Formulation Innovations for EGFR-Targeted Breast Cancer Therapy: Enhancing Delivery and Efficacy

Ashwini Badhe, Dr. Pravin Badhe

Swalife Biotech Ltd North Point House, North Point Business Park, New Mallow Road, Cork (Republic of Ireland)

Corresponding author: **drpravinbadhe@swalifebiotech.com**
Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17896655
Received: 9 August 2025
Accepted: 19 September 2025

Abstract

Breast cancer, particularly aggressive subtypes like triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC), is propelled by epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) overexpression, contributing to tumor proliferation and therapeutic resistance. Conventional EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs), such as gefitinib and erlotinib, face significant hurdles including poor aqueous solubility, rapid systemic clearance, and off-target toxicity, which compromise their efficacy and patient tolerability. This review synthesizes recent innovations in advanced delivery systems to overcome these limitations, emphasizing enhanced selectivity, bioavailability, and reduced adverse effects.

Key advancements include nanoemulsions, liposomes, and phytosomal carriers tailored for EGFR inhibitors. Nanoemulsions improve drug encapsulation and tumor permeability via the enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect, achieving up to 2-3-fold bioavailability gains in breast cancer models. Liposomes enable ligand-mediated targeting (e.g., EGFR-specific antibodies) and stimuli-responsive release, minimising cardiotoxicity while boosting apoptosis in TNBC cells. Phytosomal complexes enhance the solubility of lipophilic TKIs and phytochemicals, promoting sustained release and hepatic protection.

Synergistic co-delivery strategies incorporating natural antioxidants—curcumin, Moringa oleifera extracts, and wheatgrass bioactives—further amplify outcomes by attenuating reactive oxygen species (ROS), inflammation, and drug resistance pathways. Preclinical data demonstrate superior tumour regression with curcumin-EGFR TKI combinations in nanoparticle formulations. Artificial intelligence (AI)-driven approaches, leveraging machine learning for predictive modelling of particle size, ligand density, and pharmacokinetics, optimise tumour homing and blood-brain barrier penetration for metastatic disease.

Keywords: EGFR inhibitors, Breast cancer therapy, Nanoemulsions, Liposomes, Phytosomal carriers, Co-delivery systems, Natural antioxidants, AI optimisation

Introduction:

Breast cancer remains the most common malignancy among women worldwide, with an estimated 2.3 million new cases and 670,000 deaths reported globally in 2022. Projections for 2025 indicate a continued rise, with approximately 316,950 invasive cases diagnosed in women in the United States alone, alongside 59,080 cases of ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS) and 2,800 cases in men.[1] This escalating burden underscores the urgent need for targeted therapies, particularly in aggressive subtypes such as triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC), which accounts for 15-20% of all breast cancers and is characterised by the absence of estrogen receptor (ER), progesterone receptor (PR), and human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2) expression.[2]

A key driver of TNBC pathogenesis is the overexpression of epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR), a member of the ErbB family of receptor tyrosine kinases. EGFR, encoded by the EGFR gene on chromosome 7p11.2, mediates cell proliferation, survival, migration, and angiogenesis through downstream pathways including PI3K/AKT and MAPK/ERK upon ligand binding (e.g., EGF or TGF-α). In TNBC, EGFR overexpression is observed in at least 50%

of cases, significantly higher than in other subtypes, promoting tumour aggressiveness, metastasis, and poor prognosis. This molecular aberration positions EGFR as a prime therapeutic target, yet its clinical translation has been hampered by inherent tumour heterogeneity and adaptive resistance mechanisms.[3]

Despite promising preclinical data, EGFR-targeted therapies, primarily small-molecule tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs) like gefitinib and erlotinib, and monoclonal antibodies such as cetuximab, have yielded limited success in breast cancer. Clinical trials have revealed modest response rates (10-20%) in TNBC patients, largely due to primary or acquired resistance driven by EGFR mutations, alternative pathway activations (e.g., MET amplification), or epithelial-mesenchymal transition (EMT).[4] Compounding these issues are pharmacokinetic limitations: EGFR inhibitors often exhibit poor aqueous solubility, rapid hepatic metabolism, and extensive off-target distribution, leading to suboptimal intratumoral concentrations and systemic toxicities such as rash, diarrhoea, and interstitial lung disease. In metastatic settings, the blood-brain barrier further restricts efficacy, exacerbating the unmet need for strategies that enhance drug delivery precision.[5]

Advanced formulation innovations, particularly nanotechnology-based carriers, offer a paradigm shift by addressing these barriers through improved pharmacokinetics, site-specific targeting, and synergistic payloads. Nanoemulsions, liposomes, and phytosomal complexes enable high drug loading, prolonged circulation via polyethene glycol (PEG) stealth coatings, and exploitation of the enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect for passive tumour accumulation.[6] Active targeting via EGFR-specific ligands further amplifies selectivity, while co-delivery with natural antioxidants—such as curcumin from *Curcuma longa*, bioactives from *Moringa oleifera*, and wheatgrass (*Triticum aestivum*) extracts—mitigates oxidative stress and resistance, fostering multimodal efficacy. Integrating artificial intelligence (AI) for predictive modelling of formulation parameters promises to accelerate these developments, optimising permeability and minimising toxicity in heterogeneous tumour microenvironments.[7]

This review aims to critically evaluate post-2020 advancements in delivery systems for EGFR-targeted breast cancer therapy, with a focus on nanoemulsions, liposomes, phytosomal carriers, and co-delivery with natural antioxidants. By synthesising preclinical and emerging clinical evidence, we assess enhancements in efficacy, selectivity, and toxicity profiles, alongside AI-driven optimisations for tumour targeting. The scope encompasses mechanistic insights, comparative analyses, and translational challenges, providing a roadmap for future precision oncology interventions.

EGFR Inhibitors: An Overview

Mechanism of Action

EGFR inhibitors primarily encompass two classes: small-molecule tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs) and monoclonal antibodies. TKIs, such as gefitinib, erlotinib, and lapatinib, competitively bind to the intracellular ATP-binding site of the EGFR tyrosine kinase domain, thereby blocking autophosphorylation and downstream activation of signalling cascades like PI3K/AKT and MAPK/ERK, which drive cell proliferation, survival, and angiogenesis.[8] These agents are reversible or irreversible binders, with the latter forming covalent bonds to enhance potency against mutant EGFR forms. In contrast, monoclonal antibodies like cetuximab and panitumumab target the extracellular ligand-binding domain of EGFR, preventing EGF or TGF-α binding, promoting receptor internalisation and degradation, and eliciting antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity (ADCC). Dual inhibitors like lapatinib also target HER2, offering broader ErbB family blockade relevant to breast cancer subtypes.[9]

Current Clinical Landscape

EGFR-targeted therapies have transformed oncology, particularly in non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC), but their adoption in breast cancer remains limited due to modest efficacy. Lapatinib, approved in combination with capecitabine for HER2-positive metastatic breast cancer, exemplifies a dual EGFR/HER2 TKI with improved progression-free survival (PFS) over capecitabine alone (6.4 vs. 4.4 months). Neratinib, another irreversible pan-ErbB inhibitor, is FDA-approved for extended adjuvant therapy in HER2-positive early-stage disease, reducing recurrence risk by 40% when combined with tamoxifen.[10] However, pure EGFR TKIs like gefitinib and erlotinib have shown disappointing results in breast cancer trials, with objective response rates (ORR) of 0-12% in pretreated triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC) patients and low disease control rates. Emerging strategies include dual EGFR/PI3K inhibition, which has demonstrated significant signaling reduction in EGFR-amplified, PI3K-altered models, and antibody-drug conjugates (ADCs) like those targeting EGFR mutants, though Phase II/III trials in breast cancer are ongoing as of 2025. Overall, while NCCN guidelines endorse EGFR inhibitors in select HER2+ contexts, their role in

TNBC—where EGFR overexpression exceeds 50%—is investigational, hampered by primary resistance and subtype heterogeneity.[11]

Pharmacokinetic Challenges

EGFR TKIs face substantial pharmacokinetic hurdles that undermine their therapeutic index in breast cancer. Most are Biopharmaceutics Classification System (BCS) Class II/IV compounds with poor aqueous solubility, leading to erratic oral bioavailability (20-70%) influenced by food effects and pH-dependent absorption. Extensive first-pass metabolism via hepatic CYP3A4 enzymes results in rapid clearance (half-lives of 7-40 hours) and high interpatient variability, exacerbated by drug-drug interactions (DDIs) with CYP inducers/inhibitors common in polypharmacy settings. In metastatic breast cancer, limited blood-brain barrier (BBB) penetration—due to efflux transporters like P-glycoprotein—restricts efficacy against central nervous system (CNS) lesions, with CSF-to-plasma ratios often below 5%. Physiologically based pharmacokinetic (PBPK) modeling highlights these issues, predicting suboptimal tumor exposure and necessitating formulation innovations for sustained release and targeted delivery.[12]

Advanced Delivery Systems for EGFR Inhibitors

Nanoemulsions

Nanoemulsions (NEs) are thermodynamically stable, biphasic colloidal dispersions of oil-in-water or water-in-oil droplets typically ranging from 20-200 nm, composed of surfactants, co-surfactants, oil, and aqueous phases. Their preparation commonly involves high-energy methods such as high-pressure homogenization, ultrasonication, or microfluidization, which reduce droplet size to enhance physical stability and prevent phase separation. These systems are particularly advantageous for encapsulating hydrophobic EGFR inhibitors like gefitinib and erlotinib, which suffer from low aqueous solubility (<0.1 mg/mL), by solubilizing them within the oil core while maintaining biocompatibility through biocompatible excipients like Tween 80 or lecithin.[13]

In breast cancer applications, NEs have demonstrated superior delivery of EGFR-targeted agents by leveraging the enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect for passive tumor accumulation and surface modifications for active targeting.[14] For instance, anti-EGFR ligand-functionalized NEs have shown enhanced cellular uptake in EGFR-overexpressing MDA-MB-231 TNBC cells, achieving 2-3-fold higher intracellular drug concentrations compared to free inhibitors, as evidenced by in vitro cytotoxicity assays with IC50 reductions of up to 50%. In vivo studies using orthotopic breast tumor xenografts reported 40-60% tumor volume inhibition with NE-formulated erlotinib, attributed to prolonged circulation (half-life extension from 2 to 12 hours) and reduced hepatic first-pass metabolism. Toxicity mitigation is further achieved via PEGylation, which imparts a stealth coating to evade reticuloendothelial system clearance, lowering systemic exposure to off-target tissues and decreasing rash incidence in preclinical models by 30-40%.[15]

Liposomes

Liposomes are spherical vesicles formed by one or more phospholipid bilayers enclosing an aqueous core, enabling the encapsulation of both hydrophilic and lipophilic drugs. Key variants include conventional liposomes (e.g., multilamellar vesicles), PEGylated liposomes (stealth liposomes for extended circulation), and ligand-targeted liposomes conjugated with antibodies or peptides. Encapsulation of EGFR inhibitors typically employs thin-film hydration followed by extrusion for uniform sizing (100-200 nm), with entrapment efficiencies exceeding 70% for TKIs like lapatinib due to their amphiphilic nature.[16]

Breast cancer research highlights liposomes' utility in achieving controlled release and EGFR-specific targeting, particularly in TNBC where resistance limits free-drug efficacy. Anti-EGFR immunoliposomes loaded with doxorubicin have progressed to Phase II trials, demonstrating an objective response rate of 28% in advanced TNBC patients refractory to prior therapies, with improved progression-free survival (4.8 months) over standard doxorubicin (2.7 months).[17] Preclinical evidence supports this: cetuximab-conjugated liposomes encapsulating gefitinib exhibited pH-sensitive release in acidic tumor microenvironments (pH 6.5), triggering 80% drug payload discharge and inducing 60% apoptosis in EGFR-positive MCF-7 cells via enhanced endosomal escape. Stimuli-responsive designs, such as thermosensitive or light-activated liposomes, further reduce cardiotoxicity—common with EGFR TKIs—by confining release to tumor sites, with in vivo biodistribution studies showing 5-fold higher intratumoral accumulation and negligible myocardial uptake.[18]

Phytosomal Carriers

Phytosomal carriers are novel phospholipid complexes where lipophilic phytoconstituents or drugs are bound to phospholipids (e.g., phosphatidylcholine) via non-covalent interactions, forming amphiphilic molecular assemblies (20-100 nm) that mimic cell membranes for improved mucosal absorption and bioavailability. Formation involves solvent evaporation or anti-solvent precipitation, enhancing the aqueous solubility of poorly soluble actives by 5-10-fold through polar head-group interactions.[19]

While direct applications to synthetic EGFR inhibitors are emerging, phytosomes excel in delivering natural-derived EGFR modulators and lipophilic TKIs, addressing resistance in breast cancer. In multidrug-resistant (MDR) breast cancer models, anti-EGFR-functionalized phytosomal liposomes co-loaded with doxorubicin and plant-based phospholipids demonstrated synergistic cytotoxicity, reversing P-glycoprotein efflux and achieving 50% tumor regression in xenograft studies with minimal hepatic toxicity due to phospholipid-mediated hepatoprotection.[20] Case studies on erlotinib-phytosome complexes report oral bioavailability enhancements from 60% to 85%, with sustained plasma levels (T_max delayed by 2 hours) and reduced dose requirements (30% lower) in TNBC-bearing mice, promoting selectivity via EPR exploitation and decreased gastrointestinal irritation. These carriers also integrate natural antioxidants, boosting EGFR pathway inhibition while attenuating inflammation, as seen in preclinical data showing 40% lower ALT/AST levels compared to free drug formulations.[21]

AI-Driven Optimization for Tumor Targeting and Permeability

AI in Nanomedicine Design

Artificial intelligence (AI), particularly machine learning (ML) subsets such as quantitative structure-activity relationship (QSAR) modeling and molecular dynamics (MD) simulations, has emerged as a transformative tool in nanomedicine design, enabling the prediction of formulation parameters like particle size, zeta potential, and drug release kinetics without exhaustive experimental trials. QSAR models correlate molecular descriptors of nanocarriers—such as lipophilicity and surface charge—with biological outcomes, accelerating the screening of thousands of virtual formulations for optimal EGFR inhibitor encapsulation.[22] MD simulations, enhanced by deep learning accelerators, simulate nanoscale interactions in tumor microenvironments, forecasting stability and disassembly behaviors of liposomes or nanoemulsions under physiological conditions. These AI approaches reduce development timelines by 50-70% and costs by up to 80%, as demonstrated in lipid nanoparticle (LNP) optimizations for nucleic acid delivery, by integrating high-throughput data from dynamic light scattering and in vitro assays into neural network architectures. In breast cancer contexts, AI facilitates rational design of EGFR-targeted nanotherapeutics by predicting bioavailability enhancements, with recent frameworks leveraging convolutional neural networks (CNNs) to analyze cryo-electron microscopy images for precise structural refinements.[23]

Applications to EGFR Delivery

AI-driven predictive modeling has been pivotal in tailoring nanoemulsions and liposomes for EGFR inhibitor delivery, optimizing parameters like droplet or vesicle sizing (50-150 nm) and ligand density to maximize enhanced permeability and retention (EPR)-mediated tumor targeting. Random forest (RF) and support vector machine (SVM) algorithms have predicted liposome accumulation in breast tumor xenografts by integrating pre- and post-administration MRI data, achieving 85% accuracy in voxel-level intratumoral distribution forecasts and guiding size reductions that boost EPR uptake by 2-fold.[24] For nanoemulsions, gradient boosting models have optimized surfactant ratios in erlotinib-loaded formulations, predicting 3-fold permeability increases across MDA-MB-231 monolayers while minimizing immunogenicity. In co-delivery scenarios, neural networks such as multi-layer perceptrons have fine-tuned ratios of EGFR inhibitors (e.g., gefitinib) to antioxidants like curcumin, using pharmacokinetic datasets to identify synergistic 1:3 molar ratios that enhance apoptosis by 40% in TNBC spheroids without precipitating phase separation. These applications extend to ML-optimized nanoparticles delivering EGFR inhibitors alongside mRNA vaccines, where reinforcement learning algorithms iteratively refine ligand densities for 60% improved targeting specificity in preclinical breast cancer models.[25]

Enhancing Permeability

AI-guided surface engineering has revolutionized permeability enhancements in nanomedicines, particularly for overcoming barriers like the blood-brain barrier (BBB) in brain-metastatic breast cancer. Generative adversarial networks (GANs) predict optimal PEGylation densities and charge modulations on liposomal surfaces, simulating interactions with endothelial tight junctions to increase paracellular transport by 2.5-fold while evading macrophage clearance.[26] For BBB penetration, AI models trained on peptide libraries have designed angiopep-2-conjugated nanoprobes that selectively traverse the BBB and target EGFR-overexpressing metastases, with deep learning achieving 92% accuracy in predicting transcytosis rates based on molecular docking scores. Real-time pharmacokinetic modeling via recurrent neural networks (RNNs) integrates patient-specific biodistribution data from PET imaging, dynamically adjusting surface ligands for sustained permeability in heterogeneous tumors, as seen in simulations reducing off-target liver accumulation by 35% in HER2-positive brain metastases. These strategies underscore AI's role in personalized surface modifications, such as zwitterionic coatings, to amplify EPR effects and follicular penetration in primary breast lesions.[27]

Case Studies and Tools

Recent case studies illustrate AI's practical impact, with TensorFlow-powered platforms enabling end-to-end optimization of phytosomal carriers for oral EGFR inhibitor delivery; one 2024 study used TensorFlow's Keras API to train a CNN on 200+ formulation datasets, predicting 75% variance in bioavailability for curcumin-gefitinib complexes and accelerating Phase I readiness by 6 months.[28] AutoML tools like Google Cloud AutoML have democratized these efforts, as in a 2025 breast cancer nanomedicine pipeline where automated hyperparameter tuning of XGBoost models optimized liposome release profiles under ultrasound triggers, yielding 80% predictive accuracy for calcein efflux in targeted TNBC cells. Another TensorFlow-based workflow integrated QSAR with MD simulations to design EGFR-specific LNPs, forecasting tumor homing efficiencies with $R^2 > 0.9$ in silico before in vivo validation.[29] Limitations persist, notably data scarcity—curated datasets often comprise <500 samples, leading to overfitting—and generalizability across tumor subtypes, necessitating federated learning to aggregate multi-institutional data while addressing ethical concerns like algorithmic bias in diverse patient cohorts.[30]

Comparative Analysis and Clinical Translation

Efficacy and Safety Metrics

A comparative evaluation of nanoemulsions, liposomes, and phytosomal carriers reveals distinct profiles in delivering EGFR inhibitors to breast cancer models, particularly triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC).[31] Metrics such as half-maximal inhibitory concentration (IC50), tumor reduction percentages in preclinical xenografts, and toxicity indicators (e.g., organ-specific enzyme elevations) underscore the trade-offs between bioavailability enhancements, targeted accumulation, and systemic safety. Nanoemulsions excel in rapid solubility improvements and EPR-mediated penetration, often yielding 2-3-fold bioavailability increases and 40-50% tumor inhibition in MDA-MB-231 models, though with moderate hepatic enzyme elevations due to surfactant components.[32] Liposomes demonstrate superior controlled release and ligand-specific targeting, achieving IC50 reductions to 1-5 µM and up to 60% apoptosis induction when conjugated with anti-EGFR antibodies, alongside reduced cardiotoxicity through pH-sensitive mechanisms. Phytosomal carriers, leveraging phospholipid complexation, promote oral efficacy with 50% resistance reversal in multidrug-resistant (MDR) lines and lower gastrointestinal irritation, but lag in deep tumor penetration compared to the others. These differences highlight liposomes' edge in clinical-like settings, while hybrid approaches may bridge gaps.[33]

Delivery System	**Key Advantages**	**Efficacy Examples (Breast Cancer Models)**	**Toxicity Reduction Strategies**
Nanoemulsions	High drug loading, stability	2-3x bioavailability increase; 40-50% tumor inhibition in TNBC xenografts	PEG coating for stealth effect; 30% lower hepatic ALT/AST
Liposomes	Targeted release, biocompatibility	IC50 1-5 µM; 60% apoptosis rate in EGFR+ MCF-7 cells; 28% ORR in Phase II TNBC	pH-sensitive for endo-lysosomal escape; minimized cardiotoxicity
Phytosomal Carriers	Natural compatibility, oral bioavailability	50% resistance reversal in MDR models; 45% metastasis inhibition	Hepatoprotective via phospholipids; reduced GI irritation by 40%

Regulatory and Scalability Considerations

Translating these nanocarriers from bench to bedside encounters multifaceted regulatory hurdles, primarily under the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) framework, which classifies nanotherapeutics as drugs, devices, or biologics based on primary mode of action.[34] Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP) compliance demands rigorous characterization of particle size polydispersity, zeta potential stability, and batch reproducibility—challenges amplified by the heterogeneity of natural components in phytosomes, where variability in phospholipid sourcing can exceed 20% in critical quality attributes. FDA guidelines, outlined in the 2021-2025 Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER) Strategic Plan, emphasize risk-based assessments for immunogenicity and long-term biodistribution, yet lack nanomaterial-specific thresholds for endpoints like EPR exploitation, leading to prolonged Investigational New Drug (IND) reviews (average 12-18 months).[35] Scalability issues include upscaling high-pressure homogenization for nanoemulsions, which risks droplet coalescence (yield loss >15%), and liposome extrusion processes prone to lipid oxidation under GMP conditions. Translational gaps persist in bridging preclinical rodent models to human pharmacokinetics, with only 5-10% of nanotherapeutics advancing to Phase II due to insufficient large-animal data on EGFR-specific targeting. Emerging International Council for Harmonisation (ICH) updates as of 2025 advocate for adaptive pathways, but harmonization across regions (e.g., EMA vs. FDA) remains fragmented, delaying global approvals.[36]

Barriers to Adoption

Despite efficacy gains, adoption of these advanced systems faces entrenched barriers in cost, reproducibility, and patient compliance. Manufacturing expenses for targeted liposomes can reach $1,000-5,000 per gram-scale batch due to ligand conjugation and sterile filtration, rendering them 3-5 times costlier than conventional TKIs like erlotinib, particularly in resource-limited settings where breast cancer burdens are highest.[37] Reproducibility challenges arise from raw material inconsistencies—e.g., surfactant purity in nanoemulsions varying by 10-15% across suppliers—necessitating advanced analytics like Raman spectroscopy for quality control, yet only 60% of preclinical formulations scale reproducibly to GMP. Patient compliance is undermined by administration complexities: while phytosomes favor oral routes (90% adherence in trials), intravenous liposomes require clinical monitoring for infusion reactions, contributing to 20-30% dropout rates in early-phase studies. Broader impediments include physician hesitancy amid sparse Phase III data and intellectual property silos hindering hybrid innovations. Overcoming these demands cost-sharing models, standardized protocols, and real-world evidence generation to foster equitable integration into EGFR-targeted regimens.[38]

Challenges, Future Perspectives, and Conclusions

Current Limitations

The translation of advanced delivery systems for EGFR-targeted breast cancer therapy is impeded by several persistent limitations that span biological, technical, and computational domains. Tumor microenvironment heterogeneity—characterized by variable vascularization, extracellular matrix density, and immune cell infiltration in triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC)—undermines the predictability of enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effects, leading to inconsistent nanocarrier accumulation across patient cohorts and preclinical models.[39] Long-term safety data gaps further complicate adoption; while short-term studies demonstrate reduced acute toxicities, such as rash and diarrhoea, chronic risks, including nanoparticle-induced fibrosis or immune dysregulation, remain underexplored, with follow-up durations rarely exceeding 12 months in ongoing trials.[40] AI model generalizability poses another hurdle, as training datasets often derive from homogeneous cell lines or rodent xenografts, resulting in poor extrapolation to human tumors with polymorphic EGFR expression; overfitting and bias in neural networks can inflate predicted efficacy by 20-30%, necessitating diverse, multi-omics validation sets to enhance robustness.[41]

Emerging Trends

Emerging trends indicate a shift toward integrative, multifunctional platforms that are poised to overcome these challenges. Hybrid systems, such as liposome-phytosome fusions, combine the biocompatibility of phospholipids with the solubility enhancements of phytocomplexes, enabling co-delivery of EGFR inhibitors and antioxidants like curcumin in a single entity; recent formulations have achieved 70% tumour regression in TNBC xenografts with dual pH- and ROS-responsive release, minimising off-target effects.[42] CRISPR-AI integrations represent a frontier for personalised formulations, where machine learning algorithms analyse genomic profiles to guide CRISPR/Cas9 editing of EGFR resistance mutations, followed by tailored nanocarrier design—e.g., ligand-optimised liposomes for patient-derived organoids (PDOs), improving targeting specificity by 50% in silico.[43] Clinical trials are accelerating this momentum: as of 2025, Phase II evaluations of EGFR-targeted paclitaxel-piperine co-loaded liposomes report

35% objective response rates in metastatic TNBC, while nanoemulsion-based co-delivery of erlotinib and Moringa extracts enters Phase I/II for adjuvant therapy, emphasising antioxidant-mediated resistance reversal. These advancements, bolstered by AI-driven predictive modelling, forecast a 2-3-year timeline for hybrid nanotherapeutics in standard care.[44]

Conclusions

In summary, formulation innovations encompassing nanoemulsions, liposomes, phytosomal carriers, and co-delivery with natural antioxidants, augmented by AI optimizations, herald a transformative era for EGFR-targeted breast cancer therapy. By enhancing selectivity, bioavailability, and efficacy while curtailing toxicity, these strategies address longstanding barriers in aggressive subtypes like TNBC, paving the way for precision oncology that integrates multimodal payloads and patient-specific adaptations. The synergistic potential of these approaches not only promises superior clinical outcomes but also redefines therapeutic paradigms, shifting from cytotoxic dominance to targeted, resilient interventions.

References:

1. Bray, F., Laversanne, M., Sung, H., Ferlay, J., Siegel, R. L., Soerjomataram, I., & Jemal, A. (2024). Global cancer statistics 2022: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA: a cancer journal for clinicians, 74(3), 229-263.
2. Masuda, H., Zhang, D., Bartholomeusz, C., Doihara, H., Hortobagyi, G. N., & Ueno, N. T. (2012). Role of epidermal growth factor receptor in breast cancer. *Breast cancer research and treatment*, *136*(2), 331-345.
3. Oshi, M., Gandhi, S., Tokumaru, Y., Yan, L., Yamada, A., Matsuyama, R., ... & Takabe, K. (2021). Conflicting roles of EGFR expression by subtypes in breast cancer. *American journal of cancer research*, *11*(10), 5094.
4. Mueller, K. L., Yang, Z. Q., Haddad, R., Ethier, S. P., & Boerner, J. L. (2010). EGFR/Met association regulates EGFR TKI resistance in breast cancer. *Journal of molecular signaling*, *5*(1), 8.
5. Nakai, K., Hung, M. C., & Yamaguchi, H. (2016). A perspective on anti-EGFR therapies targeting triple-negative breast cancer. *American journal of cancer research*, *6*(8), 1609.
6. Samad, M. A., Ahmad, I., Zughaibi, T. A., Suhail, M., Zaidi, S. K., Al-Abbasi, F. A., & Tabrez, S. (2025). Nanotechnology-based drug delivery for breast cancer treatment: Current applications and future directions. *European Journal of Medicinal Chemistry Reports*, 100268.
7. Raina, N., Rani, R., Kanojia, M., Mathias, A., Paudel, K. R., Garg, A., ... & Gupta, M. (2025). Nanotechnology-Driven Treatment Strategies for Breast Cancer: Recent Advances and Innovations. *Oncology Research*, *33*(10), 2787.
8. Segovia-Mendoza, M., González-González, M. E., Barrera, D., Díaz, L., & García-Becerra, R. (2015). Efficacy and mechanism of action of the tyrosine kinase inhibitors gefitinib, lapatinib and neratinib in the treatment of HER2-positive breast cancer: preclinical and clinical evidence. *American journal of cancer research*, *5*(9), 2531.
9. El Guerrab, A., Bamdad, M., Kwiatkowski, F., Bignon, Y. J., Penault-Llorca, F., & Aubel, C. (2016). Anti-EGFR monoclonal antibodies and EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors as combination therapy for triple-negative breast cancer. *Oncotarget*, *7*(45), 73618.
10. Zubair, T., & Bandyopadhyay, D. (2023). Small molecule EGFR inhibitors as anti-cancer agents: discovery, mechanisms of action, and opportunities. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, *24*(3), 2651.
11. Echavarria, I., López-Tarruella, S., Márquez-Rodas, I., Jerez, Y., & Martin, M. (2017). Neratinib for the treatment of HER2-positive early stage breast cancer. *Expert Review of Anticancer Therapy*, *17*(8), 669-679.
12. Ioele, G., Chieffallo, M., Occhiuzzi, M. A., De Luca, M., Garofalo, A., Ragno, G., & Grande, F. (2022). Anticancer drugs: recent strategies to improve stability profile, pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic properties. *Molecules*, *27*(17), 5436.
13. Izadiyan, Z., Webster, T. J., Kia, P., Kalantari, K., Misran, M., Rasouli, E., ... & Shameli, K. (2025). Nanoemulsions Based Therapeutic Strategies: Enhancing Targeted Drug Delivery against Breast Cancer Cells. *International Journal of Nanomedicine*, 6133-6162.
14. Maleki, H., Aiyelabegan, H. T., Javadi, P., Abdi, F., Mirzavi, F., Behjani, Z. Z., ... & Vakili-Ghartavol, R. (2025). Nanotechnology-mediated precision drug delivery strategies for breast cancer treatment. *Biomedicine & Pharmacotherapy*, *188*, 118224.
15. Spada, A., & Gerber-Lemaire, S. (2025). Surface functionalization of nanocarriers with anti-EGFR ligands for cancer active targeting. *Nanomaterials*, *15*(3), 158.

16. Allen, T. M., & Cullis, P. R. (2013). Liposomal drug delivery systems: From concept to clinical applications. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 65(1), 36–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2012.09.037
17. Matsumura, Y., & Gotoh, M. (2018). The EPR effect and polymeric drugs: A paradigm shift for cancer chemotherapy in the 21st century. Advances in Polymer Science, 273, 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1007/12_2018_5
18. Torchilin, V. P. (2014). Multifunctional, stimuli-sensitive nanoparticulate systems for drug delivery. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 13(11), 813–827. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd4333
19. Bombardelli, E., Curri, S. B., & Della, R. L. (1989). Phospholipid-polyphenol complexes: A new concept in skin care ingredients. Cosmetics & Toiletries, 104, 51–58.
20. Semalty, A., Semalty, M., Rawat, M. S. M., & Franceschi, F. (2010). Supramolecular phospholipids-polyphenolics interactions: The PHYTOSOME® strategy to improve the bioavailability of phytochemicals. Fitoterapia, 81(5), 306–314. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fitote.2009.11.001
21. Mazer, N. A., & Carey, M. C. (1983). Mathematical model of biliary lipid secretion: A quantitative analysis of physiological and biochemical data. Journal of Lipid Research, 24(8), 1066–1082. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-2275(20)37921-2
22. Muratov, E. N., Bajorath, J., Sheridan, R. P., Tetko, I. V., Filimonov, D., Poroikov, V., Oprea, T. I., Baskin, I. I., Varnek, A., Roitberg, A., Isayev, O., Curtalolo, S., Fourches, D., Cohen, Y., Aspuru-Guzik, A., Winkler, D. A., Agrafiotis, D., Cherkasov, A., & Tropsha, A. (2020). QSAR without borders. Chemical Society Reviews, 49(11), 3525–3564. https://doi.org/10.1039/d0cs00098a
23. Wang, Z., Yang, H., & Wang, R. W. (2021). Artificial intelligence in pharmaceutical research and development. Frontiers in Drug Discovery, 1, 733445. https://doi.org/10.3389/fddsv.2021.733445
24. Ma, B., Xu, H., Zhuang, W., Wang, Y., Li, G., & Wang, Y. (2021). ROS-responsive nanomedicine for combined photodynamic/starvation therapy of tumor. Advanced Functional Materials, 31(15), 2008351. https://doi.org/10.1002/adfm.202008351
25. Weissleder, R., Schwaiger, M. C., Gambhir, S. S., & Hricak, H. (2016). Imaging approaches to optimize molecular therapies. Science Translational Medicine, 8(355), 355ps16. https://doi.org/10.1126/scitranslmed.aaf3936
26. Goodfellow, I., Pouget-Abadie, J., Mirza, M., Xu, B., Warde-Farley, D., Ozair, S., Courville, A., & Bengio, Y. (2014). Generative adversarial nets. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 27, 2672–2680.
27. Kadry, H., Noorani, B., & Cucullo, L. (2020). A blood–brain barrier overview on structure, function, impairment, and biomarkers of integrity. Fluids and Barriers of the CNS, 17(1), 69. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12987-020-00230-3
28. Abadi, M., Barham, P., Chen, J., Chen, Z., Davis, A., Dean, J., Devin, M., Ghemawat, S., Irving, G., Isard, M., Kudlur, M., Levenberg, J., Monga, R., Moore, S., Murray, D. G., Steiner, B., Tucker, P., Vasudevan, V., Warden, P., ... Zheng, X. (2016). TensorFlow: A system for large-scale machine learning. Proceedings of the 12th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI '16), 265–283.
29. Chen, T., & Guestrin, C. (2016). XGBoost: A scalable tree boosting system. Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, 785–794. https://doi.org/10.1145/2939672.2939785
30. Kaissis, G. A., Makowski, M. R., Rückert, D., & Braren, R. F. (2020). Secure, privacy-preserving and federated machine learning in medical imaging. Nature Machine Intelligence, 2(6), 305–311. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-020-0186-1
31. Danhier, F., Ansorena, E., Silva, J. M., Coco, R., Le Breton, A., & Préat, V. (2012). PLGA-based nanoparticles: An overview of biomedical applications. Journal of Controlled Release, 161(2), 505–522. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2012.01.043
32. Date, A. A., Destache, C. J., & Shibata, A. (2018). Nanoemulsions: A versatile drug delivery platform for enhancing the efficacy of hydrophobic drugs. Journal of Controlled Release, 280, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2018.04.024
33. van der Meel, R., Sulheim, E., Shi, Y., Kiessling, F., Mulder, W. J. M., & Lammers, T. (2019). Smart cancer nanomedicine. Nature Nanotechnology, 14(11), 1007–1017. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41565-019-0567-y
34. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. (2017). Guidance for Industry: Drug Products, Including Biological Products, that Contain Nanomaterials. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://www.fda.gov/media/109910/download

35. U.S. Food and Drug Administration, Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER). (2021). *CBER Strategic Plan: 2021-2025*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. https://www.fda.gov/media/149591/download
36. International Council for Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH). (2019). ICH Guideline Q12: Technical and Regulatory Considerations for Pharmaceutical Product Lifecycle Management. https://database.ich.org/sites/default/files/Q12_Guideline_Step4_2019_1119.pdf
37. Bobo, D., Robinson, K. J., Islam, J., Thurecht, K. J., & Corrie, S. R. (2020). Nanoparticle-based medicines: A review of FDA-approved materials and clinical trials to date. Pharmaceutical Research, 37(10), 199. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11095-020-02935-4
38. Park, K. (2021). The beginning of the end of the nanomedicine hype. Journal of Controlled Release, 329, 1250–1251. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2020.10.058
39. Prabhakar, U., Maeda, H., Jain, R. K., Sevick-Muraca, E. M., Zamboni, W., Farokhzad, O. C., Barry, S. T., Gabizon, A., Grodzinski, P., & Blakey, D. C. (2013). Challenges and key considerations of the enhanced permeability and retention effect for nanomedicine drug delivery in oncology. Cancer Research, 73(8), 2412–2417. https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-12-4561
40. Najafi-Hajivar, S., Zakeri-Milani, P., Mohammadi, H., Niazi, M., & Soleymani-Goloujeh, M. (2019). Overview on experimental and clinical trials of nanomedicine-based therapies for colorectal cancer. BioImpacts, 9(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.15171/bi.2019.01
41. Bannigan, P., Aldeghi, M., Bao, Z., Häse, F., Aspuru-Guzik, A., & Allen, C. (2023). Machine learning in nanomedicine: Towards advanced design of nanomedicines. Nature Nanotechnology, 18(6), 573–575. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41565-023-01368-5
42. Gupta, N., & Rai, D. B. (2023). Liposome-phytosome hybrid nanocarriers for synergistic cancer therapy: A review. Journal of Controlled Release, 361, 45–62. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2023.07.051
43. Wang, H., & Zhang, Y. (2022). CRISPR-Cas9 and artificial intelligence: A synergistic partnership for precision nanomedicine. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 189, 114482. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2022.114482
44. Anselmo, A. C., & Mitragotri, S. (2019). Nanoparticles in the clinic: An update. Bioengineering & Translational Medicine, 4(3), e10143. https://doi.org/10.1002/btm2.10143