***Review Article***

**Nanomaterials in Biomedical Applications: A Review**

**Abstract**

Nanomaterials exhibit unique physicochemical properties, including exceptional surface-to-volume ratios, tunable optical and electronic characteristics, and enhanced reactivity, positioning them as pivotal tools in biomedical applications. This review systematically explores various classes of nanomaterials metallic nanoparticles, carbon-based nanostructures, polymeric nanoparticles, lipid-based nanoparticles, quantum dots, and hybrid or composite materials highlighting their biomedical functionalities in drug delivery, diagnostics, cancer therapy, tissue engineering, wound healing, and biosensing applications. The size, shape, surface charge, biocompatibility, biodegradability, and optical properties of these materials significantly influence their interactions within biological systems, determining therapeutic efficacy and diagnostic accuracy. Nanomaterials such as gold and silver nanoparticles demonstrate promising therapeutic and antimicrobial capabilities, while carbon-based materials, including carbon nanotubes and graphene derivatives, provide superior mechanical and conductive properties beneficial in advanced diagnostic and therapeutic approaches. Polymeric and lipid-based nanoparticles have been effectively utilized in targeted drug delivery systems, owing to their biocompatibility, controlled drug release properties, and reduced toxicity profiles. Quantum dots offer unmatched imaging capabilities due to their quantum confinement effects, substantially improving the sensitivity and specificity of biomedical imaging techniques. Despite these advancements, toxicity concerns, including cytotoxicity, genotoxicity, bioaccumulation, and immunogenicity, pose significant barriers to clinical translation. Addressing these limitations involves standardized characterization protocols, improved surface functionalization strategies, and robust regulatory frameworks. Emerging trends like stimuli-responsive nanocarriers, theranostic platforms, and integration with artificial intelligence provide promising pathways to overcome current challenges, enhancing efficacy, safety, and personalization in nanomedicine. The continued advancement and interdisciplinary collaboration among researchers, industry, and regulatory authorities are imperative for realizing the full clinical and commercial potential of nanomaterials, thereby revolutionizing healthcare outcomes globally.
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**1. Introduction**

***Nanomaterials and Their Significance in Biomedical Sciences***

Nanomaterials represent a class of materials uniquely characterized by at least one dimension in the nanoscale range, typically between 1 to 100 nanometres (Pokropivny *et.al.,* 2007). These materials exhibit exceptional physicochemical properties, significantly different from their bulk counterparts, owing to their nanoscale size, high surface-to-volume ratio, and quantum confinement effects. These unique attributes confer upon nanomaterials enhanced mechanical strength, superior chemical reactivity, enhanced thermal and electrical conductivity, and remarkable optical properties. Such features have made them integral components in biomedical research, contributing significantly to drug delivery systems, diagnostic imaging, biosensors, cancer therapy, and tissue engineering (Harish *et.al.,* 2022). For instance, metallic nanoparticles such as gold nanoparticles exhibit surface plasmon resonance, facilitating their use in cancer photothermal therapy and sensitive diagnostic assays. The inherent biocompatibility and ease of functionalization of polymeric nanoparticles have led to their widespread adoption in targeted drug delivery systems, improving drug efficacy and reducing toxicity. Nanomaterials also play critical roles in regenerative medicine, enabling the design of biomimetic scaffolds capable of supporting tissue regeneration at the cellular and molecular levels (Chaudhury *et.al.,* 2014). The global market for nanomedicine underscores the significance of these materials, projected to exceed USD 293.1 billion by 2027, emphasizing their expanding role in modern healthcare.

***History and Evolution of Nanomaterials in Healthcare***

The conceptual foundation for nanotechnology dates back to 1959, with Richard Feynman’s seminal lecture "There's Plenty of Room at the Bottom," proposing the manipulation of matter at atomic levels (Khosla *et.al.,* 2024). Building upon this concept, advancements in nanotechnology commenced in earnest during the 1970s and 1980s, marked by the introduction of liposomes as drug carriers, which provided improved pharmacokinetics and targeted delivery capabilities. This period laid the groundwork for significant progress in nanoparticle synthesis, leading to the creation of dendrimers, polymeric nanoparticles, and metal-based nanomaterials during the subsequent decades. The commercial approval of Doxil in 1995 a liposomal formulation of doxorubicin represented a landmark achievement, establishing nanotechnology's potential in clinical settings for cancer therapy (Basingab *et.al.,* 2025). The subsequent decades saw rapid innovation, with developments such as Abraxane, an albumin-bound paclitaxel nanoparticle, demonstrating enhanced clinical outcomes and reduced side effects in cancer patients. More recently, lipid nanoparticles played a pivotal role in the rapid development and successful deployment of mRNA vaccines against COVID-19, illustrating the profound impact of nanotechnology on public health and infectious disease management. The current era is marked by sophisticated integration of artificial intelligence and machine learning algorithms, which facilitate the rational design of nanomaterials for specific biomedical applications, enhancing their efficacy, precision, and biocompatibility. This historical trajectory highlights an ongoing evolution characterized by transformative innovation, establishing nanotechnology as an indispensable component of contemporary healthcare systems (Tawiah *et.al.,* 2024).

***Classification of Nanomaterials Used in Biomedical Applications***

The classification of nanomaterials employed in biomedical applications can be approached based on their chemical composition, structural morphology, and functional characteristic (Joudeh *et.al.,* 2022). Metallic nanomaterials constitute a significant category, prominently including gold, silver, platinum, palladium, copper, and iron oxide nanoparticles. Gold nanoparticles possess distinct optical properties due to their surface plasmon resonance, making them ideal candidates for photothermal therapies and diagnostic imaging techniques. Silver nanoparticles are well-known for their potent antimicrobial properties, utilized extensively in wound dressings, surgical coatings, and infection control measures. Iron oxide nanoparticles, particularly magnetite (Fe3O4), exhibit superparamagnetic properties leveraged in magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) contrast agents and magnetic hyperthermia-based cancer treatments, enabling targeted therapy and improved patient outcomes.

Carbon-based nanomaterials, including fullerenes, carbon nanotubes (CNTs), graphene, and graphene oxide, form another critical class within biomedical nanotechnology (Ayanda *et.al.,* 2024). Fullerenes demonstrate significant antioxidant activities and have found utility in drug delivery and photodynamic therapy, particularly due to their ability to generate reactive oxygen species upon photoactivation. Carbon nanotubes, characterized by their cylindrical hollow structures, possess exceptional mechanical strength, electrical conductivity, and biocompatibility, extensively utilized in developing sophisticated biosensors and targeted drug delivery systems. Graphene and graphene oxide have emerged as highly promising materials, known for their remarkable electrical conductivity, mechanical robustness, and ease of functionalization, making them suitable for biomedical applications ranging from antimicrobial coatings to neural interfaces and regenerative medicine. Polymeric nanomaterials comprise natural polymers such as chitosan, gelatin, and alginate, and synthetic polymers including poly (lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA), polyethylene glycol (PEG), and polycaprolactone (PCL). Natural polymeric nanoparticles offer advantages in biodegradability and low immunogenicity, widely employed in drug delivery and wound healing applications. Synthetic polymeric nanoparticles, specifically PLGA-based systems, have gained prominence due to their biocompatibility, controlled degradation profiles, and versatility in drug encapsulation, serving as effective platforms for sustained and targeted drug release strategies. Lipid-based nanomaterials, prominently represented by liposomes, solid lipid nanoparticles (SLNs), and nanostructured lipid carriers (NLCs), have seen substantial utilization in pharmaceutical formulations (Viegas *et.al.,* 2023). Liposomes offer distinct advantages in encapsulating both hydrophilic and hydrophobic drugs, enhancing their bioavailability and therapeutic efficacy. SLNs and NLCs exhibit enhanced physical stability, controlled release properties, and improved biocompatibility, providing superior alternatives to conventional drug delivery methods, particularly in topical, oral, and parenteral drug administration. Quantum dots (QDs), semiconductor nanoparticles with unique photoluminescence properties, represent another important category of biomedical nanomaterials. Their tunable emission spectra, high quantum yield, and photostability enable their extensive use as imaging agents in fluorescence microscopy, diagnostics, and targeted therapeutics, greatly enhancing detection sensitivity and accuracy in clinical diagnostics and bioimaging. Hybrid and composite nanomaterials, including metal-organic frameworks (MOFs) and core-shell nanoparticles, combine properties of individual constituents, yielding multifunctional nanostructures with enhanced capabilities (Zhou *et.al.,* 2015). MOFs, characterized by their high porosity and surface area, have been explored as drug carriers and biosensors, demonstrating excellent drug loading capacity and controlled release behaviour. Core-shell nanoparticles, such as magnetic-core silica-shell structures, have been successfully utilized for multimodal imaging and targeted drug delivery, integrating multiple functionalities within a single nanoparticle system.

***Objectives and Scope of the Review***

The present review aims to comprehensively analyse recent advancements, current applications, and emerging trends of nanomaterials in biomedical fields (Devi *et.al.,* 2024). The review systematically addresses different classes of nanomaterials, elucidating their specific biomedical applications, underlying mechanisms, advantages, and limitations. The scope encompasses detailed discussions on the physicochemical properties influencing biological interactions, therapeutic effectiveness, toxicity concerns, and future prospects in clinical translation. By synthesizing recent literature, this review intends to provide critical insights for researchers, clinicians, and industry professionals, highlighting opportunities and challenges that must be addressed to realize the full potential of nanomaterials in advancing human health care.

**2. Types of Nanomaterials Used in Biomedical Applications**

***Metallic Nanoparticles***

Metallic nanoparticles are among the most widely studied and utilized categories in biomedical research owing to their distinctive physicochemical characteristics, including high surface plasmon resonance, catalytic properties, electrical conductivity, and biological compatibility. Gold nanoparticles (AuNPs) have attracted considerable attention because of their excellent optical properties, easy surface modification, and outstanding biocompatibility. AuNPs typically range between 2 and 100 nm in diameter and exhibit size-dependent surface plasmon resonance, allowing their use in applications such as photothermal cancer therapy, biosensing, drug delivery, and bioimaging. The FDA-approved applications include the use of gold nanoshells for photothermal treatment of cancer cells, reflecting their well-established therapeutic potential (Kesharwani *et.al.,* 2023). Silver nanoparticles (AgNPs), characterized by strong antimicrobial activity, are extensively applied in wound healing, surgical dressings, and medical device coatings. Their antimicrobial efficacy results from their ability to release silver ions, disrupting bacterial membranes and inhibiting DNA replication processes. AgNPs demonstrate potent activity against multi-drug-resistant bacteria, positioning them as critical components in contemporary infection control strategies. Platinum and palladium nanoparticles also demonstrate significant biomedical potential, particularly in catalytic antioxidant therapy, combating oxidative stress-associated disorders, and as efficient drug-delivery vehicles due to their chemical stability and reduced cytotoxicity profiles. Copper nanoparticles and iron oxide nanoparticles are recognized for their therapeutic and diagnostic capabilities (Vallabani *et.al.,* 2018). Copper nanoparticles show excellent antibacterial, antiviral, and antifungal activities, predominantly through generation of reactive oxygen species (ROS), making them useful in antimicrobial textiles and biomedical coatings. Iron oxide nanoparticles (Fe₃O₄ and Fe₂O₃), especially magnetite, possess superparamagnetic properties and are widely adopted for magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), targeted drug delivery, hyperthermia cancer treatments, and stem cell tracking. FDA-approved iron oxide nanoparticles like Feridex are routinely utilized in clinical imaging, showcasing their importance in modern medical diagnostics.

***Carbon-based Nanomaterials***

Carbon-based nanomaterials encompass fullerenes, carbon nanotubes (CNTs), and graphene derivatives, each displaying unique electronic, mechanical, and thermal properties suitable for biomedical applications (Ayanda *et.al.,* 2024). Fullerenes, specifically buckminsterfullerene (C₆₀), have high electron affinity, photostability, and ROS-generating capacity, thereby serving effectively in photodynamic therapy, antioxidant therapies, and antiviral treatments. Functionalized fullerenes also facilitate drug delivery, particularly across biological barriers such as the blood-brain barrier. Carbon nanotubes (CNTs) are cylindrical structures composed of sp² hybridized carbon atoms, notable for their exceptional tensile strength, chemical stability, and conductivity. They function effectively as drug carriers, biosensors, and tissue-engineering scaffolds. CNTs' high aspect ratio allows efficient cellular internalization, enabling precise drug targeting and controlled release, significantly enhancing therapeutic outcomes in cancer treatment and gene therapy. Graphene and graphene oxide, recognized for their extraordinary electrical conductivity, mechanical strength, large surface area, and ease of chemical functionalization, are extensively studied for use in biosensing, antimicrobial surfaces, cancer photothermal therapy, and neural regeneration. Graphene oxide's biocompatibility and water solubility further enhance its utility in drug-delivery platforms and tissue-engineering scaffolds.

***Polymeric Nanomaterials***

Polymeric nanomaterials can be categorized as natural or synthetic, depending on their origin and synthesis methods (Khan *et.al.,* 2022). Natural polymeric nanoparticles, derived from biomaterials such as chitosan, alginate, and gelatin, demonstrate excellent biocompatibility, biodegradability, and minimal immunogenicity. Chitosan nanoparticles exhibit unique mucoadhesive properties and are extensively utilized for drug and gene delivery, particularly via mucosal routes. Alginate nanoparticles effectively encapsulate and protect therapeutic agents, providing controlled release suitable for protein and peptide drug delivery. Gelatin-based nanoparticles, due to their intrinsic biodegradability and versatile functionalization, are employed widely for targeted anticancer therapies, regenerative medicine, and vaccine delivery systems (Jia *et.al.,* 2024). Synthetic polymeric nanoparticles, notably poly (lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA), polyethylene glycol (PEG), and polycaprolactone (PCL), have emerged prominently in nanomedicine owing to their adjustable degradation rates, tunable physicochemical properties, and robust safety profiles. PLGA nanoparticles, approved by the FDA, offer controlled drug release, enhanced drug stability, and improved biodistribution, demonstrating significant clinical utility in cancer therapeutics and vaccines (Table 2). PEGylation strategies, involving conjugation of polyethylene glycol to therapeutic molecules, have markedly increased systemic circulation time, reduced immunogenicity, and improved therapeutic efficacy. Polycaprolactone-based nanoparticles find broad application in tissue engineering and regenerative medicine due to their excellent biocompatibility and prolonged degradation profiles (Arif *et.al.,* 2022).

***Lipid-based Nanomaterials***

Lipid-based nanomaterials include liposomes, solid lipid nanoparticles (SLNs), and nanostructured lipid carriers (NLCs) (Table 1). Liposomes, vesicles composed primarily of phospholipid bilayers, effectively encapsulate hydrophilic and hydrophobic therapeutic agents, significantly enhancing drug bioavailability, reducing systemic toxicity, and enabling targeted drug delivery. The liposomal formulation Doxil demonstrates substantially improved therapeutic efficacy in chemotherapy, exemplifying liposome's clinical success. Solid lipid nanoparticles (SLNs), composed of solid lipids stabilized by surfactants, possess distinct advantages like enhanced drug stability, controlled release kinetics, and protection against enzymatic degradation (Mohammed *et.al.,* 2023). These attributes make SLNs suitable for topical, oral, and parenteral delivery systems, significantly improving patient compliance and therapeutic outcomes. Nanostructured lipid carriers (NLCs), advanced lipid-based systems designed to overcome the limitations associated with SLNs, exhibit increased drug-loading capacity, prolonged release profiles, and superior physical stability, gaining considerable attention for dermatological applications, pain management, and anticancer drug delivery.

**Table-1: Nano-based platforms and their stages in clinical used**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Nanoplatform** | **Size**  **Range** | **Compound**  **(Trade Name)** | **Application** | **Target** | **Status** |
| Liposome | <100 nm | Doxorubicin  (Doxil/Caelyx) | Cancer therapy | Kaposi’s sarcoma,  ovarian cancer,  breast cancer | FDA approved |
|  |  | Daunorubicin  (DaunoXome) | Cancer therapy |  | FDA approved |
| Dendrimer | 1–10 nm | VivaGel | Microbicide | Cervicovaginal | Phase II |
| Polymer | 50–200 nm | Methotrexate | Cancer therapy | Several different  cancers | In vitro/in vivo |
|  |  | Pegaspargase  (Oncaspar) | Cancer therapy | Acute lymphoblastic  leukemia | FDA approved |
| Micelle | 10–100 nm | Doxorubicin | Cancer therapy | Breast/Lung cancer | Phase II |
|  |  | Paclitaxel | Cancer therapy | Breast cancer | Phase II |
|  |  | Paclitaxel  (Genexol-PM) | Cancer therapy | Breast cancer | Phase II |
|  |  | Paclitaxel (Taxol) | Cancer therapy | Psoriasis | Phase II |
| Carbon  Nanotubes | 1–25nm | Paclitaxel | Cancer therapy | Lung cancer | Phase I |
| Metallic  Nanoparticles | 1–150 nm | Ferumoxides  (Feridex) | MRI contrast agent | Liver | FDA approved |
|  |  | Iron-oxide  (NanoTherm) | Cancer therapy | Glioblastoma | EU approved |
| Organic  Nanoparticles | 20–400 nm |  | Cancer therapy | Liver cancer | Phase II |
| Quantum Dots | 1–10 nm | Doxorubicin | Cancer therapy | Ovarian cancer | In vivo |
|  |  |  | Cancer therapy | Breast and prostate cancer | In vivo |
| Nanogels | <200 nm | NB-001 | Anti-viral | Herpes labialis | Phase III |
|  |  | MuGard | Mucositis | Head and neck | Phase IV |
| CPP | ~30 aa residue  long | Azurin | Cancer  therapy | Refractory  solid tumors | Phase II |
|  |  | Synthetic  peptides  XG- 102 | Cancer therapy | c-Jun-N- terminal kinases | Phase II |

**(Source: Lehner et al., 2013)**

***Quantum Dots (QDs)***

Quantum dots (QDs), semiconductor nanoparticles typically ranging from 2 to 10 nm in diameter, possess unique quantum confinement effects resulting in size-tunable optical properties, broad absorption spectra, narrow emission peaks, and high quantum yields. These remarkable optical attributes make QDs superior alternatives to traditional fluorophores in biomedical imaging, offering enhanced resolution, multiplexing capabilities, and photostability. Biomedical imaging applications utilizing QDs include cellular labelling, tumour detection, molecular imaging, and real-time tracking of biomolecules, significantly enhancing diagnostic sensitivity and accuracy (Medintz et al., 2005).

***Hybrid and Composite Nanomaterials***

Hybrid and composite nanomaterials, including metal-organic frameworks (MOFs) and core-shell nanoparticles, integrate the properties of multiple nanomaterials to achieve multifunctionality (Zhou *et.al.,* 2015). MOFs, consisting of metal ions coordinated to organic ligands, are characterized by their large surface areas, tunable porosity, and chemical stability, allowing their effective use in drug delivery, biosensing, and imaging. Their ability to host and release therapeutic agents in a controlled manner has made them promising candidates in targeted chemotherapy and personalized medicine. Core-shell nanoparticles consist of a core material enveloped by a shell composed of different materials, combining multiple functionalities such as imaging and therapy into a single nanoparticle. Magnetic-core silica-shell nanoparticles, for example, allow simultaneous magnetic resonance imaging and targeted drug delivery, significantly enhancing therapeutic efficacy and diagnostic accuracy, thus offering considerable potential in theragnostic applications.

**3. Physicochemical Properties of Nanomaterials Influencing Biomedical Applications**

*Size and shape-dependent properties*

Nanomaterials demonstrate distinct size and shape-dependent properties crucial for their biomedical applications (Yang *et.al.,* 2019). The nanoscale size significantly enhances surface-to-volume ratios, thus increasing the reactivity and interaction of nanoparticles with biological entities such as cells and proteins. Size-specific behaviours, such as cellular uptake efficiency, circulation time in blood, and biodistribution, critically influence therapeutic efficacy and toxicity. For instance, nanoparticles below 50 nm typically exhibit enhanced cellular internalization, whereas particles larger than 200 nm primarily accumulate in the reticuloendothelial system, altering biodistribution patterns and therapeutic outcomes. Shape also considerably affects nanoparticle behaviour; rod-shaped nanoparticles generally show prolonged circulation and enhanced cellular uptake compared to spherical nanoparticles, facilitating efficient tumour targeting (Hadji *et.al.,* 2022).

*Surface charge and functionalization*

The surface charge and chemical functionalization of nanoparticles directly affect their stability, cellular interactions, and bioavailability. Positively charged nanoparticles display increased affinity for negatively charged cell membranes, enhancing uptake efficiency but also potentially increasing cytotoxicity. Conversely, negatively charged or neutrally charged nanoparticles show reduced toxicity profiles and prolonged systemic circulation due to decreased protein adsorption and immune recognition. Surface functionalization, achieved through ligand attachment or polymeric coatings such as polyethylene glycol (PEG), significantly improves nanoparticle stability, reduces opsonization, and prevents premature clearance by the immune system, thus enhancing therapeutic targeting capabilities (Harrison *et.al.,* 2016).

*Biocompatibility and biodegradability*

Biocompatibility and biodegradability are essential factors governing the clinical applicability and safety profile of nanomaterials. Biocompatible nanoparticles minimize adverse reactions, including inflammation, immune activation, and cytotoxicity. Materials like chitosan, gelatin, PLGA, and lipid-based nanoparticles inherently exhibit favourable biocompatibility due to their natural biodegradation pathways, making them suitable candidates for biomedical applications. Biodegradable nanoparticles facilitate controlled drug release by gradual breakdown into non-toxic metabolites, significantly reducing chronic toxicity and ensuring effective therapeutic outcomes. Nanomaterials lacking biodegradability risk bioaccumulation and subsequent toxicity, highlighting the importance of material selection based on biodegradability characteristics (Lead *et.al.,* 2018).

*Optical and electronic properties*

The unique optical and electronic properties of nanomaterials, such as surface plasmon resonance (SPR) exhibited by metallic nanoparticles (e.g., gold and silver nanoparticles), quantum confinement effects in quantum dots, and superior electrical conductivity in carbon-based nanomaterials, have profound implications for biomedical imaging and diagnostics. For instance, gold nanoparticles exhibit strong SPR absorption, enabling their use in photothermal therapies and sensitive diagnostic assays. Quantum dots, due to their size-dependent emission spectra and high quantum yield, provide exceptional resolution in fluorescence imaging, significantly surpassing traditional dyes in diagnostic sensitivity and accuracy (Yao *et.al.,* 2014).

**4. Applications of Nanomaterials in Biomedicine**

*Drug Delivery Systems*

Nanomaterials significantly enhance drug delivery by improving drug solubility, stability, and site-specific targeting (Wang *et.al.,* 2014). Targeted drug delivery mechanisms exploit the specific binding of nanoparticles functionalized with ligands to receptors overexpressed on diseased cells, achieving higher therapeutic efficacy and reduced systemic toxicity. Passive targeting leverages the enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect, facilitating preferential accumulation in tumour tissues due to abnormal vascular structures. Active targeting incorporates ligand-mediated binding, significantly improving delivery precision and therapeutic index. Stimuli-responsive nanocarriers, designed to release their therapeutic payload in response to specific stimuli (e.g., pH, temperature, enzymes), further optimize therapeutic efficiency by providing controlled, on-demand drug release.

*Diagnostics and Imaging*

Nanomaterials revolutionize diagnostic imaging modalities, enhancing contrast and sensitivity in MRI, CT, ultrasound, and optical imaging (Butt *et.al.,* 2025). Superparamagnetic iron oxide nanoparticles (SPIONs) markedly improve MRI contrast, allowing early tumour detection and accurate imaging of biological processes. Gold nanoparticles enhance CT imaging through high X-ray attenuation. Quantum dots offer superior optical properties, significantly improving fluorescence imaging resolution. Nanomaterial-based biosensors demonstrate high sensitivity and specificity, enabling early disease detection and monitoring.

*Antimicrobial and Antiviral Applications*

Nanoparticles exhibit potent antimicrobial activities primarily by disrupting bacterial cell membranes, generating reactive oxygen species (ROS), and interfering with microbial DNA replication (Wang *et.al.,* 2017). Silver and copper nanoparticles effectively combat antibiotic-resistant bacterial strains, providing critical solutions against emerging superbugs. Nanomaterials also show antiviral efficacy by inhibiting viral entry, replication, and release, exemplified by silver and graphene-based materials effectively inactivating viruses such as SARS-CoV-2, thus playing vital roles in public health responses to pandemics.

*Cancer Therapy*

Nanomaterials enable advanced cancer therapies, including photothermal therapy (PTT), photodynamic therapy (PDT), and chemotherapy. Gold nanoparticles efficiently convert absorbed light into heat, selectively destroying cancer cells via hyperthermia. Photodynamic therapy employs nanoparticles as carriers of photosensitizers, enhancing therapeutic selectivity and minimizing damage to healthy tissues. Nanocarrier-mediated chemotherapy significantly improves drug delivery precision, reducing off-target effects and enhancing therapeutic outcomes. Nanomaterials also facilitate gene and RNA-based therapies, efficiently delivering genetic materials for targeted gene silencing or editing (Yu *et.al.,* 2023).

*Tissue Engineering and Regenerative Medicine*

Nanomaterials are extensively utilized in tissue engineering, providing scaffold materials that mimic the native extracellular matrix. Nanostructured biomaterials support bone, cartilage, and neural regeneration by promoting cell adhesion, proliferation, and differentiation. Materials such as carbon nanotubes, graphene, and polymeric nanofibers significantly enhance tissue regeneration efficacy, enabling the repair and regeneration of damaged tissues with improved biological and mechanical properties.

*Wound Healing and Skin Regeneration*

Nanomaterials play essential roles in wound healing by providing antimicrobial protection, modulating inflammation, and enhancing tissue regeneration. Silver nanoparticles, chitosan nanoparticles, and graphene oxide-based dressings demonstrate robust antibacterial and anti-inflammatory activities, significantly accelerating wound closure and tissue regeneration (Fadhil *et.al.,* 2024).

*Biosensing and Lab-on-a-Chip Devices*

Nanomaterial-based biosensors exhibit exceptional sensitivity and selectivity, facilitating rapid, point-of-care diagnostics. Microfluidic and nanofluidic devices incorporating nanoparticles offer miniaturized, highly efficient diagnostic platforms, greatly enhancing diagnostic speed, accuracy, and accessibility in clinical and field settings.

**Table-2: List of drugs approved by FDA. Source: Adapted from US‐FDA and EMA**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Trade**  **Name** | **Company** | **Year**  **Approved** | **Active Pharmaceutical Ingredient** | **Indication** | **Nanotechnology** |
| Visudyne |  | 2000 | Verteporfin | Photodynamic therapy for age- related macular degeneration | Liposome |
| Doxil/Caelyx |  | 1995 | Doxorubicin | Antineoplastic | PEGylated liposome |
| AmBisome |  | 1990 | Amphotericin B | Fungal infections | Liposome |
| Abelcet |  | 1995 | Amphotericin B | Fungal infections | Liposome |
| Definity |  | 2001 | Octofluoropropane |  | Liposome |
| Myocet |  | 2001 | Doxorubicin |  | Liposome |
| DepoCyte |  | 1999 | Cytarabine | Lymphomatous meningitis | Liposome |
| DepoDur |  | 2004 | Morphine |  | Liposome |
| DaunoXome |  | 1996 | Daunorubicin | Antineoplastic | Liposome |
| Octocog alfa |  | 2009 | Factor VIII | Antineoplastic | Liposome |
| Abraxane | Abraxis  Biosciences | 2005 | Paclitaxel | Metastatic breast cancer | Albumin-bound  nanoparticles |
| Rapamune | Wyeth | 2000 | Rapamycin | Immunosuppress ant | Nanocrystal Ela |
| Emend | Merck | 2003 | Aprepitant | Anti-emetic | Nanocrystal Ela |
| Tricor | Abbott | 2004 | Fenofibrate | Hypercholesterol emia | Nanocrystal Ela |
| Megace ES | Par Pharma Co | 2005 | Megestrol | Anti-anorectic | Nanocrystal Ela |
| Triglide | Sciele  Pharma Inc. | 2005 | Fenofibrate | Hypercholesterol emia | IDP-P  Skyepharma  nanocrystal |
| Mepact |  |  | Mifamurtide |  | Liposome |
| Amphotec |  | 1996 |  | Fungal infections | Micelle |
| Estrasorb |  | 2003 |  | Vasomotor symptoms associated with menopause | Micelle |
| Taxotere |  | 1996 |  | Antineoplastic | Micelle |
| Somatuline  Depot |  | 2007 |  | Acromegaly | Nanotube |
| Feraheme Injection |  | 2009 |  | Treatment of iron deficiency anemia in patients with Chronic Kidney Disease | SPIO |

**(Source: European Science Foundation: Nanomedicine, an ESF‐European Medical Research Councils (EMRC)Forward Look report, 2005.)**

**5. Toxicity and Safety Concerns of Nanomaterials**

*Cytotoxicity and genotoxicity studies*

Evaluating the cytotoxicity and genotoxicity of nanomaterials is critical to ensuring their safe application in biomedical contexts (Saifi *et.al.,* 2018). Cytotoxicity refers to the ability of nanomaterials to cause cell death or damage, commonly assessed through assays such as MTT, LDH release, and live/dead staining. Nanoparticles, particularly metal-based ones like silver and gold, have shown varying degrees of cytotoxic effects depending on their size, shape, surface charge, and concentration. Smaller nanoparticles (<10 nm) often exhibit higher cytotoxicity due to increased cellular uptake and reactive oxygen species (ROS) generation, leading to oxidative stress, apoptosis, and cellular dysfunction. Genotoxicity studies examine the ability to induce DNA damage, mutations, or chromosomal aberrations, essential for assessing long-term carcinogenic potential. Genotoxic effects are often evaluated using comet assays, micronucleus assays, and Ames tests. Studies indicate that nanoparticles such as zinc oxide, titanium dioxide, and carbon nanotubes can induce genotoxic responses primarily through oxidative stress and inflammatory pathways (Kwon *et.al.,* 2014).

*Long-term biocompatibility and bioaccumulation*

Assessing long-term biocompatibility and bioaccumulation is vital for predicting chronic exposure risks associated with nanomaterials. Biocompatibility refers to the ability of nanomaterials to function safely within biological systems without causing adverse effects over extended periods. Nanoparticles designed for medical applications, such as PLGA and liposomes, generally exhibit favorable biocompatibility profiles due to their biodegradability. Contrarily, materials like quantum dots and metallic nanoparticles often pose concerns related to long-term accumulation in vital organs, potentially causing chronic toxicity. Bioaccumulation, especially in organs such as the liver, kidneys, spleen, and lungs, poses significant health risks. Nanoparticles with slow degradation rates can accumulate over time, leading to sustained inflammatory responses, fibrosis, or organ dysfunction. Long-term animal studies and pharmacokinetic modeling are essential to comprehensively evaluate bioaccumulation risks and ensure safety in clinical use (Tee *et.al.,* 2019).

*Immunogenicity and inflammatory responses*

Nanomaterials can trigger immunogenic and inflammatory responses that significantly influence their therapeutic efficacy and safety. Immunogenicity involves the ability of nanomaterials to activate immune responses, potentially leading to allergic reactions, hypersensitivity, or autoimmune effects. Factors such as surface properties, size, and charge significantly influence immune activation. Positively charged nanoparticles often exhibit higher immunogenic potential due to enhanced interactions with negatively charged immune cell membranes. Inflammatory responses arise when nanoparticles activate innate immune pathways, leading to cytokine release and recruitment of immune cells (Silva *et.al.,* 2017). Chronic inflammation due to persistent exposure can result in tissue damage and exacerbate underlying diseases. Materials such as silica, carbon nanotubes, and certain metallic nanoparticles notably induce strong inflammatory reactions through activation pathways involving macrophages and cytokine release.

*Regulatory frameworks and risk assessment guidelines*

The growing application and potential health risks associated with nanomaterials have prompted the establishment and evolution of robust regulatory frameworks and risk assessment guidelines globally. Regulatory agencies like the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), European Medicines Agency (EMA), and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) have developed guidelines addressing nanoparticle characterization, safety assessments, and risk management. These frameworks mandate detailed physicochemical characterization, toxicological evaluations, and environmental assessments before clinical translation and commercialization. Risk assessment guidelines emphasize comprehensive toxicity screening, exposure assessments, and lifecycle analyses to mitigate risks associated with nanoparticle use (Isibor *et.al.,* 2024). Standardized protocols and validated analytical methods ensure consistent and reliable evaluation of nanomaterials, thereby enhancing regulatory compliance and patient safety.

**6. Challenges and Future**

*Current limitations in biomedical applications of nanomaterials*

Despite significant advancements, several limitations persist in the biomedical applications of nanomaterials (Mabrouk *et.al.,* 2021). One primary concern involves achieving precise control over nanoparticle distribution, clearance rates, and targeted delivery, which remains challenging due to the complex nature and heterogeneity inherent in biological systems. Issues such as nanoparticle aggregation, nonspecific interactions with biological components, and rapid clearance by the reticuloendothelial system (RES) compromise the effectiveness and clinical utility of nanoparticles. Additionally, variability in synthesis protocols and batch-to-batch inconsistency often result in significant challenges concerning reproducibility, quality control, and scalability. The lack of standardized protocols for nanoparticle characterization and toxicity assessment further complicates regulatory approval and commercialization, hindering clinical translation and market entry of novel nanotherapeutics (Ahmad *et.al.,* 2022).

*Strategies for enhancing efficacy and safety*

Addressing existing limitations requires strategies focused on enhancing nanoparticle efficacy and safety. Surface functionalization and coating strategies, such as polyethylene glycol (PEG) modification, can significantly reduce nonspecific binding and RES clearance, improving nanoparticle stability, circulation time, and targeted delivery precision. Advanced targeting strategies, including ligand-mediated active targeting, stimuli-responsive delivery systems, and personalized nanomedicine approaches, further enhance therapeutic efficiency by ensuring site-specific drug release and minimal off-target effects (Rahim *et.al.,* 2021). Robust characterization and standardization protocols for synthesis and quality control must be developed to address reproducibility issues, ensuring consistent production and facilitating regulatory approval processes. Developing comprehensive computational modelling and predictive simulation tools could further optimize nanoparticle design, improving clinical translation potential by predicting in vivo behaviour accurately.

*Emerging trends in nanomedicine and theranostics*

Emerging trends in nanomedicine and theranostics highlight integrated diagnostic and therapeutic approaches that leverage the multifunctionality inherent in nanomaterials (Jiang *et.al.,* 2024). Theranostic nanoplatforms, combining imaging agents and therapeutic payloads within a single nanoparticle, provide simultaneous disease diagnosis, real-time monitoring, and targeted treatment, significantly enhancing patient outcomes and personalized care. Advances in stimuli-responsive nanomaterials capable of responding dynamically to biological signals or external stimuli, such as temperature, pH, enzymes, and magnetic fields, offer precise control over drug release and therapeutic activity, facilitating real-time adaptability to patient-specific conditions. The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning in nanoparticle design and optimization has significantly accelerated the rational development of advanced nanomedicines, enabling precise prediction and customization of nanoparticle properties for individual patient needs (Serov *et.al.,* 2022).

*Potential for clinical translation and commercialization*

The potential for clinical translation and commercialization of nanomedicines remains high, given ongoing research efforts, increased regulatory clarity, and technological advancements. Success stories such as Doxil (liposomal doxorubicin), Abraxane (albumin-bound paclitaxel nanoparticles), and lipid nanoparticle-based mRNA vaccines demonstrate the significant impact and market potential of clinically approved nanomedicines. Continued focus on safety, efficacy, manufacturing scalability, and regulatory compliance will facilitate smoother translation pathways. Enhancing collaboration among academia, industry, and regulatory agencies is critical to overcoming existing challenges, accelerating approval timelines, and ensuring market success. The establishment and refinement of regulatory guidelines specific to nanomedicines by global agencies such as FDA, EMA, and OECD further supports the robust development, validation, and commercialization of nanomedicine-based products, ensuring their widespread adoption and acceptance in clinical practice (Mitra *et.al.,* 2024).

**Conclusion**  
Nanomaterials have demonstrated exceptional potential in revolutionizing biomedical applications, including targeted drug delivery, advanced diagnostics, cancer therapeutics, and regenerative medicine. Their unique physicochemical properties, such as size and shape-dependent behaviour, surface charge, biocompatibility, and optical characteristics, significantly enhance therapeutic efficacy and precision diagnostics. Despite these promising advancements, challenges such as cytotoxicity, bioaccumulation, immunogenicity, and inconsistent manufacturing processes require stringent assessment and standardization. Emerging strategies, including stimuli-responsive delivery systems, theranostic platforms, and integration with artificial intelligence, offer substantial improvements in efficacy and safety. Collaborative efforts among researchers, regulatory bodies, and industry stakeholders are essential for addressing existing limitations, facilitating clinical translation, and ensuring successful commercialization. Continued exploration and rigorous evaluation will further solidify the role of nanomaterials in advancing personalized medicine and improving global healthcare outcomes.
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