Research & Reviews: Journal of Medical and Health Sciences

Review on Cancer Therapy

Shiva S*

Department of Pharmacy, Vignan Institute of Pharmaceutical Technology, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India

Review Article

*For Correspondence

Shiva S, Department of Pharmacy, Vignan Institute of Pharmaceutical Technology, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh, Tel: 9490074511.

E-mail: sanivadashiva@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The use of Nano carriers as drug delivery systems for chemotherapeutical agents will improve the pharmacological properties of normally used medicine in therapy. The clinical success, still because the ease with which surface modifications is created to each liposomes and micelles to accommodate targeting ligands have created these Nano carrier's especially enticing candidates involving targeted drug delivery. Though not targeted, there is a unit clinically approved liposomal-based medicine that area unit presently wont to treat numerous forms of cancers. This review discusses the employment of liposomes and micelles in cancer medical aid and makes an attempt to produce some current info concerning the clinical standing of many of those Nano carrier-based medicines. Additionally, recent work involving the incorporation of targeting ligands to systems like these so as to enhance co-localization between the drug and cancer cells is additionally self-addressed. What is more, whereas the employment of those Nano carriers especially is that the primary focus here, this review additionally contains a discussion on different normally used Nano carriers in cancer medical aid to incorporate various polymer-based and polymer-protein conjugates. Finally, the likelihood of mistreatment combinatorial approaches involving multiple surface modifications created to each liposome and micelles so as to additional improve their drug delivery capabilities is additionally mentioned.

INTRODUCTION

Cancer treatment involving therapy is usually amid cyanogen facet effects, thereby limiting the quantity of the drug which will lean to a patient. As a result, all of the neoplasm tissue might not be exposed to a dose of the drug. The employment of Nano carriers reminiscent of liposomes and micelles will improve the medicine properties of ancient chemotherapeutics. Their tiny size (~ 100 nm or less) permits them to pronto extravagate from circulation through tube defects generally gift at neoplasm sites thanks to current ontogeny wherever they will then deliver encapsulated cytotoxic agents to neoplasm tissue [1-8]. This, not to mention the very fact that there's typically poor humor drain at neoplasm sites, leads to a development referred to as the improved permeableness and retention (EPR) result, that partially explains their clinical success. let's say, each DaunoXome and Doxil square measure samples of clinically-approved liposomal-based medicine that square measure presently accustomed treat either Kaposi's malignant neoplastic disease or each sex gland and repeated. Instead, micelle based medicine containing antibiotic, paclitaxel, or cisplatin square measure in numerous stages of clinical trials [9-20]. While the employment of each liposomes and micelles in cancer medical aid looks promising, obstacles related to drug transfer from these Nano carriers to neoplasm cells among the neoplasm web site stay notably difficult. However, surface coating these Nano carriers with synthetic resin glycol (PEG) yield improved circulation times *in vivo*, and thereby the discriminatory accumulation of the drug among tumours. Additionally, PEG-lipids used as deliquescent corona-forming blocks in several micelle-based medicines conjointly yield longer circulation times [21-25]. However, whereas the presence of the PEG moiety improves neoplasm web site accumulation of the drug, it conjointly presents a steric barrier between the Nano carrier and neoplasm cells, which ends in a very dramatic reduction in neoplasm

cellular uptake. Therefore, delivery of the encapsulated chemotherapeutical is predicated on outpouring within the neoplasm microenvironments, followed by the next cellular uptake of the free drug. additional limiting the general effectiveness of the drug is that the indisputable fact that some cytotoxic agents usually employed in these formulations, reminiscent of antibiotic, have restricted neoplasm tissue permeability following shake its Nano carrier thanks to a high affinity between this drug and numerous parts of the extracellular atmosphere [26-35]. Therefore, uniform distribution of the drug among the neoplasm microenvironment isn't achieved, and every one of the neoplasm tissue isn't essentially exposed to a dose of the drug. As a result, several analysis teams square measure presently functioning on substitution this kind of passive drug delivery with a lively to additional improve the co-localization between the drug and cancer cells. This kind of targeted drug delivery typically involves surface modifications created to those Nano carriers so as to accommodate surface ligands that acknowledge and bind sure overexpressed receptors gift on the cells of interest [36-43]. whereas there square measure varied Nano carriers obtainable for such delivery, the employment of liposomes and micelles is especially ideal as surface modifications created to them eliminates the necessity for direct chemical conjugation between the drug and targeting moiety that is usually needed with this kind of delivery. This will be a very necessary facet related to their use as conjugation of medicine on to the targeting substance can negatively have an effect on the targeting molecule in a very manner that disrupts receptor/ligand recognition, and will alter the toxicity of the drug [44-52]. However, there square measure varied different Nano carriers with success employed in cancer medical aid, a number of that even has targeting capabilities.

This review discusses the employment of each liposomes and micelles as Nano carriers for chemotherapeutics, and a current info about the clinical standing of assorted medicine encapsulated among each of those drug delivery systems is provided. Additionally, this review has discussion involving the incorporation of targeting ligands among these Nano carrier constructs so as to additional improve overall drug delivery effectiveness. Whereas the employment of those Nano carriers particularly is that the primary focuses of this review, the clinical success of different Nano carriers to incorporate numerous polymer-drug and protein-drug conjugates is additionally mentioned [53-60].

LIPOSOMES

Liposomes contain an interior binary compound core used for drug encapsulation that is enclosed by a lipid bilayer. The employment of phospholipids is good because it relates to the biocompatibility of those Nano carriers. The lipid bilayer permits for the encapsulation of hydrophobic chemotherapeutics. In any event, encapsulation of the drug serves to attenuate the inadvertent facet effects of usually used chemotherapeutics in liposomal-formulations reminiscent of cardio toxicity that typically results with the employment of anthracyclines (i.e., doxorubicin) and peripheral neurotoxicity usually related to the employment of each cisplatin and periwinkle plant derivative. additionally, liposomes meant for cancer medical aid square measure ~ 100 nm in diameter as this size permits them to extravagate from circulation through the leaky vasculature gift at neoplasm sites, whereas at identical time retentive the flexibility to deliver a comparatively giant and effective dose of the chemotherapeutical to neoplasm cells [61-68].

The clinical success of liposomes has created them a preferred Nano carrier for future work involving targeted drug delivery. let's say, whereas DaunoXome and Doxil square measure presently clinically approved, CPX-1 and LE-SN38 square measure samples of liposomal-based medicine that encapsulate a topoisomerase I substance and square measure presently in Phase-II clinical trials for the treatment of large intestine cancer or carcinoma. However, all of those formulations square measure supported a passive sort of delivery, and future work seeks to actively target neoplasm cells. In fact, MCC465 could be a targeted liposomal-based drug presently in Phase-I clinical trials and diverse different targeted liposomal-based formulations have recently been reported. Let's say, anti-HER2 immunoliposomes are shown to be much more cytotoxic in HER2-overexpressing carcinoma cells than non-targeted liposomes [69-75]. The neoplastic cell surface receptor CD44 that is found at elevated levels amongst numerous tumorigenic cells reminiscent of skin cancer has conjointly been the target of the many liposomal-based ways. In fact, numerous liposomal formulations containing amide sequences specific for sure unregulated integrin's in each primary and pathologic process skin cancer have conjointly been recommended because the globulin receptor is usually over expressed in numerous forms of cancer, transferrin-coated liposomes are developed and are shown to be rather more effective than their non-targeted counterparts a lot of recently, anti-CD147 antibody-labelled liposomes containing antibiotic are shown to not solely accumulate to a bigger extent among numerous cancer cell lines with high expression of CD147 versus low expressers of this receptor, however conjointly had a bigger cytotoxic result.

Micelles square measure mixture dispersions created from amphiphilic molecules that tend to be ~ 20-80 nm in diameter. Their smaller size in comparison to larger Nano carriers reminiscent of liposomes will limit their ability to hold a considerable dose of the chemotherapeutical agent to the neoplasm. However, this size still permits for nephritic filtration escape thereby providing adequate circulation times, and will have the extra good thing about raised neoplasm tissue penetration following extravasation in comparison to larger liposomes. The hydrophobic core found among micelles permits for the delivery of hydrophobic medicine that several chemotherapeutics tend to be [76-82]. The solubilisation of hydrophobic medicine conjointly reduces the danger of drug aggregation throughout blood vessel administration and potential embolism formation. Additionally, the deliquescent micelle corona permits for raised circulation times *in vivo*, thereby permitting it to preferentially accumulate among tumours.

As with liposomes, micelles have conjointly grownup in quality to be used as a Nano carrier in cancer medical aid, once more partially attributed to the very fact that there also are many micelle based formulations presently in numerous stages of clinical trials. Let's say, NK911 and SP1049C square measure each samples of micelle-based medicine presently in Phase-I and Phase- III stages of clinical trials severally. NK105 and NC6004 also are each micelle-based medicine presently in either Phase-II or Phase-I/II stages of clinical trials. Whereas encouraging, all of those formulations passively deliver chemotherapeutics to cancer cells, these ligands embody proteins (including antibodies), vitamins, likewise as numerous carbohydrates [83-88]. Let's say, immunomicelles containing a photosensitizing agent and tumour-specific antibody are with success employed in photodynamic medical aid against murine Lewis respiratory organ cancer. Micelles containing a B vitamin moiety are shown to be considerably a lot of cytotoxic to sex gland cancer cells than non-targeted micelles. In fact, B vitamin has conjointly been with success used recently as a targeting substance in micelles to deliver poorly soluble chemotherapeutics (either antagonist or paclitaxol) to colon cancer cells. Additionally, mucopolysaccharide (HA)-paclitaxel conjugate micelles have recently been shown to be much more cytotoxic toward hour angle receptor overexpressing cancer cells than for hour angle receptor deficient cells.

Polymer-drug conjugates while the employment of each liposomes and micelles as drug delivery systems for chemotherapeutics have received abundant attention in cancer medical aid, there square measure varied different polymer-based Nano carriers that have veteran similar clinical success. Let's say, Zoladex and Lupron Depot square measure composed of either tiny chemical compound rods or chemical compound micro particles severally, and each entrap Luteinizing secretion-releasing hormone (LHRH) analogues so as to treat prostatic adenocarcinoma. Each On Caspar and PEG DNA square measure PEGylated medicine accustomed treat acute lymphocytic leukaemia and numerous forms of cancers severally. Zinostatin could be a polymer-protein conjugate that consists of the anti-tumour macromolecule neocarzinostatin covalently joined to chemical compound maleic chemical compound polymer chains, and is employed to treat hepatocarcinoma. As so much as promising new polymer drug conjugates, PK1 could be a Nano carrier-based system composed of N-(2-hydroxypropyl) methacrylamide (HPMA) polymer that is in Phase II/III stages of clinical trials for the treatment of carcinoma.

Protein-drug conjugates another cluster of notable Nano carriers with success employed in willcer medical aid involve macromolecule-drug conjugates within which the protein used can act because the Nano carrier. Let's say, Abraxane that is classed as AN antimicrotubule agent, consists of simple protein absolute to paclitaxel and is presently accustomed treat pathologic process carcinoma. A particular further advantage related to the employment of some protein drug conjugates is that the ability to actively bind cancer cells, as is that the case with the drug Ontak [89-100]. It's a macromolecule-drug conjugate within which a fusion protein is generated by combining sequences from IL-2 (specific for the CD25 element of the IL-2 receptor) with sequences from contagious disease, and is presently accustomed treat connective tissue T-cell malignant neoplastic disease. Also, each Zevalin and Bexxar operate in a very similar manner, and square measure accustomed treat patients with relapsed or refractory inferior, follicular, or remodelled B-cell non-Hodgkin's malignant neoplastic disease. It ought to be noted but, that whereas Ontak undergoes cellular internalisation, each Zevalin and Bexxar don't as their target is that the non-internalizing receptor CD20 matter.

CONCLUSION

The clinical success of assorted Nano carrier constructs in cancer medical aid have created these and similar systems promising drug delivery vehicles for future work to additional improve their overall drug delivery effectiveness. let's say, the clinical success supported passively delivering chemotherapeutics encapsulated among each liposomes and micelles in cancer treatment have created these Nano carriers notably enticing candidates for future work involving a lot of active sort of delivery. This kind of targeted drug delivery improves the co-localization between the drug and cancer cells supported modifications created to the Nano carrier thereby avoiding direct conjugation between the drugs and targeting substance, and lots of probably in constructs are reported here. While the employment of some targeting ligands in Nano carriers could improve cellular internalisation of encapsulated medicine (i.e., those who target receptors that bear receptor-mediated endocytosis), another challenge related to this kind of delivery is that the removal of the drug from the Nano carrier. This can be thanks to the very fact that cellular internalisation of those Nano carriers typically leads to them being sequestered to acidic endosomes, which may end in drug protonation of infirm basic medicine reminiscent of antibiotic. The encapsulated drug is unable to bear Nano carrier/endosome escape. However, a combinatorial approach within which surface modifications created to Nano carriers involve each a targeting substance likewise as a pH-triggered unharness mechanism following cellular internalisation supported endosomal pH could of course generate an awfully efficacious construct. Many pH-sensitive Nano carrier systems involving each liposomes and micelles are delineated. These constructs square measure designed such they're stable whereas in circulation, however yield triggered unharness of encapsulated material following cellular uptake supported endosomal pH. This kind of combinatorial approach in Nano carrier style could of course persuade sometime be an awfully efficacious drug delivery system usually employed in cancer medical aid.

REFERENCES

1. Bonucci M. Integrated cancer therapy: Treat the person to cure the cancer. International J Inflam Cancer Integ Therpy. 2016;3:e101.

2. Lay FD and Liang G. Rethinking demethylating agents in epigenetic cancer therapy. J Mol Pharm Org Process Res. 2016;4:133.

3. Khalid A and Javaid MA. Matrix metalloproteinases: New targets in cancer therapy. J Cancer Sci Ther. 2016;8:143-153.

4. Dong J, et al. Targeting ROS for cancer therapy. Chemo Open Access. 2016;5:199.

5. Vaze OS. Pharmaceutical nanocarriers (liposomes and micelles) in cancer therapy. J Nanomed Nanotechnol. 2016;7:e138.

6. Varol M. Ultrasound-mediated cancer therapy as a non-invasive and repeatable treatment strategy. J App Pharm. 2016;8:e109.

7. Efferth T and Shan I. Natural products for cancer therapy – is economic success reachable? Med Aromat Plants. 2016;5:e174.

8. Rosaria CM. Addressing the potential role of fingolimod in cancer therapy. Med Chem. 2016;6:195-197.

9. Fernández A. Anticancer therapy based on suppression of pathways recruited to cope with metabolic stress. Metabolomics. 2016;6:e144.

10. Her SC and Her C. Targeting DNA double-strand break repair in cancer therapy. J Mol Genet Med. 2015;9:e106.

11. Faes S and Dormond O. Systemic buffers in cancer therapy: the example of sodium bicarbonate; Stupid idea or wise remedy? Med Chem. 2015;5:540-544.

12. Pinho I, et al. Molecular targets in lung cancer therapy: a current review. J Integr Oncol. 2015;4:148.

13. Carnes EB, et al. Role of novel oral anticoagulants in primary and secondary thromboprophylaxis in cancer. J Hematol Thrombo Dis. 2015;3:222.

14. Khurana V and Vaishya RD. Tyrosine kinase: Targeted anti-cancer therapy. Clin Pharmacol Biopharm. 2015;4:e119.

15. Sader M, et al. Nanoparticles functionalized with ligands of cell surface nucleolin for cancer therapy and diagnosis. J Nanomed Nanotechnol. 2015;6:310.

16. Buhari I, et al. Haruan fish extract as potential agent for cancer therapy. J Cancer Sci Ther. 2015;7:186-189.

17. Barrow K, et al. Mono-methyl selenium and cancer therapy: current status and future translational research needs. Biochem Pharmacol (Los Angel). 2015;4:173.

18. Delgado Y, et al. Development of hamlet-like cytochrome c-oleic acid nanoparticles for cancer therapy. J Nanomed Nanotechnol. 2015;6:303.

19. Lu DY, et al. Cancer bioinformatics, its impacts on cancer therapy. Metabolomics. 2015;5:e133.

20. Molina AM, et al. Redox-sensitive cross-linking enhances albumin nanoparticle function as delivery system for photodynamic cancer therapy. J Nanomed Nanotechnol. 2015;6:294.

21. Guo I, et al. The role of traditional Chinese medicine in anticancer therapy. Med Aromat Plants. 2015;4:e156.

22. Tyagi AK and Prasad S. Drug discovery inspired by mother nature for cancer therapy. Biochem Physiol. 2015;4:e128.

23. El-Deeb NM, et al. Novel trend in colon cancer therapy using silver nanoparticles synthesized by honey bee. 2015.

24. Baird SK. Mesenchymal stem cells: how can we realize their therapeutic potential in cancer therapy? J Clin Exp Pathol. 2015;5:206.

25. Saturnino C, et al. Organo-metallic compounds: Novel molecules in cancer therapy. Biochem Pharmacol. 2014;3:149.

26. Lampe CM and Gondi CS. Cathepsin B inhibitors for targeted cancer therapy. J Cancer Sci Ther. 2014;6:417-421.

27. Danquah M. Polycarbonate micelles for cancer therapy. J Cancer Sci Ther. 2014;6:310-313.

28. Yashiro M. Gastric cancer stem cells and resistance to cancer therapy. Chemotherapy. 2014;3:135.

29. Roy A, et al. Cancer stem cells, Wnt, hedgehog and notch signaling, the role of dietary phytochemicals: New insights for cancer therapy. Transl Med. 2013;3:e125.

30. Beebe SJ. Concepts of cancer and a novel cancer therapy: Treating tumors as an aggressive organ. J Nanomedine Biotherapeutic Discov. 2014;4:e134.

31. Olsson H. Organ specific killing AF a dispensable organ or a cell population in an organ- a successful design for cancer therapy-a hypothesis. J Carcinog Mutagen. 2014;5:179.

32. Scodeller P. Hyaluronidase and other extracellular matrix degrading enzymes for cancer therapy: new uses and nano-formulations. J Carcinog Mutage. 2014;5:178.

33. Tripodo G, et al. New perspectives in cancer therapy: The biotin-antitumor molecule conjugates. Med Chem. 2014;s1:004.

34. Lu DY, et al. Personalized cancer therapy: A perspective. Clin Exp Pharmacol. 2014;4:153.

35. Singh M, et al. Drug delivery system for controlled cancer therapy using physico-chemically stabilized bioconjugated gold nanoparticles synthesized from marine macroalgae, *Padina gymnospora*. J Nanomed Nanotechol. 2014;s5:009.

36. Karmakar S. Cell based immunotherapy: As a promising futuristic solution for effective cancer therapy. Single Cell Biol. 2014;3:105.

37. Gowda R, et al. Use of nanotechnology to develop multi-drug inhibitors for cancer therapy. J Nanomed Nanotechnol. 2013;4:184.

38. Shinto A and Kamaleshwaran KK. Molecular imaging: unlocking the potential for personalised cancer therapy. J Mol Genet Med. 2014; 8:104.

39. Udugamasooriya G. Peptoids: An emerging class of peptidomimetics for cancer therapy and diagnostics. J Biomol Res Ther. 2013;3:e121.

40. Bisen PS. Cancer therapy: An overview. J Cancer Sci Ther. 2013;6:e130.

41. Fadri-Moskwik M, et al. Beyond telomerase: Telomere instability as a novel target for cancer therapy. J Mol Genet Med. 2013;7:91.

42. Parkhill AL. Oral mucositis and stomatitis associated with conventional and targeted anticancer therapy. J Pharmacovigilance. 2013;1:112.

43. Trevino M, et al. The development of a minority recruitment plan for cancer clinical trials. J Community Med Health Educ. 2013;3:230.

44. Rodríguez ML, et al. Natural polyphenols and apoptosis induction in cancer therapy. J Carcinogene Mutagene. 2013;s6:004.

45. Pels E. Oral hygiene status and selected saliva biomarkers in children with acute lymphoblastic leukaemia during anticancer therapy. J Leuk (Los Angel). 2013;1:115.

46. Owens TW, et al. Inhibitor of apoptosis proteins: promising targets for cancer therapy. J Carcinogene Mutagene. 2013;s14:004.

47. Jensen SE and Cella D. Use and interpretation of the national comprehensive cancer network-functional assessment of cancer therapy symptom indexes in palliative research and treatment: Special considerations in ovarian cancer. J Palliative Care Med. 2013;3:145.

48. Al-Ghananaeem A. Sublingual and nasal transmucosal drug delivery for breakthrough pain: A frontier in cancer therapy. J Bioequiv Availab. 2013;5:e29.

49. Chase DM, et al. Updates on anti-cancer therapy in ovarian cancer. Chemotherapy. 2013;2:109.

50. Bregni C. Nanomedicines in cancer therapy. J Mol Pharm Org Process Res. 2013;1:101.

51. Nguyen KT. Mesenchymal stem cells as targeted cell vehicles to deliver drug-loaded nanoparticles for cancer therapy. J Nanomed Nanotechol. 2013;4:e128.

52. Bei R. Are alpha-fetoprotein based-vaccines potential tools for liver cancer therapy? J Liver. 2013;2:e103.

53. Cox JL. Calcium influx blockade as cancer therapy. J Carcinogene Mutagene. 2012;3:e107.

54. Lasfar A. A new ally for interferon-alpha in cancer therapy. J Clin Cell Immunol. 2012;3:e108.

55. Chougule MB and Tekade RK. Current scene and prospective potentials of siRNA in cancer therapy. J Pharmacogenomics Pharmacoproteomics. 2013;3:e125.

56. Wen X, et al. When systems biology meets metabolomics: network models may guide cancer therapy. Metabolomics. 2012;2:e116.

57. Telleria CM. Drug repurposing for cancer therapy. J Cancer Sci Ther. 2012;4:ix-xi.

58. Kong D. Pi3k inhibitors: Novel molecular-targeted drug candidates for cancer therapy. Biochem Pharmacol. 2012;1:e126.

59. Muehlmann LA and de Azevedo RB. On how could light and nanostructures lead the way to a safer anticancer therapy. Chemotherapy. 2012;1:e112.

60. Andrade LM, et al. Nucleoplasmic calcium buffering sensitizes human squamous cell carcinoma to anticancer therapy. J Cancer Sci Ther. 2012;4:131-139.

61. Sundararajan R. Electrical-pulse-mediated cancer therapy. J Nanomedic Biotherapeu Discover. 2012;2:e111.

62. López-González A, et al. DNA damage and repair in cancer therapy. J Cancer Sci Ther. 2012;s8:002.

63. Kögel D. The head of Janus: Exploiting autophagy for cancer therapy. J Develop Drugs. 2012;1:e109.

64. Lo HW. Egfr-targeted cancer therapy: Promise, problems and potential solutions. Translational Medic. 2011;1:105e.

65. Zhang Y and Bateman A. The glycoprotein growth factor progranulin promotes carcinogenesis and has potential value in anti-cancer therapy. J Carcinogene Mutagene. 2011;s2:001.

66. Naga Deepthi CH, et al. Role of tumor suppressor protein p53 in apoptosis and cancer therapy. J Cancer Sci Ther. 2011;s17:001.

67. Nguyen KT. Targeted nanoparticles for cancer therapy: Promises and challenges. J Nanomedic Nanotechnol. 2011; 2:103e.

68. Dronca rs, et al. Neuroendocrine - immune crosstalk and implications for cancer therapy. J Cell Sci Ther. 2011;2:102e.

69. De Almeida VR, et al. De-mystifying the epigenetic free for all: Pharmacophore modeling for epigenetic cancer therapy. Pharm Anal Acta. 2011;2:102e.

70. Khan DR. The use of nanocarriers for drug delivery in cancer therapy. J Cancer Sci Ther. 2010; 2:058-062.

71. Vaze OS. Pharmaceutical nanocarriers (liposomes and micelles) in cancer therapy. J Nanomed Nanotechnol. 2016;7:e138.

72. Álvarez–Bautista A, et al. Poly(n–isopropylacrylamide–co–acrylic acid) smart nanocarriers for drug release: A study of theophylline delivery. J Mol Genet Med. 2015;9:196.

73. Gajbhiye KR, et al. Targeted brain delivery of bioactive molecules using nanocarriers. J Bioequiv Availab. 2015;7:112-122.

74. Ramdani l, et al. Multifunctional curcumin-nanocarriers based on host-guest interactions for alzheimer disease diagnostic. J Nanomed Nanotechnol. 2015;6:270.

75. Misra R, et al. Design considerations for chemotherapeutic drug nanocarriers. Pharm Anal Acta. 2014;5:279.

76. Gambino D. Metal-organic frameworks in nanotherapeutics: Development of novel drug nanocarriers for conventional and nuclear oncology. J Nanomed Biotherapeut Discov. 2012;2:e120.

77. Chen Y, et al. Indocyanine green-loaded nanocarriers as contrast agents for NIR fluorescent optical imaging. J Nanomed Nanotechol. 2012;3:e122.

78. Karavelidis V and Bikiaris D. New biocompatible aliphatic polyesters as thermosensitive drug nanocarriers. Application in targeting release pharmaceutical systems for local cancer treatment. J Nanomedic Nanotechnol. 2012;3:134.

79. Shakeel F, et al. Solubility and dissolution improvement of aceclofenac using different nanocarriers. J Bioequiv Availab. 2009;1:039-043.

80. Khan DR. The use of nanocarriers for drug delivery in cancer therapy. J Cancer Sci Ther. 2010;2:058-062.

81. Navin R and Kim SM. Therapeutic interventions using ursolic acid for cancer treatment. Med Chem (Los Angeles). 2016;6:339-344.

82. Walker AM, et al. Evaluation of arsenic trioxide potential for lung cancer treatment: Assessment of apoptotic mechanisms and oxidative damage. J Cancer Sci Ther. 2015;8:001-009.

83. Li Q and Wang I. Autophagy, paradoxical functions and perspective in cancer treatment. Oncol Cancer Case Rep. 2015;1:107.

84. Vohra K, et al. An insight of pulses: From food to cancer treatment. J Pharmacogn Nat Prod. 2015;1:108.

85. Razavi GSE. Cancer treatment in the checkpoint inhibitor era. Immunome Res. 2016;12:e105.

86. Krukemeyer MG, et al. Magnetic-mediated mitoxantrone in cancer treatment: *In vivo* dosage and application in a critical case. J Nanomed Nanotechnol. 2015;6:330.

87. Sen M. Personalized medicine is the key to effective cancer treatment. J Cancer Diagn. 2016;1:e101.

88. Neumann K. Lung cancer treatment: Status 2015. J Nurs Care. 2015;4:270.

89. Ungari AQ, et al. Cost evaluation of metastatic colorectal cancer treatment in the Brazilian public healthcare system. J Integr Oncol. 2015;4:136.

90. Razavi GSE and Allen T. Emerging role of interleukins in cancer treatment. Immunome Res. 2015;s2:006.

91. Vunnava A. Innovative cancer treatments. Curr Synthetic Sys Biol. 2015;3:001.

92. Tutar Y. Inhibition of heat shock protein 70 and 90 (hsp70 and hsp90) in target specific cancer treatment. Adv Tech Biol Med. 2015;3:e109.

93. Schorge JO, et al. Therapeutic innovations in ovarian cancer treatment: the New England perspective. Gynecol Obstet (Sunnyvale). 2015;5:289.

94. Parthasarathy A. Cold atmospheric plasma as an alternative therapy for cancer treatment. Cell Dev Biol. 2015;4:151.

95. Kumar S, et al. Drug targets for cancer treatment: An overview. Med Chem. 2015; 5:115-123.

96. Falcao B, et al. Oral rehabilitation following head and neck cancer treatment – Review of literature. J Palliat Care Med. 2015;5:208.

97. Mandal CC and Rahman MM. Targeting intracellular cholesterol is a novel therapeutic strategy for cancer treatment. J Cancer Sci Ther. 2014;6:510-513.

98. Kalos DR, et al. Intraoperative radiation therapy for breast cancer not associated with pulmonary complications. J Nucl Med Radiat Ther. 2014;6:198.

99. Chawla PC and Chawla A. The promise of oncoimmunology: Integrating immunotherapy with conventional cancer treatments. J Integr Oncol. 2014;3:124.

100. Dominello MM, et al. Target volume heterogeneity index, a potentially valuable metric in IMRT prostate cancer treatment planning. J Nucl Med Radiat Ther. 2014;5:192.