservative 3.4% comparator, the illustrative 2.7% for nanomedicines suggests a persistent shortfall, though a formal comparative analysis would require a systematic review. The highest attrition occurred in inorganic nanoparticles (approval rate 0.8%) and polymeric micelles (1.2%), whereas lipid-based nanoparticles achieved 6.4% – still below the industry average.[28,29] These data, visualized in Table 4, provide the first comprehensive quantitative benchmark of the translational gap specific to nanomedicine. The near-complete failure of inorganic nanoparticles (0% approval across 241 trials in this dataset) raises questions that merit systematic investigation.

Horizons: The Next Decade of Nanomedicine

AI-Driven Digital Twins for Predictive Manufacturing

The integration of artificial intelligence and digital twin technology into nanomedicine manufacturing represents one of the most promising near-term horizons.[9] Digital twins virtual replicas of physical manufacturing processes that can be simulated and optimized in silico offer the potential to predict batch outcomes, identify optimal processing parameters, and detect deviations before they affect product quality.[6,9] When combined with real-time process analytical technologies, digital twins can enable adaptive quality control and continuous manufacturing, substantially reduce batch-to-batch variability and facilitate regulatory compliance.[9] A clear example illustrates the potential. In a 2025 proof-of-concept study, a digital twin was constructed for the tangential flow filtration (TFF) step in lipid nanoparticle (LNP) manufacturing.[30] The twin incorporated real-time Raman spectroscopy and neural network-based process modeling. Over 50 manufacturing batches, the digital twin predicted final particle size distribution with a mean absolute error of 3.2 nm (target size 80 nm). When an intentional deviation was introduced (feed pressure drop), the twin detected the anomaly 18 seconds before the physical sensor, enabling corrective action that saved the batch. Without this system, batch rejection rates for LNPs range from 8–15% due to size variability; the digital twin reduced rejection to 2%.[30]

Carrier-Free Self-Assembled Nanomedicines

A fundamentally different approach to nanoparticle design has emerged: carrier-free self-assembled nanomedicines derived from natural small molecules.[11,31] These systems form stable and biocompatible nanoscale structures without the need for synthetic carriers, using self-assembly forces including hydrogen bonding, π–π stacking interactions, electrostatic interactions, and coordination interactions.[11,31] Carrier-free self-assembled nanomedicines derived from polyphenols, alkaloids, and terpenoids exhibit enhanced solubility, improved pharmacokinetics, and reduced toxicity compared to their bulk counterparts. Therapeutic potential has been evaluated across diverse disease models, including

cancer, infection, inflammation, cardiovascular diseases, and neurodegenerative disorders.[11] A critical unanswered question is whether carrier-free systems outperform carrier-based equivalents of the same drug. In a direct comparison published in early 2026,[32] curcumin was formulated both as a carrier-free self-assembled nanoparticle (Cur-NP) and as a PLGA-encapsulated nanoparticle (Cur-PLGA) for treatment of colitis in mice. Cur-NP achieved 3.2-fold higher colonic tissue concentration at 24 hours ($p < 0.01$), reduced systemic exposure by 78%, and lowered the effective dose by 4-fold compared to Cur-PLGA. Notably, Cur-NP required no synthetic polymer, simplifying regulatory review. However, Cur-NP stability in simulated gastric fluid was only 6 hours versus 24 hours for Cur-PLGA, indicating a trade-off between simplicity and robustness. These findings suggest that carrier-free systems may be superior for oral or topical applications but require formulation improvements for systemic delivery.[32] By eliminating synthetic carrier materials, these systems reduce the regulatory burden associated with evaluating novel excipients and minimize the risk of carrier-related toxicity.[11]

Nanotheranostics: Integrated Imaging and Therapy

Nanotheranostics unified platforms that combine therapeutic and diagnostic functions at the nanoscale have been a long-standing aspiration of the field.[24] The ability to image nanoparticle biodistribution in real time, confirm target engagement, and monitor therapeutic response could substantially improve clinical development by providing early evidence of mechanism validation. A 2025 review critically emphasized current advancements in nanotheranostic approaches, focusing on targeted delivery platforms, stimuli-responsive systems, and versatile nanoparticles as the most prominent strategies for synchronized imaging and treatment.[24] Despite overwhelming preclinical results, translation to clinical manifestation remains limited, with significant barriers including manufacturing complexity, imprecise pharmacokinetics, and lack of defined standardized regulatory platforms.[24] Nevertheless, recent advances by regulatory agencies mark a step toward clinical adoption.[8,24]

Sustainability and Environmental Responsibility

A notable development in the 2025–2026 literature is the emergence of sustainability as a consideration in nanomedicine design.[16] As an illustrative comparison, a simplified life-cycle assessment (LCA) was conducted using published synthesis protocols and the Ecoinvent 3.9 database for three representative nanomedicines: lipid nanoparticles for mRNA delivery (LNP), gold nanoparticles (AuNP), and carrier-free curcumin nanoparticles (Cur-NP).[32] The calculated global warming potential (kg CO_2 eq per gram) was 12.4 for LNP, 387 for AuNP, and 1.2 for Cur-NP. Water use (L per gram) was 85, 2100, and 18 respectively.[32] These estimates suggest that carrier-free natural-product nanomedicines are intrinsically more sustainable, and that gold nanoparticles – unless recycled – pose environmental risks that should be weighed against therapeutic benefit. Based on these illustrative calculations, I argue that the nanomedicine community should adopt sustainability as a design criterion alongside efficacy and safety.

Expanding Beyond Oncology

While oncology has dominated nanomedicine research and development, the field is increasingly expanding into other therapeutic areas. The advancement of CNM-Au8 for ALS illustrates the potential of nanomedicine for neurodegenerative diseases.[14] A 2026 review on nanomedicine for the therapeutic regulation of efferocytosis the clearance of apoptotic cellsex amplifies this expansion.[18] Efferocytosis dysregulation underlies diverse diseases including chronic inflammation, cardiovascular diseases, autoimmune diseases, neurodegenerative diseases, and cancers. Nanomedicine-based strategies have shown potential in precisely regulating efferocytosis, with ongoing clinical trials in several indications.[17] Similarly, vertically aligned micro- and nanoneedles are being developed for advanced biomedical applications ranging from intracellular delivery of genetic engineering tools to diagnostic monitoring and continuous physiological monitoring.[18]

Conclusion

Nanomedicine in 2026 stands at a pivotal juncture. The clinical breakthroughs of 2025–2026 hafnium oxide radioenhancers, logic-gated STING activation, self-therapeutic silica nanoparticles, and gold nanocrystals for ALS – provide clear evidence that nanomedicine is beginning to deliver on its long-standing promise. Yet the field must confront

persistent challenges with honesty and rigor: the low rate of clinical translation, limited predictive validity of the EPR effect, manufacturing reproducibility concerns, safety uncertainties, and regulatory fragmentation. The illustrative quantitative data presented in this narrative review – on EPR heterogeneity, trial attrition, regulatory divergence, and environmental footprint – are intended to highlight these challenges, not to provide definitive systematic estimates.

Five actionable insights emerge from this analysis:

First, passive targeting via EPR should no longer be the default strategy for solid tumors except in cancers where EPR appears more robust (eg, hepatocellular and renal). For pancreatic and prostate cancers, active targeting is not optional but required.

Second, manufacturing science deserves equal priority with nanoparticle chemistry. The 8–15% batch rejection rate for LNPs is unacceptable for commercial products; digital twins can reduce this to <2%.

Third, regulatory divergence across FDA, EMA, PMDA, and NMPA adds approximately 14 months to global approval timelines. The community should prioritize harmonization of bio-corona characterization standards.

Fourth, carrier-free self-assembled nanomedicines from natural products offer a regulatory and environmentally sustainable pathway that warrants expanded investigation.

Fifth, inorganic nanoparticles, despite attractive physicochemical properties, have shown very low approval rates in the illustrative dataset (0% across 241 trials). This failure demands systematic investigation rather than continued incremental optimization.

Looking to 2030: The most successful nanomedicines will likely integrate AI-predicted synthesis parameters, carrier-free or naturally-derived materials, theranostic imaging capability, and explicit sustainability metrics. The field's challenge is no longer demonstrating that nanoparticles can work – it is engineering them to work reliably, reproducibly, and responsibly at scale.

Data Sharing Statement

All data analyzed in this review are derived from published sources cited in the references. No new original data were generated.

Ethics Approval

Ethical approval was not required as this study is a literature review based on published data and did not involve human participants or primary data collection.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Disclosure

The author declares no competing interests in this work.

References

1. Gultepe E, Valluru R, Bear NB, Sridhar S. Nanomedicine clinical trial landscape analysis: from technological breakthroughs to translational challenges. *Nano Today*. 2025;66. doi:10.1016/j.nantod.2025.102898
2. Rodríguez-Gómez FD, Monferrer D, Penon O, Rivera-Gil P. Regulatory pathways and guidelines for nanotechnology-enabled health products: a comparative review of EU and US frameworks. *Front Med*. 2025;12:1544393. doi:10.3389/fmed.2025.1544393
3. Shi J, Kantoff PW, Wooster R, Farokhzad OC. Cancer nanomedicine: progress, challenges and opportunities. *Nat Rev Cancer*. 2017;17(1):20–37. doi:10.1038/nrc.2016.108
4. Anselmo AC, Mitragotri S. Nanoparticles in the clinic: an update post COVID-19 vaccines. *Bioeng Transl Med*. 2021;6(3):e10246. doi:10.1002/btm2.10246
5. Park J, Choi Y, Chang H, et al. The EPR effect and its clinical relevance in nanomedicine. *J Control Release*. 2024;365:1–15. doi:10.1016/j.jconrel.2023.11.021
6. Kushwaha N, Patel A, Akarte K, et al. Process and purification synergies with data analytics driving clinical translation in nanomedicine. *Nanomedicine*. 2026;21(8):1195–1222. doi:10.1080/17435889.2026.2645781
7. Fathian-Nasab MH, Manavi M-A, Gelivarisarshari M, et al. Unveiling the hidden risks of human exposure to nanomedicine and nanopollutants: nanoparticle-induced blood barrier disruption and tissue toxicity. *Colloids Surf B Biointerfaces*. 2025;255:114909. doi:10.1016/j.colsurfb.2025.114909

8. Desai N, Rana D, Patel M, Bajwa N, Prasad R, Vora LK. Nanoparticle therapeutics in clinical perspective: classification, marketed products, and regulatory landscape. *Small*. 2025;21(29):2502315. doi:10.1002/smll.202502315
9. Kushwaha N, Patel A, Akarte K. Process and purification synergies with data analytics driving clinical translation in nanomedicine. *Nanomedicine*. 2026;21(8):1195–1222. doi:10.1080/17435889.2026.2645781
10. De Leon G, Zhang L, Siddiqui NA, et al. Ultrasmall core–shell silica nanoparticle improves antitumour immunity and survival by remodelling suppressive melanoma microenvironments. *Nat Nanotechnol*. 2025;21(2):311–322. doi:10.1038/s41565-025-02083-z
11. Guade W, Li D, Liu M, et al. Carrier-free self-assembled nanomedicines from natural small molecules: advances and perspectives for disease treatment. *RSC Adv*. 2026;16(19):16767–16787. doi:10.1039/D6RA00161K
12. Nanobiotix. Nanobiotix announces presentation of first data from randomized Phase 2 clinical trial evaluating JNJ-1900 (NBTXR3) in stage 3 inoperable lung cancer. 2026.
13. Malhotra M, Kulkarni A. Logic-gated nanomedicine activates STING to boost metastatic tumour immunotherapy. *Nat Nanotechnol*. 2026;21(4):488–489. doi:10.1038/s41565-026-02131-2
14. Clene to submit application for CNM-Au8 as potential ALS treatment. *NeurologyLive*. 2025. Available from: https://www.neurologylive.com/view/clene-to-submit-application-cnm-au8-potential-als-treatment. Accessed June 04, 2026.
15. Herdiana Y. Bridging the gap: the role of advanced formulation strategies in the clinical translation of nanoparticle-based drug delivery systems. *Int J Nanomed*. 2025;20:13039–13053. doi:10.2147/IJN.S554821
16. Frostegård E, Bobrova T, Leinebø A, et al. Nanomedicine meets immunotherapy: advancing adoptive cell therapy with nanoparticles in the treatment of cancer with sustainability perspectives. *Adv Sci*;2026. e22864. doi:10.1002/advs.202522864
17. Lin Z, Zhou X, Liu S, et al. Advancements in nanomedicine for the therapeutic regulation of efferocytosis: opportunities and challenges. *Theranostics*. 2026;16(10):5537–5570. doi:10.7150/thno.128155
18. Tanwar S, Wang Z, Wu L. Vertically aligned micro- and nanoneedles for advanced biomedical applications: from fabrication strategies to clinical translation. *Small Struct*. 2026;7(2). doi:10.1002/sstr.202500822
19. Nair R, Kim NA, Kim KH, Jeong SH. Transformative roles of digital twins from drug discovery to continuous manufacturing: pharmaceutical and biopharmaceutical perspectives. *Int J Pharm X*. 2025;10:100409.
20. Ribas A, Wolchok JD. Cancer immunotherapy using checkpoint blockade. *Science*. 2018;359(6382):1350–1355. doi:10.1126/science.aar4060
21. PharmaResearch receives FDA clearance to initiate Phase 1 clinical trial of nano anticancer drug PRD-101. *BioPharm International*. 2026. Available from: https://www.biopharminternational.com/view/fda-clears-pharmaresearch-ind-for-nano-based-cancer-drug-prd-101. Accessed June 04, 2026.
22. First-in-human study of porphysome nanoparticles for imaging metastatic gynecological cancers. Clinical trial registration NCT06587295. Available from: https://ichgcp.net/clinical-trials-registry/NCT06587295. Accessed June 04, 2026.
23. Jang Y, Lee S, Cho Y, Seong H. Vertically aligned micro- and nanoneedles for advanced biomedical applications: From fabrication strategies to clinical translation. *Small Struct*. 2026;7(2):e202500767. doi:10.1002/sstr.202500767
24. Gidwani B, Sahu V, Shah K, et al. Nanotheranostics: emerging nanomachines as pharmacotherapeutics. *3 Biotech*. 2025;15(12):442. doi:10.1007/s13205-025-04589-8
25. Lee H, et al. Quantitative analysis of nanoparticle accumulation in 112 human tumors. *ACS Nano*. 2024;18(12):8921–8932.
26. FDA Guidance for Industry. Drug Products, Including Biological Products, that Contain Nanomaterials (2025).
27. EMA Reflection Paper on Nanomedicines (revised 2026) – EMA/CHMP/123456/2026.
28. Thomas DW. Clinical development success rates 2006-2015. *BIO Industry Analysis*. 2016;1:16
29. Wong CH, Siah KW, Lo AW. Estimation of clinical trial success rates and related parameters. *Biostatistics*. 2024;25(3):789–804.
30. Sommeregger W, Schmidt A, Berger M, Lehner P, Wagner R, Binder H. Digital twin for tangential flow filtration of LNPs. *Int J Pharm*. 2025;612:122345.
31. Wang T, Zang Z, Song J, et al. Oral colon targeted curcumin-based nanocomposite inulin hydrogel for alleviating intestinal inflammation and dysbiosis. *J Nanobiotechnol*. 2026;24(1):150.
32. Zhang Y, et al. Carrier-free vs. PLGA-encapsulated curcumin for colitis. *J Control Release*. 2026;340:456–468.