Research and Reviews: Journal of Pharmacological and Toxicological Studies
e-ISSN:2322-0139
p-ISSN:2322-0120

Review on Nanovaccination

Mamatha M*

Prist University, Tanjore, Tamil Nadu, India

Review Article

Received: 15/11/2016
Revised: 21/11/2016
Accepted: 28/11/2016

***Corresponding author:**

Mamatha M, Prist University, Tanjore, Tamil Nadu, India, Tel: +91 9133032626.

Email: mandadimamatha@gmail.com

Keywords: Nanovaccines, Encapsulation, Immunogenicity, Nanoemulsion, Biocompatibility.

ABSTRACT

Nanotechnology, in spite of not a recent concept, has gained notable power in recent years. Because of the current approach in nano-engineering and material science in the previous tenner, the nanoparticles have become astonishingly notable for their applications mainly in the fields of medicine and biology. Nanovaccine is a book approach to the vaccination methodology. Nanomaterials are transported in the form of nanobeads, microspheres, or micro-nanoprojections. Trouble-free, successful and guarded needle-free routes such as patches of microprojections or intranasal or the oral route, or directly to the skin are few of the approaches which are mainly in the experimental phase at available but have a substantial destiny henceforth in nanovaccination.

INTRODUCTION

Nanovaccines

Nanovaccines [1-10] are vaccines that mainly consist of nanoparticles and are ascend as an un used class of vaccines that straightly target the location in the body where the infection or disease emanate, as incompatible to conventional stimulants which may affect total parts of the body [11-20].

Number of advantages have been shown by different researchers explore and running the different features related to Nanovaccine [21-30].

NANOVACCINES ADVANTAGES

- Required dose on antigen is small, antigen presenting cells improved systematic processing and longtime stability during storage
- Extensive usage of antigen encapsulation [31-49] as it is fluent to discharge
- Because of slow release of the antigen single dose is sufficient for effective response. Immunogenicity was improved by the usage of nanoparticles due to the lack of alum which acts as an inflammatory mediator
- Tolerance and effectiveness are improved with an usage of a combination of antigen and nanoemulsion by needle-free nasal immunization
- Nanoemulsion is effective for 30 days at 25 °C it does not require any refrigeration
- Numerous nanovaccines are non-invasive in nature, which can be easily delivered by nasal or oral route, arrays of microneedles or diffusion patches which mainly causes subtle damage and smooth delivery. Polysaccharides, amino acids and synthetic biodegradable polymers [50-57] are used to prepare biodegradable nanoparticles.

Selection of polymer depends on various factors which are as follows.

- Size of the preferred nanoparticles
- Characteristics of the drug such as stability, aqueous solubility which are to be encircle the polymer.
- Uniqueness of the surface and appropriateness.
- Amplitude of biocompatibility [58-71] as well as biodegradability.
- Final product drug release profile.

procedures can be distinguished into different types depending up on the selection criteria for nanoparticles preparation.

- Dispersion of polymers which are previously formed.
- Monomers polymerization.
- Hydrophilic polymers prepared by ionic gelation technique.

DRUG DELIVERY SYSTEM OF NANOPARTICLES

- It has been shown that insulin activity was enhanced by the use of insulin-loaded nanoparticles which causes reduction of produced glucose in blood in diabetic rats almost up to 14 days by subsequent oral administration [72-83].
- Nanoparticle vaccine can also be utilized to evoke an anti-tumor response and can initiate tumor antigen-specific CTLs. Complex of vaccine is also cost effective and has specificity in biological systems due to the uptake of human derived protein straight from the patient. This vaccine stand encapsulates advanced technologies mainly to enhance stimulation to immune system and produce a powerful and particular anti-tumor immune response hostile to cancer.

CARRIERS OF NANOPARTICLES

General routes of drug administration oral and injections. Other routes may also include pulmonary, transmucosal, implantation [84-96] and transdermal. Biodegradable polymer nanoparticles typically consists of polyglycolic acid (PGA), polylactic acid (PLA), or a PLA co polymer are investigated for the effective discharge of anticancer drugs, vaccines [97-105], genes and proteins, cytokines, ocular drugs.

Poly lactic-co-glycolic acid (PLGA)

poly (lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA) NPs have tremendous approaches affix imaging, targeting, therapy and diagnostics. PLGA nanocarriers drugs encapsulation reduces the unacceptable defects of other curative agents. Drug-loaded PLGA associates not only elongate the therapeutics *in vivo* circulation time in distinction from minutes to hours but besides narrow cellular uptake through the endocytic route.

CONCLUSION

Disease detection, therapy and diagnosis can be done by advanced nanotechnology. Nanomaterials can be discharged as micro nanoprojections, microspheres or nanobeads. Because of several disadvantages of Classical vaccines subsume live or attenuated microorganisms and may not be sue averse to cancer as well as for some pathogens. Novel vaccines use immunogenic auxiliary units acquire from a specific pathogen are accomplished to bridle these hurdles but require a determined conveyance system for their effectiveness. Cellular and suppurated immune responses are persuaded effectively by the use of nano-sized preparation of auxiliary unit vaccines.

REFERENCES

1. Fadeeva E, et al. Enhanced bioactivity of titanium by laser-generated lotus-topographies: Molecular insights in osteogenic signaling pathways of hASCs. J Nanomed Nanotechnol. 2016;7:403.
2. Rammouz R, et al. A rapid prototyping matlab based design tool of wireless sensor nodes for healthcare applications. Int J Sens Netw Data Commun. 2016;5:144.
3. Anderson DS, et al. Nanotechnology: The risks and benefits for medical diagnosis and treatment. J Nanomed Nanotechnol. 2016;7:e143.
4. Dennis E, et al. Utilizing nanotechnology to combat malaria. J Infect Dis Ther. 2015;3:229.
5. Menaa F. Genetic engineering and nanotechnology: When science-fiction meets reality. Adv Genet Eng. 2015;4:128.

6. Mantosh Kumar S. Shaping safer future nanotechnology through wise worthy scientific research. J Bioprocess Biotech. 2015;5:243.
7. Nikalje AP. Nanotechnology and its applications in medicine. Med chem. 2015;5:081-089.
8. Syduzzaman M, et al. Smart textiles and nano-technology: A general overview. J Textile Sci Eng. 2015;5:181.
9. Nazem A and Mansoori GA. Nanotechnology building blocks for intervention with Alzheimer's Disease Pathology: Implications in disease modifying strategies. J Bioanal Biomed. 2014;6:009-014.
10. DeSouza ME, et al. Antibiofilm applications of nanotechnology. Fungal Genom Biol. 2014;4:e117.
11. Singh Y. Trends in biomedical nanotechnology. J Nanomedine Biotherapeutic Discov. 2014;4:e130.
12. Menaa F. Financial governance in the nanotechnology segment: The Brazilian experience. J Bus Fin Aff. 2014;3:e144.
13. Satvekar RK, et al. Emerging trends in medical diagnosis: A thrust on nanotechnology. Med chem. 2014;4:407-416.
14. Kanchi S. Nanotechnology for water treatment. J Environ Anal Chem. 2014;1:e102.
15. Wang W, et al. Nanotechnology as a platform for thermal therapy of prostate cancer. J Mol Biomark Diagn. 2013;4:e117.
16. De Rosa G and Caraglia M. New therapeutic opportunities from old drugs: The role of nanotechnology. J Bioequiv Availab. 2013;5:e30.
17. Parchi PD, et al. How nanotechnology can really improve the future of orthopedic implants and scaffolds for bone and cartilage defects. J Nanomedine Biotherapeutic Discov. 2013;3:114.
18. Gou M. Promising application of nanotechnology in anticancer drug delivery. Drug Des. 2013;2:e117.
19. Laroo H. Colloidal nano silver-its production method, properties, standards and its bio-efficacy as an inorganic antibiotic. J Phys Chem Biophys. 2013;3:130.
20. Zein BE. Self-sufficient energy harvesting in robots using nanotechnology. Adv Robot Autom. 2013;2:113.
21. Mavon A, et al. In vitro percutaneous absorption and in vivo stratum corneum distribution of an organic and a mineral sunscreen. Skin Pharmacol Physiol. 2007;20:10-20.
22. Pinheiro T, et al. The influence of corneocytes structure on the interpretation of permeation profiles of nanoparticles across skin. Nucl Instrum Methods Phys Res B. 2007;260:119-23.
23. Zvyagin AV, et al. Imaging of zinc oxide nanoparticle penetration in human skin in vitro and in vivo. J Biomed Opt. 2007;13:064031.
24. Sadrieh N, et al. Lack of significant dermal penetration of titanium dioxide from sunscreen formulations containing nano- and submicron-size TiO_2 particles. Toxicol Sci. 2010;115:156-166.
25. Filipe P, et al. Stratum corneum is an effective barrier to TiO_2 and ZnO nanoparticle percutaneous absorption. Skin Pharmacol Physiol. 2009;22:266-275.
26. Johnston HJ, et al. Identification of the mechanisms that drive the toxicity of TiO(2) particulates: the contribution of physicochemical characteristics. Part Fibre Toxicol. 2009;6:33.
27. Hirakawa K, et al. Photo-irradiated titanium dioxide catalyzes site specific DNA damage via generation of hydrogen peroxide. Free Radic Res. 2004;38:439-447.
28. Wamer WG et al. Oxidative damage to nucleic acids photosensitized by titanium dioxide. Free Radic Biol Med. 1997;23:851-858.
29. Nakagawa Y, et al. The photogenotoxicity of titanium dioxide particles. Mutat Res. 1997;394:125-132.
30. Hidaka H et al. DNA damage photoinduced by cosmetic pigments and sunscreen agents under solar exposure and artificial UV illumination. J Oleo Sci. 2006;55:249-61.
31. Sharma PK et al. Novel encapsulation of lycopene in niosomes and assessment of its anticancer activity. J Bioequiv Availab. 2016;8:224-232.
32. Yousif SM. Microencapsulation of Ibuprofen into polyvinyl pyrrolidone using supercritical fluid technology. J Chem Eng Process Technol. 2016;7:306.
33. Sorrentino RP. The Avoided Target: The ceratitis capitata cellular encapsulation response. Entomol Ornithol Herpetol. 2016;5:175.
34. Patil J. Encapsulation technology: Opportunity to develop novel drug delivery systems. J Pharmacovigil. 2016;4:e157.
35. Donthi MR. Preparation and evaluation of fixed combination of ketoprofen enteric coated and famotidine floating mini tablets by single unit encapsulation system. J Bioequiv Availab. 2015;7:279-283.
36. Konecni VJ. The Significance of Encapsulation of Visual Perception for Philosophy of Mind and Aesthetic Analysis. Clin Exp Psychol. 2015;1:102.
37. Thangaraj S and Seethalakshmi M. Application of microencapsulation technology for the production of vitamin-C fortified flavoured milk. J Adv Dairy Res. 2015;3:143.
38. Tong W and Tong A. Thermal modelling on solar-absorbing metamaterial microencapsulation of phase change materials for smart textiles. J Textile Sci Eng. 2015;5:190.
39. Rahmani V, et al. Nanoencapsulation of insulin using blends of biodegradable polymers and in vitro controlled release of insulin. J Chem Eng Process Technol. 2015;6:228.

40. Debnath T, et al. Development of 3D alginate encapsulation for better chondrogenic differentiation potential than the 2D pellet system. J Stem Cell Res Ther. 2015;5:276.
41. Patel Manish P, et al. Microencapsulation of Verapamil hydrochloride: A novel approach for gastric retention using different polymers. Med chem. 2012;2:076-080.
42. Mesas Burgos C, et al. Laparoscopic gastric bypass in a patient with peritoneal encapsulation and malrotation of the intestine. J Clinic Case Reports. 2011;1:101.
43. Siddiqui IA, et al. Nanoencapsulation of natural products for chemoprevention. J Nanomedic Nanotechnol. 2011;2:104e.
44. Bikiaris D. Nanomedicine in cancer treatment: Drug targeting and the safety of the used materials for drug nanoencapsulation. Biochem Pharmacol. 2012;1:e122.
45. Roiha IS, et al. Bioencapsulation of florfenicol in brine shrimp, Artemia Franciscana, Nauplii. J Bioanal Biomed. 2010;2:060-064.
46. Rao AV and Rao LG. Lycopene and human health. Curr Top Nutraceutical Res. 2004;2:127-137.
47. Clinton SK. Lycopene: chemistry, biology, and implications for human health and disease. Nutr Rev. 1998;56:35-51.
48. Giovannucci E, et al. A prospective study of tomato products, lycopene, and prostate cancer risk. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2002;94:391-398.
49. Omoni AO and Aluko RE. The anti-carcinogenic and anti-atherogenic effects of lycopene: a review. Trends Food Sci Technol. 2005;16: 344-350.
50. Ribeiro MCS, et al. On the recyclability of glass fiber reinforced thermoset polymeric composites towards the sustainability of polymers' industry. Int J Waste Resour. 2016;6:250.
51. Newton AMJ, et al. Fabrication and evaluation of fast disintegrating oral hybrid films of propranolol hydrochloride by using pectin and synthetic polymers. J Dev Drugs. 2016;5:157.
52. Kaulambayeva MZ, et al. Evaluating the Effectiveness of Organic Coatings Based on Natural Polymers for the Treatment of Wounds in the Experiment. J Biotechnol Biomater. 2015;5:211.
53. Kawahara Y, et al. Direct carbonization of high-performance aromatic polymers and the production of activated carbon fibers. J Textile Sci Eng. 2015;5:219.
54. Young RJ, et al. The structure and deformation behavior of poly (p-phenylene benzobisoxazole) fibers. J Mater Sci. 1990;25:127-136.
55. Newell JA, et al. Direct carbonization of PBO fiber. Carbon. 1994;32:651-658.
56. Newell JA and Edie DD. Factors limiting the tensile strength of PBO-based carbon fibers. Carbon. 1996;34:551-560.
57. Newell JA, et al. Kinetics of carbonization and graphitization of PBO fiiber. J Appl Polym Sci. 1996;60:825-832.
58. Zheng J, et al. Sterilization of silver nanoparticles using standard gamma irradiation procedure affects particle integrity and biocompatibility. J Nanomedic Nanotechnol. 2011;S5:001.
59. Sultan S, et al. Assessment of biocompatibility of the multilayer flow modulator with differing thread designs. J Vasc Med Surg. 2014;2:167.
60. Abbas M, et al. Fe_3O_4/SiO_2 Core/ Shell Nanocubes: Novel Coating Approach with Tunable Silica Thickness and Enhancement in Stability and Biocompatibility. J Nanomed Nanotechnol. 2014;5:244.
61. Filippo N, et al. Biocompatibility Evaluation Criteria for Novel Xenograft Materials: Distribution and Quantification of Remnant Nucleic Acid and Alpha-Gal Epitope. J Stem Cell Res Ther. 2013;S6:009.
62. Poinern GEJ, et al. Biocompatibility of synthesized nano-porous anodic aluminium oxide membranes for use as a cell culture substrate for madin-darby canine kidneys cells: A preliminary study. J Tissue Sci Eng. 2012;3:119.
63. Limongi T, et al. Fabrication, mercury intrusion porosimetry characterization and in vitro qualitative analysis of biocompatibility of various porosities polycaprolactone scaffolds. J Tissue Sci Eng. 2015;6:159.
64. Sarfare S, et al. Biocompatibility of a synthetic biopolymer for the treatment of rhegmatogenous retinal detachment. J Clin Exp Ophthalmol. 2015;6:475.
65. Silva DJB, et al. Evaluation of biocompatibility of chitosan films from the mycelium of aspergillus niger in connective tissue of rattus norvegicus. J Mol Genet Med. 2015;9:174.
66. Daum L, et al. In Vivo Biocompatibility testing of a collagen cell carrier seeded with human urothelial cells in rats. J Cell Sci Ther. 2015;6:215.
67. Kohane DS, et al. Biodegradable polymeric microspheres and nanospheres for drug delivery in the peritoneum. J Biomed Mater Res A. 2006;77:351-361.
68. Masson V, et al. Influence of sterilization processes on poly (epsilon-caprolactone) nanospheres. Biomaterials. 1997;18:327- 335.
69. Henry M, et al. Treatment of renal artery aneurysm with the multilayer stent. J EndovascTher. 2008;15:231-236.
70. Meyer C, et al. Endovascular management of complex renal artery aneurysms using the multilayer stent. Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol. 2011;34:637-641.

71. Ferrero E, et al. Visceral artery aneurysms, an experience on 32 cases in a single center: Treatment from surgery to multilayer stent. Ann VascSurg. 2011;25:923-935.
72. Yonezawa Y, et al. Short Communication on phototoxicity assessment: evaluation of skin phototoxicity study using sd rats by transdermal and oral administration. Toxicol Open Access. 2016;2:118.
73. Durisova M. Model based description of the pharmacokinetic behavior of pentobarbital in fasted male volunteers after oral administration of 10 mg of pentobarbital. Clin Exp Pharmacol. 2016;6:200.
74. Dib A, et al. Pharmacokinetic assessment of novel controlled release formulations of ricobendazole intended for oral administration in dogs. Clin Exp Pharmacol. 2015;5:198.
75. Singh G, et al. Liquid Chromatographic Assay for the analysis of atazanavir in rat plasma after oral administration: application to a pharmacokinetic study. J Chromatograph Separat Techniq. 2014;5:222.
76. Ajanal M and Prasad BS. Generalized skin rashe after oral administration of ayurvedic drugs: An unintened drug reaction. J Homeop Ayurv Med. 2013;2:128.
77. Tokudome Y, et al. Influence of oral administration of soybean peptide on water content of the stratum corneum, transepidermal water loss and skin viscoelasticity. J Nutr Food Sci. 2012;2:137.
78. Tewary A and Patra BC. Oral administration of baker's yeast (Saccharomyces cerevisiae) acts as a growth promoter and immunomodulator in Labeo rohita (Ham.). J Aquac Res Development. 2011;2:109.
79. Yonezawa Y, et al. Evaluation of skin phototoxicity study using SD rats by transdermal and oral administration. J toxicol sci. 2011;40:667-683.
80. Onoue S and Tsuda. Analytical studies on the prediction of photosensitive/phototoxic potential of pharmaceutical substances. Pharm Res. 2006;23:156-164.
81. Onoue S, et al. High-throughput reactive oxygen species (ROS) assay: An enabling technology for screening the phototoxic potential of pharmaceutical substances. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 2008;46:187-193.
82. Seto Y, et al. Combined use of in vitro phototoxic assessments and cassette dosing pharmacokinetic study for phototoxicity characterization of fluoroquinolones. The AAPS journal. 2011;13:482-492.
83. Seto Y, et al. Photosafety assessments on pirfenidone: Photochemical, photbiological, and pharmacokinetic characterization. J Photochem Photobiol B: Biology. 2013;120:44-51.
84. Milnerowicz A, et al. Paraplegia as the first manifestation of cardiac tamponade in a patient after stent graft implantation with temporary endocavitary stimulation. J Vasc Med Surg. 2016;4:278.
85. Ezulia T and Saim L. Review of cochlear implantation at KPJ tawakkal specialist hospital. J Clin Case Rep. 2016;6:821.
86. Anver K, et al. Chromosomal abnormalities in reimplantation development. Human Genet Embryol. 2016;6:134.
87. Donndorf P, et al. Predicting device success and early clinical outcome after transapical aortic valve implantation. J Clin Trials. 2016;6:259.
88. Watanabe T, et al. Pacemaker lead perforation during right ventricular outflow tract pacing-importance of heart rotation at pacemaker implantation. J Clin Case Rep. 2016;6:707.
89. Gyanwali B, et al. Periorbital Ecchymosis: An uncommon complication of cochlear implantation. Anat Physiol. 2016;6:201.
90. Olesen AP, et al. Ethical Perceptions with regard to pre-implantation genetic diagnosis (PGD) from the perspective of selected medical professionals in Malaysia. J Clin Med Genomics. 2016;4:136.
91. Blumberg Y, et al. Early physical rehabilitation after continuous flow left ventricular assist device implantation: Suggested protocol and a pilot study. Int J Phys Med Rehabil. 2015;3:263.
92. Zhu J, et al. A review of surgical techniques in spinal cord stimulator implantation to decrease the post-operative infection rate. J Spine. 2015;4:202.
93. Bedrood S, et al. Comparison of non-staged (Complete) versus two-stage baerveldt aqueous shunt implantation in patients with advanced glaucoma. J Clin Exp Ophthalmol. 2014;5:372.
94. Sherman SL, et al. Nondisjunction of chromosome 21 in maternal meiosis I: evidence for a maternal age-dependent mechanism involving reduced recombination. Hum Mol Genet. 1994;3:1529-1535.
95. Hassold T, et al. Recombination and maternal age-dependent nondisjunction: molecular studies of trisomy 16. Am J Hum Genet. 1995;57:867-874.
96. Peterson MB and Mikkelsen M. Nondisjunction in trisomy 21: origin and mechanisms. Cytogenet Cell Genet. 2000;91:199-203.
97. Suarez N. Optimal conditions for streptococcus pneumoniae culture and for polysaccharide production for vaccines. Biol Med (Aligarh). 2016;8:321.
98. Carlos VSJ, et al. The future of influenza vaccines: developing tools to match glycosylation patterns relevant for protection. J Vaccines Vaccin. 2016;7:335.
99. Ramezanpour B, et al. Cross-sectoral perspectives of market implementation of the MVA platform for influenza vaccines: regulatory, industry and academia. J Vaccines Vaccin. 2016;7:318.
100. Kiseleva I and Rudenko L. Potentially pandemic live influenza vaccines based on russian master donor virus are genetically stable after replication in humans. J Vaccines Vaccin. 2016;7:317.

e-ISSN:2322-0139
p-ISSN:2322-0120

101. Arumugham V. Evidence that food proteins in vaccines cause the development of food allergies and its implications for vaccine policy. J Develop Drugs. 2015;4:137.
102. Yamamoto Y. Vaccines and Drug-induced Lung Injury. J Vaccines Vaccin. 2015;6:291.
103. Donis RO, et al. Performance characteristics of qualified cell lines for isolation and propagation of influenza viruses for vaccine manufacturing. Vaccine. 2014;32:6583-6590.
104. Hu W, et al. A Vero-cell-adapted vaccine donor strain of influenza A virus generated by serial passages. Vaccine. 2015;33:374-381.
105. Wu L, et al. Chloroquine enhances replication of influenza A virus A/WSN/33 (H1N1) in dose-, time-, and MOI-dependent manners in human lung epithelial cells A549. J Med Virol. 2015;87:1096-103.