Scholars LITERATURE

Nanotechnology and Nanomaterials Research

Short Review

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47275/2692-885X-101
Volume 1 Issue 1

Nanotechnology and Cancer: Overview

Ala Mohammed*

Department of Pharmacy, Cairo University, Egypt

Correspondence to: Ala Mohammed,Faculty, Department of Pharmacy, Cairo University, Egypt, E-mail: dr.alaa.mohammad@gmail.com

Citation: Mohammed A (2020) Nanotechnology and Cancer: Overview. Nanotechnol Nanomater Res, Volume 1:1. 101. DOI: https://doi.org/10.47275/2692-885X-101.

Received: April 11, 2020; **Accepted:** April 25, 2020; **Published:** April 30, 2020

The molecular study of cancer is increasingly changing from models focused on phenomenological explanations to network models originating from system biology, capable of capturing the disease's emerging pathophysiology at the molecular level. It might be possible to turn this (still academic) image into a clinically applicable context for the cancer fight, but it is a scientific and technical challenge. New in vitro diagnostic techniques and treatment strategies to tackle this problem. Arising in-vitro diagnostic techniques and therapeutic pathways to address this issue are being established. The conversation of in vitro diagnostics is driven by the concept of reliably, sensitively, and at very low cost, producing huge numbers of calculations. Diagnostic methods focused on nanotechnology and microfluidics. Therapies dependent on nanoparticles that have entered the clinic. Identify Nano therapy approaches designed to maximize effectiveness while reducing the adverse side effects typically related to chemotherapies at the same time. Identify Nano therapy approaches designed to maximize effectiveness while reducing the adverse side effects typically associated with cancer chemotherapies at the same time. The American Cancer Society predicts the number of new cancer cases and fatalities that will happen in the U.S. and compiles the current population-based cancer statistics. The Monitoring, Epidemiology, and Final results Program gathered prevalence data; the National Cancer Registry Program; and the Central Cancer Registry Association of North America. The National Center for Health Statistics has collected data on mortality. There are expected to be 1,806,590 fresh cancer cases and 606,520 cancer deaths in the United States in 2020 [1]. The cancer death rate increased until 1991, then steadily dropped through 2017, resulting in a 29 percent overall decrease that translated into an expected 2.9 million fewer deaths from cancer than would have resulted if peak rates had continued. This development is driven by long-term death-rate reductions for the 4 leading cancers. However, declines for female breast and colorectal cancers have accelerated over the past decade and stopped for prostate cancer. Although the incidence of diagnosed cancers has gradually risen, the regulated numbers of cancer-related deaths have continued the same. In this stagnant backdrop, a new image of cancer is beginning, which is inspiring hope that cancer could be curable. This image and the way it drives the creation of new diagnostic and therapeutic technologies. In-vitro diagnostic nanotechnologies and microfluidics and drug delivery nanotechnologies. Such innovations are only a few items, although vital ones, that are being put together to win the cancer battle. The latest developments, both intellectual and technical, allow the vision of a future where cancer is a controlled chronic ailment. Remember how cancer was looked at just a few years ago. Most of the pathology activities were focused on a few phenomenological tests for disease assessment. Improved awareness of cancer has shown that multiple genetic mutations can cause a given form of cancer, each of which may result in a different result. The awareness led to the cancer pathways model [2]. Few interacting protein channels, each creating a cascade of molecular incidents. Also in the exclusion of signalling molecules, a provided pathway, if genetically altered in different ways, is essentially short-circuited and thus continuously triggered. Emerging molecular cancer therapies are targeted against different pathways, often targeting the genetically engineered proteins. Molecular tests [3,4], such as the detection of mRNAs or related pathway proteins, are increasingly being used to classify the modified pathway or the cancer reaction to therapy[5]. Such an examination can theoretically indicate effective treatment [6-8], cancer progression [9], the potential for post-therapy recurrence [10], or the potential for drug resistance. Molecular visualization in vivo is now being widely used as a test of medication effectiveness [11]. Models for the pathways are useful but limited. A pathway-based treatment usually requires advanced knowledge of the presence of cancer, so it is a more reliable pathology document but not a technique for early detection. Another downside is that pathway models do not compensate for cancer's complex progression, and they underestimate the degree of interconnectivity between the different genes and proteins. Lastly, models of the pathways believe a provided cancer is homogeneous, which is almost certainly wrong. Disease and disease progression network models arise from system biology approaches [12], which typically include deep transcriptome analyses [13], often combined with concentrated proteomic examinations [14], both incorporated together using computational methods [15]. Network models can demonstrate how disease onset and progression is represented in the form of differentially expressed genes and their corresponding networks of proteins. Existing network models, while unfavourable, are starting to provide insight on the pathophysiology of disease development at the molecular level. Firstly, the proteomic and genomic repositories can be exploited similarly to produce a list of eligible biomarkers that can be identified in body fluids. For context, blood is a powerful insight into health and disease, but it is a noisy environment, with $> 10^4$ proteins spanning a concentration spectrum of $> 10^9$. An instance of an effective technique for capturing the signal from such an area is the capability to distinguish organ-specific, secreted proteins in the blood [16]. Second, if the regulatory channels affiliated with the respective proteins are detected, then calculations of those proteins can be directly correlated with the disease's developmental pathophysiology. Third, dynamic models will soon be the best network

models, and thus the molecular signatures obtained from the disease are observed against a time-averaged perspective. Eventually, dynamic network models can allow disease detection before clinical symptoms grow and thus pave the way for prophylactic treatments. This emerging cancer image holds promise to improve diagnosis as well as therapies. This situation allows several more clinically important questions to be asked for diagnostics but it imposes new demands on both measurement and computational technologies. The information would inevitably become the commodity of value, meaning that quantitative, sensitive, and multipara meter diagnostic measurements must be achieved easily, and the results must be incorporated quickly to produce a clear but accurate diagnostic conclusion. Multipara meter steps take genes, proteins, and cells into account. Gradual and consistent execution of affordable calculations requires small quantities of tissue and limited management of the samples. Now nanotechnologies, modern chemical processes, and microfluidics appear as important instruments. Nearly always, the ability to diagnose cancer early coincides with the ability to cure the disease, usually through combinations of surgery, radiation therapy, and chemotherapy. Emerging molecular therapies have shown promise against very specific tumor groups [17,18], but cancer is normally kept at bay for just 1-2 years before returning in a drug-resistant form [19,20]. As a precept, the more common chemotherapies are more successful against large numbers of patients but they are often followed by side effects ranging from hair loss to heart arrest. Latest drug encapsulation and distribution nanotechnologies are being established to improve drug delivery precision to aim, as well as decreasing non-cancerous tissue ingestion and growing toxicity.

Emerging Nanoparticle Therapeutics

Forward-looking detailed diagnosis can leverage recent developments in nanotechnology to include in-vitro molecular pathophysiology assessments from body fluids such as blood. Such innovative clinical techniques will give details that will allow new treatment approaches to be implemented, given adequate therapies are available. Nanotechnology plays a part in developing new forms of cancer therapy. Such nanotherapeutics hold the ability to have fewer side effects on successful treatments. Most cancer patients suffer from metastatic, drug-resistant disease. The main aim of cancer treatments will then be the ability to handle this stage and all of those immediately prior to it. This is hoped that therapy will be started at shorter and shorter stages of disease development as the diagnostic tools advance. In the broadest context, furthermore, it would be beneficial to create treatments that could be used at all stages of cancer due to the immense resources needed to bring a new drug to the market. Aimed nanoparticles have the ability to deliver unattainable treatments like all other medication approaches. The deception of pharmacokinetics from a systemic application is reachable by adjusting the size and surface properties of the Nano product. To reduce single-pass kidney clearance, nanoparticles should be larger than ~10 nm and not positively charged to a large extent to allow such PK deceptions. The molecules can be tailored to provide long or short distribution times, and they can be guided to different types of cells inside target areas with precise control of the size and interface properties. These basic requirements can also be met by other forms of therapies, such as molecular conjugates, but specific nanoparticles are distinct from all other technological instances. Therapeutics now known as nanoparticles have been around for quite some time. Nano-scaled devices for clinical treatment and its new implementation point. Liposomes carrying small-molecule anticancer drugs have been permitted since after 1990. If they are stabilized but do not provide intracellular distribution of drug components, liposomes (almost 100 nm and larger) can offer extra distribution times. They are thus not successful toward disease that is immune to flows from the cell surface. They also have little influence over the time of the release of the drug. Its use is mainly in solubilizing medicines and increasing distribution periods to promote increased drug absorption of tumors. Nanoparticles dependent on albumin were licensed by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration in 2005, but are not immunotherapies for nanoparticles, because they dissolve into the circulatory system after administration. Drug substances Nano crystals are also certified for oral administration but these nanoparticles never enter the bloodstream. These first certified forms of nanoparticles show that therapeutics based on nanoparticles can be distributed safely to patients and can increase the protection and potency of other drug components. Newer nanoparticles structures, moreover, have distinct advantages over those initial nanoparticles.

References

1. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A (2020) Cancer statistics, 2020. CA: A Cancer J Clinicians 70:7-30.https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21590
2. Weinberg RA (2013) The biology of cancer. Garland science, New York, United States.
3. Bertolini F, Sukhatme VP, Bouche G (2015) Drug repurposing in oncology-patient and health systems opportunities. Nat Rev Clin Oncol 12:732.https://doi.org/10.1038/nrclinonc.2015.169
4. Wild R, Castaneda S, Flefleh C, Fager K, Inigo I, et al. (2004) BMS-354825, a dual SRC/ABL kinase inhibitor, displays potent anti-tumor activity in a model of intracranial CML growth. Blood 104: 1988.https://doi.org/10.1182/blood.V104.11.1988.1988
5. Zhang SD, Gant TW (2008) A simple and robust method for connecting small-molecule drugs using gene-expression signatures. BMC Bioinformatics 9: 258.https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2105-9-258
6. Jabbour E, Cortes JE, Kantarjian HM (2008) Molecular monitoring in chronic myeloid leukemia: response to tyrosine kinase inhibitors and prognostic implications. Cancer 112:2112-2118.https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.23427
7. Liegl B, Hornick JL, Lazar AJ (2009) Contemporary pathology of gastrointestinal stromal tumors. Hematol Oncol Clin North Am 23: 49-68.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hoc.2008.12.002
8. Araujo J, Logothetis C (2010) Dasatinib: a potent SRC inhibitor inclinical development for the treatment of solid tumors. Cancer Treat Rev. 36:492-500.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ctrv.2010.02.015
9. Kaneta Y, Kagami Y, Tsunoda T, Ohno R, Nakamura Y, et al.(2003) Genome-wide analysis of gene-expression profiles in chronic myeloid leukemia cells using a cDNA microarray. Int J Oncol 23:681-691.https://doi.org/10.3892/ijo.23.3.681
10. Maier S, Nimmrich I, Koenig T, Eppenberger-Castori S,Bohlmann I, et al. (2007) DNA-methylation of the homeodomain transcription factor PITX2 reliably predicts risk of distant disease recurrence in tamoxifen-treated, node-negative breast cancer patients–technical and clinical validation in a multi-centre setting in collaboration with the European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC) PathoBiology group. Eur J Cancer. 43:1679-1686.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2007.04.025
11. Waldherr C, Mellinghoff IK, Tran C, Halpern BS, Rozengurt N, et al. (2005) Monitoring antiproliferative responses to kinase inhibitor therapy in mice with 3′-deoxy-3′-18F-fluorothymidine PET. J Nucl Med 46:114-120.
12. Alon U (2019) An introduction to systems biology: design principles of biological circuits. CRC press, London, United Kingdom.
13. Wulfkuhle J, Espina V, Liotta L, Petricoin E (2004)Genomic and proteomic technologies for individualisation and improvement of cancer treatment. Eur J Cancer 40:2623-2632.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2004.05.020
14. Shiio Y, Suh KS, Lee H, Yuspa SH, Eisenman RN, et al. (2006) Quantitative proteomic analysis of Myc-induced apoptosis a direct role for myc induction of the mitochondrial chloride ion channel, mtCLIC/CLIC4. J Biol Chem 281:2750-2756.https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M509349200
15. Fisher J, Henzinger TA (2007) Executable cell biology. Nat Biotechnol 25:1239-1249. https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt1356
16. Hood L (2003) Systems biology: integrating technology,biology, and computation. Mech Age Develop 124:9-16.https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-6374(02)00164-1

17. Gu FX, Karnik R, Wang AZ, Alexis F, Levy-Nissenbaum E, et al. (2007) Targeted nanoparticles for cancer therapy. Nano Today 2:14-21.https://doi.org/10.1016/S1748-0132(07)70083-X

18. Druker BJ (2004) Molecularly targeted therapy: Have the floodgates opened? Oncologist 9:357-360.https://doi.org/10.1634/theoncologist.9-4-357

19. Shawver LK, Slamon D, Ullrich A (2002) Smart drugs: tyrosine kinase inhibitors in cancer therapy. Cancer Cell 1:117-123.https://doi.org/10.1016/S1535-6108(02)00039-9

20. Carter TA, Wodicka LM, Shah NP, Velasco AM, Fabian MA, et al. (2005) Inhibition of drug-resistant mutants of ABL, KIT, and EGF receptor kinases. ProcNat Acad Sci 102:11011-11016.https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0504952102