Volume 11, Issue 1, January – 2026 International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology
ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jan352

Implantable Therapeutic Devices: Bridging the Gap Between Systemic and Localized Cancer Therapy

Yashasvi Sunil Joshi[1]; Aditya Brijesh Joshi[2]; Aanand J. Purohit[3]

[1,2,3]Bhausaheb Mulak College of Pharmacy Umred.

Publication Date: 2026/01/19

Abstract: Systemic chemotherapy remains central to cancer treatment but is limited by nonspecific biodistribution, dose-limiting toxicity, and poor penetration into solid tumors. Nanomedicine has improved pharmacokinetics and targeting, yet most nanoparticles fail to accumulate meaningfully within tumors due to biological clearance and stromal barriers. Implantable drug-delivery systems (IDDS), particularly micro-reservoir platforms enabled by microelectromechanical systems (MEMS), have emerged as a promising strategy to overcome these limitations by placing therapeutics directly at or within the tumor site. This review synthesizes the evolution of implantable devices from early passive polymers and osmotic pumps to modern programmable microchips with electronically triggered reservoirs, wireless control, and integrated sensors. The engineering foundations of reservoir architecture, membrane activation, and energy management are discussed in relation to pharmacological benefits, including high intratumoral concentrations, reduced systemic toxicity, improved drug stability, and precise spatiotemporal control of mono- and multi-agent regimens. Preclinical evidence across breast, pancreatic, glioblastoma, melanoma, prostate, head-and-neck cancers, and sarcomas demonstrates enhanced tumor penetration and therapeutic efficacy with substantially lower systemic exposure. Emerging smart implants incorporating real-time monitoring and AI-assisted dosing represent the next step toward adaptive, patient-specific therapy. Despite strong promise, translation to the clinic requires addressing challenges in biocompatibility, foreign-body response, drug stability, manufacturing scalability, regulatory pathways, and patient acceptance. Overall, micro-reservoir implantable systems offer a transformative path toward precision local oncology by shifting therapeutic control from systemic circulation to the tumor microenvironment itself, enabling more effective and individualized cancer treatment.

How to Cite: Yashasvi Sunil Joshi; Aditya Brijesh Joshi; Aanand J. Purohit (2026) Implantable Therapeutic Devices: Bridging the Gap Between Systemic and Localized Cancer Therapy. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 11(1), 998-1011. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jan352

I. INTRODUCTION

Cancer continues to impose one of the largest health burdens worldwide, with an estimated 19.3 million new cases and 10 million deaths in 2020 according to GLOBOCAN data, a number expected to rise sharply by 2040 due to population ageing, environmental exposures, and lifestyle-associated risks [1,2]. Parallel improvements in detection paradoxically inflate incidence by identifying previously unseen disease. As these trends converge, cancer therapy faces intensifying pressure to deliver treatments that are simultaneously more effective and more tolerable.

Systemic chemotherapy remains central to treatment across tumor types despite the rise of immunotherapy and molecularly targeted agents [3]. Its persistent limitations stem largely from nonspecific biodistribution, causing widespread toxicity—myelosuppression, gastrointestinal injury, cardiomyopathy—and constraining dose intensity [4]. In solid tumors, abnormal vasculature, heterogeneous perfusion, and elevated interstitial fluid pressure reduce intratumoral penetration, making systemically administered cytotoxics unable to reach therapeutic levels uniformly throughout the tumor mass [5].

Nanomedicine has attempted to solve these challenges. Liposomes, polymeric nanoparticles, micelles, and hybrid systems improve solubility, alter pharmacokinetics, and exploit passive (EPR-based) and active targeting strategies [6–9]. Some nano-enabled chemo-immunotherapy systems further modulate the tumor microenvironment to amplify local immune activation [8].

However, systemic nanocarriers remain significantly constrained by opsonization, renal filtration, mononuclear phagocyte clearance, and difficulty penetrating dense stroma [6,10]. As a result, the majority of injected nanoparticles never reach the tumor.

These persistent obstacles have increased interest in implantable drug delivery systems (IDDS), which bypass systemic circulation entirely to deliver therapeutic payloads directly to, or adjacent to, the tumor [11]. IDDS provide prolonged drug release at high local concentrations while

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jan352

reducing systemic exposure and treatment-associated toxicities [12]. Early clinical success with devices such as Gliadel®, along with improvements in polymer science, MEMS microfabrication, and wireless actuation, has fueled a new generation of precision implants [33,34].

Among IDDS platforms, micro-reservoir systems fabricated using microelectromechanical systems (MEMS) represent one of the most sophisticated approaches emerging in the past two decades. These devices consist of multiple sealed reservoirs that can release discrete doses via electrochemical, electrothermal, degradative, or mechanical activation [13–16]. The first-in-human trial of a wirelessly controlled microchip implant delivering an osteoporosis medication established clinical feasibility and paved the way toward oncology applications [9].

Preclinical studies now demonstrate that micro-reservoir implants can deliver chemotherapeutics, immunotherapies, antibody fragments, and combinational regimens directly into tumors with precise timing, exceptional local concentrations, and markedly reduced systemic toxicity [17,18]. These capabilities position micro-reservoir IDDS as a platform capable of addressing longstanding pharmacokinetic, pharmacodynamic, and microenvironmental limitations.

This review synthesizes the engineering principles, pharmacological advantages, preclinical evidence, translational challenges, and future directions of micro-reservoir implantable drug delivery systems, emphasizing their emerging role in precision local oncology.

➢ *Early Passive Implantable Systems*

The earliest implantable drug delivery devices were structurally simple polymeric rods, wafers, and pellets designed to maintain sustained local drug concentrations independent of systemic dosing. Their emergence paralleled the rise of biodegradable polymers—PLA, PGA, PLGA—which enabled predictable, erosion-controlled or diffusion-driven release profiles [31].

A key precursor was Norplant®, introduced in 1990 for contraception, consisting of six silicone capsules filled with levonorgestrel, providing up to five years of hormone release [32]. Though non-oncologic, it demonstrated long-acting, user-independent dosing and regulatory feasibility.

A major breakthrough for oncology was the Gliadel® wafer, approved in 1996 for localized carmustine (BCNU) delivery after surgical resection of high-grade gliomas [33–35]. Placed in the resection cavity, wafers erode to release BCNU over 2–3 weeks, bypassing the blood–brain barrier and enabling concentrations unattainable via systemic therapy [34,46]. Gliadel established that local implants could reshape treatment strategies, particularly for tumors shielded from systemic circulation.

Mechanistically, early implants relied on either (1) diffusion, where drug molecules migrated along concentration gradients, or (2) polymer degradation, where hydrolysis released entrapped payloads [35]. These systems offered predictable kinetics but lacked programmability or adaptive control. Once implanted, dosing could not be altered, halted, or triggered externally.

Still, these first-generation devices validated the longevity, safety, and clinical value of localized sustained release. Their limitations created the conceptual space for more advanced programmable platforms, ultimately shaping the evolution toward MEMS-enabled micro-reservoir technology.

➢ *Osmotic Pumps and Controlled-Release Implants*

The limitations of early passive implants—chiefly their inability to sustain zero-order release or adapt to clinical needs—led to the development of osmotic pump–based systems, an important technological bridge between polymer depots and programmable MEMS devices. These systems evolved from laboratory prototypes of the 1970s into clinically relevant implants by the mid-1990s.

Osmotic implants contain a semipermeable membrane that permits water influx while preventing drug efflux. Once implanted, water entry generates internal osmotic pressure that drives a piston or expanding osmotic engine, pushing drug from a reservoir at a near constant rate [36,37]. This architecture enables zero-order kinetics, difficult to achieve with biodegradable matrices.

The ALZET® pump exemplified the capability of miniature osmotic engines in preclinical research, delivering proteins, chemotherapeutics, and small molecules continuously for weeks without external power [38]. The first major clinical advance was the DUROS® implant, a titanium device roughly the size of a matchstick, capable of releasing leuprolide for up to 12 months with exceptionally stable kinetics [39,40]. Its success demonstrated that long-term, power-free, implantable drug delivery was achievable in humans.

Despite these advantages, osmotic systems have inherent constraints. They typically accommodate only one drug, offer fixed, non-adjustable release rates, and cannot be reprogrammed after implantation [41]. These limitations encouraged the development of more advanced, digitally controllable systems but firmly established the engineering principles—compartmentalization, membrane selectivity, mechanical piston-driven output—that influenced later MEMS architectures.

➢ *Polymeric Wafers and Biodegradable Implants*

Biodegradable implants represented another key step in localized oncology therapy. The most influential example remains the Gliadel® wafer, a polyanhydride matrix (PCPP:SA) embedded with carmustine (BCNU) for direct placement into the resection cavity of malignant gliomas. Developed in the late 1980s, this matrix undergoes surface erosion, providing predictable release while maintaining high local concentrations [42–45].

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jan352

Gliadel® gained FDA approval in 1996, becoming the first biodegradable chemotherapeutic implant used clinically [44]. Drug release over 2–3 weeks achieves intraparenchymal exposure that bypasses the blood–brain barrier and reduces systemic toxicity [45,46]. The success of Gliadel validated local intracranial delivery, informing decades of research on polymer-based implants.

Subsequent efforts extended biodegradable systems to agents such as paclitaxel and cisplatin using PLGA and other polymers [47]. Although these implants offered controlled release and biodegradation, they remained limited by low drug-loading capacity, lack of programmability, and surgical placement requirements.

Nevertheless, polymeric wafers laid the foundation for more sophisticated reservoir-based devices by demonstrating that sustained, localized chemotherapy can meaningfully influence tumor outcomes.

- *Emergence of MEMS Microchips and Silicon Micro-Reservoir Devices*

The early 2000s marked a pivotal transition with the introduction of microelectromechanical systems (MEMS)–based microchips capable of precise, electronically controlled drug release. Langer and Cima's group repurposed semiconductor fabrication methods to create silicon substrates etched with dozens to hundreds of sealed micro-reservoirs [48].

Each reservoir was capped with a thin metal membrane—typically gold or titanium—that could be opened via electrothermal melting or electrochemical dissolution, enabling on-demand, pulsatile, or sequential release [49–51]. These features offered unprecedented temporal precision: release events could be programmed electronically or triggered wirelessly.

Advances quickly followed. Coatings such as parylene and silicon carbide improved biocompatibility and protected electronics in vivo [52]. Optimized reservoir geometries, thin-film deposition, and microheater efficiency reduced activation energy requirements and increased device longevity. Later generations integrated microprocessors, onboard batteries, or wireless control modules, moving toward fully programmable implants.

These innovations established MEMS microchips as the first systems to combine multi-reservoir architecture, miniaturization, electronic precision, and long-term stability, creating the technological foundation for next-generation implants [53].

- *Modern Micro-Reservoir Implant Families (2015–2025)*

Recent advances have diversified micro-reservoir systems into several distinct device families, each optimized for specific therapeutic and engineering demands.

II. ELECTROCHEMICAL AND ELECTROTHERMAL MEMS SYSTEMS

These platforms build directly on early microchips, using electrical inputs to rupture or dissolve reservoir membranes with high precision. Improvements in microheater design, thin-film metallurgy, and activation circuitry have reduced energy requirements and improved reliability under physiological conditions [54].

- *Microfluidic Pump–Based Implants*

Microfluidic devices integrate micropumps, microvalves, and microchannels to deliver continuous or pulsatile flows, accommodating high-viscosity formulations and enabling dynamic dose titration. Actuation methods include piezoelectric pumping, electroosmotic flow, and membrane-driven valves [55]. Their flexibility makes them suitable for antibodies, peptides, and multi-agent regimens.

- *3D-Printed and Modular Reservoir Platforms*

Additive manufacturing allows customizable shapes, reservoir volumes, and implant geometries, facilitating patient-specific designs. Modular cartridge systems permit preloaded drug units to be assembled into a single implant, supporting multi-drug sequences without complex refilling mechanisms [56].

- *Biodegradable Microdevices*

Emerging biodegradable systems use degradable silicon, magnesium films, or polymeric membranes to enable transient implants that dissolve after therapy, eliminating retrieval procedures. These systems are attractive for postsurgical oncology settings requiring finite treatment durations [57].

- *Hybrid Systems*

Next-generation implants increasingly combine features—MEMS reservoirs integrated into 3D-printed scaffolds, microfluidic channels feeding MEMS-ruptured outlets, or biodegradable actuators paired with electronic triggers. These hybrid models are particularly advantageous for chemo-immunotherapy, where sequential release enhances synergy [58].

- *Translational Status*

While most platforms demonstrate strong preclinical efficacy, clinical translation is slower due to manufacturing, regulatory, and biocompatibility challenges. Early human trials have validated programmable release for non-oncologic applications, and oncology-specific implants are moving toward early-phase evaluation [59].

III. DESIGN PRINCIPLES AND ENGINEERING CHARACTERISTICS OF MICRO-RESERVOIR IMPLANTABLE DEVICES

Micro-reservoir implants operate at the intersection of microfabrication, biomaterials engineering, and pharmacokinetics. Their performance depends on how reservoir geometry, membrane design, energy supply, and biocompatible encapsulation integrate into a stable long-term

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jan352

system. The following sections condense these engineering principles while preserving the technical accuracy of the original text.

➢ *Reservoir Geometry and Fabrication Methods*

Reservoir design determines drug loading capacity, release kinetics, and compatibility with diverse therapeutic agents. Modern reservoirs range from tens of micrometres to several millimetres in volume depending on dosing requirements [60].

➢ *Fabrication Approaches*

Silicon-based microfabrication—photolithography, deep reactive ion etching (DRIE), and thin- film deposition—remains common due to its ability to produce uniform arrays of cavities with precise dimensional control [61]. Polymer-based microfabrication using SU-8 lithography, parylene molding, or soft lithography provides additional flexibility, allowing softer, more compliant structures better suited to biological tissue [62].

Additive manufacturing has expanded design possibilities further. Continuous liquid interface production and multi-material 3D printing support complex reservoir geometries and spatially graded structures that would be difficult to fabricate using planar methods [63].

➢ *Engineering Considerations*

Optimal reservoir architecture balances several constraints:1) minimal device footprint with adequate drug capacity,2) robust sealing to prevent premature leakage,3) predictable diffusion or activation rate after membrane rupture. Reservoir spacing affects heat transfer for thermal actuation, mechanical stress distribution, and device flexibility.

➢ *Membrane Materials and Activation Mechanisms*

Reservoir membranes function as controlled barriers governing when and how a sealed drug dose is released.

➢ *Membrane Materials*

Metal membranes—gold, platinum, titanium—are widely used due to predictable melting points, biostability, and compatibility with electrothermal or electrochemical activation [64]. Polymer membranes such as parylene-C, PEG-based dissolvable films, or PLGA provide biodegradability or selective permeability but require careful formulation to avoid premature swelling [65]. Ceramic and nitride membranes offer ultrathin, chemically stable alternatives suitable for precision devices [66].

➢ *Activation Mechanisms*

Activation can be triggered through several mechanisms:

- Electrothermal melting, using microheaters to rupture thin metal films;
- Electrochemical dissolution, where anodic bias selectively erodes metal membranes;
- Mechanical rupture, common in biodegradable or swelling-based systems;
- Hydrogel-driven actuation, enabling passive time-controlled release without electronics [67].

Membranes must maintain chemical stability, minimal pre-activation permeability, and reproducible rupture energies. Finite element analysis is typically used to optimize heater placement and membrane thickness [68].

➢ *Energy Management and Power Requirements*

Long-term performance depends on stable energy delivery for sensor operation, microcontroller logic, wireless communication, and reservoir activation.

➢ *Battery-Based Approaches*

Rechargeable lithium microbatteries and solid-state batteries offer compact, high-energy-density power sources but require careful encapsulation to prevent leakage and must withstand long implantation periods [69].

➢ *Wireless Power Transfer and Energy Harvesting*

Inductive coupling is the most established wireless powering method, enabling external power delivery without transcutaneous wires [70]. Radiofrequency and ultrasound-based power systems are emerging alternatives with improved depth penetration and smaller antenna requirements [71]. Some implants incorporate mechanical or biochemical energy harvesters (e.g., glucose fuel cells) to reduce dependence on stored battery capacity [72].

Power budgeting influences membrane design, activation mode, and controller operation. Electrochemical activation consumes less energy per release than thermal melting, though thermal rupture offers faster, cleaner opening.

➢ *Encapsulation, Biocompatibility, and Tissue Integration*

Micro-reservoir implants interact with a dynamic biological environment. Their longevity and function depend heavily on how the surrounding tissue responds.

➢ *Foreign-Body Response and Encapsulation*

Implantation triggers rapid adsorption of blood proteins, followed by neutrophil infiltration and macrophage activation. Persistent macrophage activity promotes formation of foreign-body giant cells and ultimately a fibrous capsule, which can impair drug diffusion, affect membrane activation, and alter release kinetics [66–70].

➢ *Material Strategies to Reduce Tissue Reaction*

Parylene coatings reduce protein adsorption and inflammatory cell adhesion, improving hemocompatibility [72]. Silicon carbide and silicon nitride coatings increase chemical stability. Anti-fouling strategies—PEGylation, zwitterionic coatings—minimize macrophage adhesion and slow capsule formation [73].

Biodegradable materials such as PLGA and polycaprolactone eliminate long-term implantation issues but must degrade predictably without destabilizing the drug payload [74].

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jan352

➢ *Encapsulation Integrity and Hermeticity*

Drug stability requires robust barriers against moisture ingress. Traditional hermetic sealing uses titanium housings and ceramic–metal feedthroughs [75]. More recent advances employ atomic layer deposition (ALD) of alumina or hafnia, which allows ultrathin moisture barriers without increasing device bulk [76]. Even minimal water penetration can degrade sensitive biologics or interfere with electronics [77].

➢ *Mechanical Mismatch and Long-Term Stability*

A mismatch between stiff implants and soft tissues increases micromotion and inflammation [78]. Flexible substrates or hydrogel buffers can reduce this mismatch. Long-term implants must also resist corrosion, polymer swelling, mineralization, and mechanical fatigue [80–81].

IV. PHARMACOLOGICAL ADVANTAGES OF MICRO-RESERVOIR IMPLANTABLE DRUG DELIVERY SYSTEMS IN CANCER THERAPY

Micro-reservoir implantable systems change the fundamental pharmacological landscape by relocating drug administration from the bloodstream to the tumor site itself. This shift dramatically alters drug gradients, systemic exposure, and tissue kinetics, enabling therapeutic effects that are difficult—or impossible—to achieve with systemic chemotherapy or nanomedicine.

➢ *Overcoming Tumor Microenvironment Barriers*

Solid tumors are characterized by heterogeneous perfusion, elevated interstitial fluid pressure, dense extracellular matrix (ECM), and hypoxic cores, all of which resist inward drug penetration during systemic therapy [82]. Even advanced nanoparticles often enter tumors unevenly or fail to reach poorly vascularised regions.

Micro-reservoir implants bypass these limitations by releasing drug from within the tumor or its immediate margins. This reverses the direction of diffusion, creating outward-facing concentration gradients that permit drugs to penetrate avascular, hypoxic, or dense stromal regions [83]. Drug washout is minimized because most of the payload remains inside tumor tissue rather than circulating systemically [84].

The resulting exposure profile supports higher local cytotoxicity, improved diffusion through rigid ECM structures, and enhanced effects on slow-cycling or hypoxic tumor cells that are typically resistant to systemic agents [85].

Achieving Higher Intratumoral Concentrations With Lower Systemic Exposure A central advantage of micro-reservoir implants is the ability to deliver exceptionally high local drug concentrations while maintaining minimal plasma exposure. Preclinical models consistently show:

- 10–200× higher intratumoral drug concentrations compared with IV delivery,
- Negligible systemic levels, often below quantification limits,
- Sustained intratumoral exposure lasting days to weeks from a single release event [86–88].

Separating local concentration from systemic toxicity dramatically widens the therapeutic window. Many drugs degraded rapidly by the liver or rendered inactive in circulation—e.g., fragile biologics or short-lived small molecules—remain stable inside sealed micro-reservoirs until release [89].

➢ *Reducing Systemic Toxicity and Improving Tolerability*

Because most released drug remains localized, systemic toxicity falls sharply. Animal studies show significantly lower rates of:

- Myelosuppression,
- Hepatotoxicity and nephrotoxicity,
- Cardiotoxic injury (especially with anthracyclines),
- Gastrointestinal mucosal damage [90–92].

Improved tolerability enables treatment strategies that are otherwise contraindicated due to toxicity, such as high-dose pulses, drug combinations with overlapping toxicities, and rapid sequencing of agents [91].

Clinically, this reduction in systemic burden may decrease emergency visits, supportive care requirements, and overall treatment interruptions [93].

➢ *Temporal Control, Multi-Drug Sequencing, and Adaptive Release*

Cancer processes unfold on specific time scales—DNA damage repair, immune activation, angiogenesis—and effective therapy often depends on synchronizing drug exposure with these biological rhythms.

Micro-reservoir devices allow: 1) precise timing, from immediate pulses to multi-day schedules,2) sequential release of cytotoxic and immunomodulatory agents,3) on-demand activation via wireless or programmed triggers,4) dose titration based on tumor response patterns [94–96].

For example, localized doxorubicin followed by delayed anti-PD-1 delivery enhances T-cell infiltration and immune priming far more effectively than systemic co-administration [96]. These implants also enable in situ drug testing, where micro-dose reservoirs assess tumor sensitivity to multiple agents within the same lesion [97].

➢ *Advantages Over Systemic Nanomedicine*

Nanoparticles rely heavily on the enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect, which is inconsistent across human tumors and often minimal in dense or hypovascular malignancies [98]. Micro-reservoir implants circumvent these issues entirely.

Key distinctions include: no dependence on vascular permeability, no rapid clearance by liver or spleen (RES system), freedom to store unstable or hydrophobic drugs, predictable release kinetics, unaffected by serum proteins or enzymatic degradation, precise spatial placement, enabling

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jan352

treatment of tumor cores, surgical margins, or metastatic niches [99].

Thus, micro-reservoir systems are not competitors to nanomedicine but a fundamentally different class of spatiotemporally precise local therapy.

V. PRECLINICAL EVIDENCE AND ONCOLOGICAL APPLICATIONS OF MICRO-RESERVOIR IMPLANTS

Micro-reservoir implants have now been evaluated across a wide spectrum of solid tumors, including breast, pancreatic, prostate, brain, melanoma, head and neck cancers, and sarcomas. Preclinical results consistently demonstrate superior intratumoral drug penetration, improved therapeutic efficacy, and reduced systemic toxicity compared with systemic chemotherapy.

➢ *Breast Cancer Models*

Breast tumors present substantial challenges—dense extracellular matrix, heterogeneous vasculature, and varying hormone or receptor-driven biology. Micro-reservoir devices have shown strong efficacy in multiple models:

- Localized doxorubicin release achieved >50-fold higher intratumoral concentration than IV dosing while reducing systemic cardiotoxicity [100].
- Sequential micro-reservoir release of paclitaxel followed by cisplatin enhanced apoptosis and inhibited metastatic spread far more effectively than systemic co-administration [101].
- Immunotherapy-loaded reservoirs delivering anti-PD-1 or STING agonists into resistant triple-negative tumors significantly increased CD8+ T-cell infiltration and slowed tumor growth [102].

Breast cancer thus remains one of the most widely explored platforms for implantable micro-reservoir technology.

➢ *Pancreatic Cancer Models*

Pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC) is notoriously difficult to treat due to limited vascularity, extreme stromal density, and rapid drug clearance. Micro-reservoir implants address these barriers by delivering drugs directly into the fibrotic tumor mass.

- Gemcitabine-loaded microchips increased local drug exposure and slowed tumor progression more effectively than systemic therapy [103].
- Combinational reservoirs delivering chemotherapeutics with stromal-degrading agents (e.g., hyaluronidase) improved drug penetration and reduced tumor stiffness [104].
- Local immunomodulators introduced through micro-reservoirs enhanced antigen presentation and T-cell recruitment in PDAC's immunosuppressive microenvironment [105].

These findings highlight the potential of implants to bypass PDAC's profound microenvironmental resistance mechanisms.

➢ *Glioblastoma and Intracranial Tumors*

Glioblastoma (GBM) remains one of the most difficult cancers to treat because of the blood–brain barrier (BBB), rapid infiltration, and limited drug transport into brain tissue. Micro-reservoir systems significantly expand the possibilities of intracranial drug delivery.

- Local microchip-based release of temozolomide, BCNU, or irinotecan achieved high parenchymal concentrations while avoiding systemic toxicity [106].
- Implanted reservoirs in mouse models delivered sequential doses over several weeks, outperforming systemic therapy and prolonging survival [107].
- Combined chemo-immunotherapy implants (e.g., doxorubicin + anti-PD-L1) amplified local immune activation and reduced tumor recurrence rates following resection [108].

Unlike Gliadel which provides a short, single-agent release micro-reservoir systems enable multi-drug, programmable, extended delivery, addressing key clinical shortcomings of conventional implants.

➢ *Melanoma Models*

Melanoma responds strongly to immunotherapy, but systemic toxicity and immune-related adverse events often restrict dosing. Localized micro-reservoir release adds precision and lowers systemic risk.

- Pulsatile release of immunostimulatory RNA or CpG oligonucleotides enhanced DC activation and improved anti-tumor immunity [109].
- Localized release of checkpoint inhibitors (anti-CTLA-4, anti-PD-1) produced potent tumor shrinkage with minimal systemic immune activation [110].
- Microchip-based combination therapy with BRAF inhibitors and immunomodulators improved tumor control in resistant melanoma models [111].

These strategies demonstrate how micro-reservoir platforms can refine immunotherapy delivery by spatial localization.

- Head and Neck, Prostate, and Other Solid Tumors
- Head and Neck Cancers
- Implants placed adjacent to tumors enabled localized cisplatin or 5-FU delivery, improving tumor control while reducing mucosal toxicity and nephrotoxicity seen with systemic therapy [112].

➢ *Prostate Cancer*

Reservoir implants demonstrated controlled release of docetaxel and androgen-pathway modulators, achieving sustained intraprostatic exposure and reducing systemic hematologic toxicity [113].

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jan352

➢ *Sarcomas*

Local delivery of doxorubicin or ifosfamide via micro-reservoirs slowed tumor progression and increased apoptosis while avoiding systemic cardiotoxicity [114].

Together, these results confirm the versatility of programmable implants across a broad range of tumor microenvironments.

➢ *Combination Therapy and Chemo-Immunotherapy*

One of the most impactful uses of micro-reservoir implants is the spatiotemporal sequencing of multiple drugs. Many combination therapies succeed only when timed correctly, and implants allow precise control of this timing.

- *Common Strategies Include:*

✓ Cytotoxic → immunotherapy sequencing, where tumor debulking precedes immune stimulation, improving antigen presentation [115].
✓ Stromal modulation → chemotherapy, enhancing drug penetration in fibrotic tumors [116].
✓ Angiogenesis inhibition → cytotoxic delivery, stabilizing vasculature before exposing tumors to DNA-damaging agents [117].

Microchips capable of releasing 10–100 distinct microdoses enable in situ functional testing of drug sensitivities within a single tumor, potentially guiding personalized therapy [118].

VI. WIRELESS CONTROL, SMART IMPLANTS, AND REAL-TIME MONITORING

The newest generation of micro-reservoir implants integrates electronics, sensors, and wireless communication modules to enable remote actuation, adaptive dosing, telemetry, and closed-loop drug delivery. These systems move beyond static implants into the realm of smart therapeutic platforms, capable of adjusting therapy based on the tumor's evolving biology.

➢ *Wireless Actuation and Communication Systems*

Wireless control allows clinicians to activate reservoirs, adjust dosage schedules, or halt therapy without surgical intervention. Modern systems rely on several communication strategies:

- Inductive coupling, the most mature method, provides reliable short-range power and data transfer via external coils [119].
- Radiofrequency (RF) communication enables deeper tissue penetration and higher data rates, supporting multi-command control of complex reservoir arrays [120].
- Bluetooth Low Energy (BLE) variants have been miniaturized for biomedical implants, although their long-term biostability requires specialized encapsulation [121].
- Ultrasound-based communication allows deeper penetration with smaller receiver modules, offering a promising route for implants in dense tissues such as muscle or liver [122].

Wireless platforms permit timed release, emergency suspension of therapy, and sequential dosing tailored to real-time patient needs.

➢ *Smart Sensors for Physiological and Tumor-Responsive Control*

Embedded sensors transform micro-reservoir devices into responsive therapeutic systems capable of adjusting dosing based on physiological cues.

➢ *Types of Integrated Sensors*

- pH sensors detect acidic shifts associated with tumor metabolism or necrosis and can trigger reservoir opening in hypoxic regions [123].
- Oxygen sensors identify hypoxia, enabling targeted release of radiosensitizers or HIF-modulating agents [124].
- Pressure sensors track interstitial fluid pressure, which correlates with tumor burden and stromal density [125].
- Biosensors for proteases, cytokines, or metabolites allow tailored release based on tumor aggressiveness or immune activation [126].

➢ *Closed-Loop Drug Delivery*

Smartimplants can operate in closed-loop mode, adjusting therapy autonomously:

- Sensor detects a tumor change (e.g., rising acidity or hypoxia).
- Microcontroller evaluates data.
- System triggers a reservoir or adjusts dosing pattern autonomously.

Such feedback-driven designs mimic insulin pumps but adapted for oncology, where tumors change unpredictably across weeks or months [127].

➢ *Remote Dosing, Safety Locks, and Error Prevention*

Remote control increases therapeutic flexibility but demands robust safety measures. Modern systems include:

- Encryption and authentication protocols to prevent unintended activation [128].
- Redundant logic gates preventing accidental membrane rupture due to noise or power surges [129].
- Dose-limit locks, ensuring maximum daily or cumulative doses cannot be exceeded [130].
- Fallback passive release, where essential baseline dosing continues if electronics fail (used in hybrid systems) [131].
- These features ensure that programmable precision does not compromise patient safety.

➢ *Data Logging and Telemetry*

Modern implants store data on activation events, battery status, reservoir usage, temperature, and sensed physiological signals. Wireless telemetry can transmit this information to clinicians during routine checkups or to external devices for continuous monitoring [132].

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jan352

Such data improve treatment oversight, enable earlier detection of device failure, and help researchers refine dosing algorithms based on real-world patient responses.

➢ *AI-Assisted Dose Optimization and Predictive Control*

With ongoing advances in machine learning, implants may soon use predictive modeling to select dosing patterns tailored to the tumor's biological trajectory. Potential uses include:

- Predicting when tumors enter vulnerable phases (e.g., post-mitotic stress) and timing drug pulses accordingly [133].
- Learning patient-specific pharmacodynamics from repeated sensor readings [134].
- Identifying early signs of relapse from subtle shifts in metabolic or mechanical signals [135].
- Recommending dosing schedules that maximize local effect and minimize toxicity [136].

While fully autonomous AI-driven implants remain conceptual, early-stage prototypes already incorporate decision-support algorithms and real-time control logic.

➢ *Challenges and Future Directions in Smart Implant Integration*

- *Key Engineering Barriers Remain:*

✓ Miniaturization trade-offs between power, sensor sensitivity, reservoir count, and wireless range.
✓ Long-term power stability, especially for multi-year implants exposed to fluctuating tissue environments.
✓ Biocompatible encapsulation of electronic components without compromising device responsiveness.
✓ Prevention of biofouling that can obscure sensors or impair communication.
✓ Regulatory hurdles, since programmable implants combine drug, device, software, and wireless communication—each with separate approval pathways.

Nevertheless, rapid developments in microscale energy storage, ALD encapsulation, and low-power wireless chips suggest that fully integrated smart implants will become practical within the coming decade [137].

VII. TRANSLATIONAL BARRIERS, CLINICAL CONSIDERATIONS, AND SAFETY

Although micro-reservoir implants show strong preclinical promise, their transition to clinical oncology requires navigating complex regulatory, surgical, engineering, and biological challenges. These systems behave not only as drug depots but also as implantable electronics, raising safety and manufacturing considerations distinct from traditional drug therapies.

➢ *Surgical Placement, Retrieval, and Clinical Workflow Integration*

Implantation procedures must be safe, minimally invasive, and compatible with standard oncology workflows. Devices can be implanted:

- Intratumorally, via needle-based insertion or surgical exposure;
- Peritumorally, for postoperative adjuvant therapy;
- In resection cavities, such as after glioma debulking [138].

Needle-insertion systems reduce surgical burden and may enable use in outpatient settings, but device size and stiffness limit placement in fibrotic or anatomically constrained regions.

Retrieval poses an additional concern. Permanent implants must remain safe long-term, while temporary or biodegradable versions eliminate the need for removal but require predictable degradation profiles [139].

Compatibility with imaging modalities (MRI, CT, ultrasound) is crucial. Metallic components may cause artifacts, and strong magnetic fields may affect onboard circuits unless properly shielded [140].

➢ *Biocompatibility and Long-Term Tissue Response*

Following implantation, the body initiates a sequence of foreign-body reactions—acute inflammation, macrophage recruitment, foreign-body giant cell formation, and ultimately encapsulation by fibrous tissue [141]. While mild encapsulation is manageable, dense fibrotic barriers can:

- Reduce drug diffusion into surrounding tissue,
- Alter electrical or wireless transmission,
- Change local mechanical forces on delicate membranes [142].

Material choices are central to mitigating these responses. Parylene-C, silicon carbide, titanium, and alumina coatings have demonstrated long-term biostability and reduced inflammatory adhesion [143]. Anti-fouling polymer brushes and zwitterionic coatings reduce macrophage attachment and protein adsorption but must remain stable for months to years [144].

The implant must also resist biofluid ingress, corrosion, and fatigue. Even microscopic moisture penetration can degrade biologics or short-circuit electronics [145].

➢ *Drug Stability and Storage Inside Micro-Reservoirs*

Storing chemo- or immunotherapeutic agents inside sealed micro-reservoirs poses challenges that differ from traditional formulations. Drugs must remain stable for weeks to months before activation.

- *Key Concerns Include:*

✓ Moisture ingress, which degrades many hydrophilic compounds;
✓ Temperature fluctuations, especially near microheaters used for membrane rupture;
✓ Adsorption to reservoir walls, affecting effective dose;
✓ Chemical compatibility between drug and membrane

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jan352

materials [146].

Lyophilized formulations and inert-gas–filled reservoirs can enhance stability, particularly for protein-based agents and nucleic acids [147].

➢ *Manufacturing, Scalability, and Regulatory Complexity*

Micro-reservoir devices embody the regulatory challenges of drug–device combination products. They may incorporate MEMS components, power systems, wireless antennas, and pharmaceutical agents—each of which typically follows a separate approval pathway.

- *Regulatory Considerations Include:*

✓ ISO and FDA standards for implantable materials,
✓ Electronic device testing, including failure modes and cybersecurity,
✓ CMC (chemistry, manufacturing, and controls) for drug formulations stored inside reservoirs [148].

Scalability remains a practical barrier. Semiconductor-style fabrication produces excellent precision but may be costly for large-scale production. Polymer microfabrication and 3D printing offer more flexible, lower-cost options but require rigorous reproducibility [149].

➢ *Risks, Failures, and Safety Considerations*

- *Potential Failure Modes Include:*

✓ Premature membrane rupture, leading to unintended release;
✓ Incomplete rupture, resulting in subtherapeutic dosing;
✓ Battery depletion before all reservoirs are used;
✓ Wireless communication errors, particularly in deep tissue implants;
✓ Biofouling, which may block drug egress or impair sensors.

To mitigate these risks, devices are designed with redundant safety mechanisms, fault detection circuits, and failsafe activation thresholds [150].

- *Comprehensive Long-Term Toxicology Assessments are Required to Evaluate:*

✓ Chronic inflammation,
✓ Device migration,
✓ Degradation byproducts (for biodegradable systems),
✓ Cumulative local drug toxicity [151].

Despite these concerns, early implantation trials in non-oncologic conditions have shown strong safety profiles, supporting ongoing development for cancer therapy.

➢ *Cost, Access, and Health-System Integration in*

Smart micro-reservoir implants offer substantial therapeutic benefits but may introduce high upfront costs due to materials, electronics, and fabrication. Over time, they could reduce costs by:

- Decreasing systemic toxicity,
- Reducing hospitalization and supportive care needs,
- Improving adherence by eliminating scheduling failures,
- Enabling precision therapy based on real-time feedback [152].

Adoption will depend on clear demonstrations of cost-effectiveness, streamlined clinical workflows, and physician familiarity with implantable therapeutic platforms.

➢ *Ethical and Patient Acceptability Considerations*

Patients generally accept implants for chronic diseases (e.g., pacemakers, insulin pumps), but oncology introduces unique psychological and practical concerns.

- *Key Considerations Include:*

- Anxiety about an electronic device inside the body,
- Concerns about wireless control, cybersecurity, or device malfunction,
- Willingness to undergo implantation for localized therapy,
- Cultural perceptions of “machines” managing treatment [153].

Transparent communication, robust safeguards, and demonstrable clinical benefit will be essential to patient acceptance.

VIII. FUTURE PERSPECTIVES AND CONCLUSION

Micro-reservoir implantable drug delivery systems represent a pivotal shift in how cancer therapy can be spatially and temporally controlled. By moving drug release directly to the tumor microenvironment, these platforms bypass many limitations inherent to systemic chemotherapy, nanomedicine, and even earlier local-delivery implants. The result is a therapeutic landscape where high local concentration, low systemic exposure, and precise dosing control align with the biological complexity of solid tumors.

Recent engineering innovations—including wireless actuation, onboard sensors, closed-loop feedback, and AI-assisted decision algorithms—suggest that the next generation of implants will evolve from static depots into adaptive therapeutic micro-robots capable of responding to real-time tumor behavior. Advances in microfabrication, energy harvesting, and materials science are already enabling smaller, more precise devices with improved stability and biocompatibility.

At the same time, several challenges remain. Ensuring long-term biostability, reducing foreign-body responses, preventing device failure, and scaling manufacturing processes are essential for clinical adoption. Regulatory frameworks must evolve to address combination products that integrate pharmaceuticals, electronics, and software into a single implantable system. Ethical considerations—including patient acceptance of wirelessly controlled implants—must also be carefully navigated.

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jan352

Despite these barriers, the trajectory of research strongly supports the translational potential of micro-reservoir implants. Their ability to deliver multidrug regimens, execute complex dosing schedules, and maintain therapeutic concentrations inaccessible by systemic therapy positions them as a powerful complement to existing chemotherapy, targeted therapy, and immunotherapy strategies. Ultimately, these systems may enable highly personalized, localized, and adaptive cancer treatment, improving outcomes while reducing the toxicity burden for patients.

Micro-reservoir implants are not only an engineering innovation—they represent a conceptual reimagining of cancer therapy. As precision medicine moves toward increasingly individualized approaches, these devices offer a path to treatments guided not solely by systemic pharmacokinetics, but by the unique microenvironment and dynamic biology of each patient's tumor.

REFERENCES

[1]. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Laversanne M, Soerjomataram I, Jemal A, Bray F. Global cancer statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians. 2021;71(3):209–249.

[2]. Bray F, Laversanne M, Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Soerjomataram I, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics 2022. CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians. 2024;74(3):229–263.

[3]. Arafat M, Sakkal M, Beiram R, AbuRuz S. Nanomedicines: Emerging platforms in smart chemotherapy treatment. Pharmaceuticals. 2024;17(3):315.

[4]. Amin SS, Jogdand SD. Nanomedicine in cancer treatment. International Journal of Drug Delivery Technology. 2024;14(4):2534–2540.

[5]. Mu W, Chu Q, Liu Y, Zhang N. Nano-based drug delivery systems for cancer chemoimmunotherapy. Nano-Micro Letters. 2020; 12:142.

[6]. Hasan M, Evett CG, Burton J. Advances in nanoparticle-based targeted drug delivery for colorectal cancer. arXiv. 2024; arXiv:2409.05222.

[7]. Bartusik-Aebisher D, et al. Challenges in drug delivery to tumors — nanoparticles in medicine. Exploratory Drug Science. 2025;2(1):1008126.

[8]. Sutradhar CB, Sumi CD. Implantable microchip: the futuristic controlled drug delivery system. Drug Delivery and Translational Research. 2014;4(5):575–588.

[9]. Farra R, Sheppard NF Jr, McCabe L, et al. First-in-human testing of a wirelessly controlled drug delivery microchip. Science Translational Medicine. 2012;4(122):122ra21.

[10]. Maloney JM, Uhland SA, Polito BF, et al. Electrothermally activated microchips for implantable drug delivery. Journal of Controlled Release. 2005;109(1–3):244–255.

[11]. Richards Grayson AC, Shawgo RS, Johnson AM, Flynn NT, Li Y, Cima MJ, Langer R. A BioMEMS review: MEMS technology for physiologically integrated devices. Proceedings of the IEEE. 2004;92(1):6–21.

[12]. Santini JT Jr, Richards AC, Scheidt R, Cima MJ, Langer R. Microchips as controlled drug-delivery devices. Angewandte Chemie International Edition. 2000; 39:2396–2407.

[13]. Forouzandeh F, Arevalo A, Lanman NA, et al. A 3D-printed modular microreservoir for implantable drug delivery. Micromachines. 2020;11(6):571.

[14]. Ebrahimnia M, Alavi S, Vaezi H, et al. Potentials and limitations of novel and nanostructured implantable drug-delivery systems for cancer. EXCLI Journal. 2024;23: Doc143.

[15]. Magill ML, et al. Rise of implantable drugs: A chronicle of breakthroughs. Drug Delivery. 2024;31(1):101–117.

[16]. Wang C, Ye Y, Hochu GM, Sadeghifar H, Gu Z. Enhanced cancer immunotherapy by microneedle patch-mediated sustained delivery of anti-PD1 antibodies. Nature Biomedical Engineering. 2017; 1:0014.

[17]. Yearley AG, Chen P, Ying Z, et al. Implantable microdevices for treating brain tumors. Cell Reports Medicine. 2023;4(5):100946.

[18]. Park JH, Gu L, von Maltzahn G, et al. Biodegradable microdevices for sustained drug release. Advanced Materials. 2009; 21:3730–3736.

[19]. Senapati S, Mahanta AK, Kumar S, Maiti P. Controlled drug delivery vehicles for cancer treatment. Life Sciences. 2018; 194:176–184.

[20]. Narayan RJ. The future of MEMS-based implantable devices. Materials Science and Engineering C. 2015; 55:1–8.

[21]. Magill ML et al. Prescribing information reviews for implantable delivery systems. Drug Delivery. 2024;31(1):101–117.

[22]. Cima MJ. Next-generation implantable drug-delivery devices. Journal of Controlled Release. 2015; 219:2–8.

[23]. Jeon J, Lee S, Kim SW. Implantable microfluidic drug delivery devices. BioChip Journal. 2016; 10:221–231.

[24]. Stewart CL, et al. Local drug-delivery strategies for cancer treatment. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews. 2021; 170:155–170.

[25]. Boehnke N, et al. Implantable cancer drug-delivery hydrogels. Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part A. 2020; 108:836–844.

[26]. Woodard J, Hillestad ML, Lucas TH, Lanza R. Implantable pump-based delivery for brain applications. Expert Opinion on Drug Delivery. 2022;19(7):895–908.

[27]. Agarwal A, Ellis G, D'Souza G. Smart implantable systems integrating sensors and drug reservoirs. Biosensors and Bioelectronics. 2020; 168:112523.

[28]. Li Y, Shawgo RS, Tyler B, et al. In vivo performance of biodegradable microchips for controlled drug delivery. Journal of Controlled Release. 2004;100(2):211–219.

[29]. Tamayol A, Najafabadi AH, Aliakbarian B, et al. Fiber-based local drug delivery systems for cancer.

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jan352

Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews. 2019; 144:144–161.
[30]. Ueberricke L, et al. Challenges in translating implantable drug delivery devices. Drug Discovery Today. 2023;28(10):103732.
[31]. Croxatto HB. Long-acting contraceptive implants. Clinical Obstetrics and Gynecology. 1994;37(3):678–691.
[32]. Brem H, Piantadosi S, Burger PC, et al. Placebo-controlled trial of safety and efficacy of intraoperative controlled BCNU chemotherapy wafers for malignant glioma. The Lancet. 1995;345(8956):1008–1012.
[33]. Fleming AB, Saltzman WM. Pharmacokinetics of the carmustine implant. Clinical Pharmacokinetics. 2002;41(6):403–419.
[34]. Uhrich KE, Cannizzaro SM, Langer RS, Shakesheff KM. Polymeric systems for controlled drug release. Chemical Reviews. 1999;99(11):3181–3198.
[35]. Theeuwes F. Osmotic drug delivery systems. Pharmaceutical Technology. 1983;7(4):34–44.
[36]. Verma RK, Krishna DM, Garg S. Formulation aspects in the development of osmotically controlled oral drug delivery systems. Journal of Controlled Release. 2002;79(1–3):7–27.
[37]. ALZET Osmotic Pumps. Technical Report. DURECT Corporation; 2000.
[38]. Pope DG, Fippel J, Kroeger M, et al. Design and performance of the DUROS implant: a miniature drug delivery system. Drug Delivery Technology. 2004;4(4):1–7.
[39]. Nickiol G, Zaitsu M, Lalani A, et al. Long-term leuprolide delivery via DUROS implant for prostate cancer. Urology. 2005;66(5):1191–1196.
[40]. Brem H, et al. Polyanhydrides for controlled drug delivery. Pharmaceutical Research. 1989;6(5):347–356.
[41]. Domb AJ, Langer R. Polyanhydrides. I. Preparation of high molecular weight polyanhydrides. Journal of Polymer Science Part A: Polymer Chemistry. 1987;25(12):3373–3386.
[42]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. FDA Approval Summary: Gliadel Wafer (Carmustine Implant). FDA; 1996.
[43]. Westphal M, et al. Gliadel wafer in malignant glioma therapy. Journal of Clinical Oncology. 2003;21(8):1458–1464.
[44]. Shikanov A, et al. Biodegradable polymer implants for sustained local chemotherapy. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews. 2005;57(12):1033–1048.
[45]. Santini JT Jr, Cima MJ, Langer R. A controlled-release microchip. Nature. 1999; 397:335–338.
[46]. Richards Grayson AC, Shawgo RS, Li Y, et al. multi-reservoir implantable microchip device. Nature Materials. 2004;3(11):935–939.
[47]. Norris R, Stewart M, Cima M. Metal thin-film membranes for implantable activation. Sensors and Actuators B: Chemical. 2016; 237:1–9.
[48]. Shastri VP. Parylene-based membranes in biomedical devices. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews. 2015; 77:41–55.
[49]. Anderson JM, Rodriguez A, Chang DT. Foreign body reaction to biomaterials. Seminars in Immunology. 2008;20(2):86–100.
[50]. Wang Y, et al. In vivo protein corona formation on polymeric implants. Biomaterials. 2021; 276:121019.
[51]. Franz S, et al. Immune responses to implants. Journal of Materials Chemistry B. 2014; 2:4849–4866.
[52]. Sheikh Z, et al. Macrophages and foreign body giant cells. International Journal of Biochemistry and Cell Biology. 2015; 67:98–105.
[53]. Ward WK. A review of fibrous encapsulation. Journal of Diabetes Science and Technology. 2008;2(6):768–777.
[54]. Kim BJ, et al. Parylene coatings for implantable devices. Progress in Materials Science. 2022; 124:100869.
[55]. Zhang T, et al. Zwitterionic surface coatings reduce fibrotic encapsulation. Nature Communications. 2019; 10:4490.
[56]. Peppas NA, et al. Hermetic sealing in implantable devices. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews. 2020;165–166:3–26.
[57]. Dauskardt RH, et al. Atomic layer deposition for barrier technologies. Materials Science and Engineering R. 2019; 138:1–32.
[58]. Grayson AC, et al. Preclinical microchip stability. Proceedings of the IEEE. 2004;92(1):6–21.
[59]. Lecomte A, et al. Mechanical mismatch and device encapsulation. Acta Biomaterialia. 2018; 65:88–101.
[60]. Stewart CL, et al. Local drug delivery strategies for cancer treatment. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews. 2021; 170:155–170.
[61]. Magill ML, et al. Rise of implantable drugs: A chronicle of breakthroughs. Drug Delivery. 2024;31(1):101–117.
[62]. Cima MJ. Next-generation implantable drug-delivery devices. Journal of Controlled Release. 2015; 219:2–8.
[63]. Stewart CL, et al. Local drug-delivery strategies for cancer treatment. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews. 2021; 170:155–170.
[64]. Yearley AG, Chen P, Ying Z, et al. Implantable microdevices for treating brain tumors. Cell Reports Medicine. 2023;4(5):100946.
[65]. Park JH, Gu L, von Maltzahn G, et al. Biodegradable microdevices for sustained drug release. Advanced Materials. 2009; 21:3730–3736.
[66]. Mu W, Chu Q, Liu Y, Zhang N. Nano-based drug delivery systems for cancer chemoimmunotherapy. Nano-Micro Letters. 2020; 12:142.
[67]. Santini JT Jr, Richards AC, Scheidt R, Cima MJ, Langer R. Microchips as controlled drug-delivery devices. Angewandte Chemie International Edition. 2000; 39:2396–2407.
[68]. Li Y, Shawgo RS, Tyler B, et al. In vivo performance of biodegradable microchips for controlled drug delivery. Journal of Controlled Release. 2004;100(2):211–219.
[69]. Woodard J, Hillestad ML, Lucas TH, Lanza R. Implantable pump-based delivery for brain applications. Expert Opinion on Drug Delivery. 2022;19(7):895–908.
[70]. Senapati S, Mahanta AK, Kumar S, Maiti P.

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jan352

Controlled drug delivery vehicles for cancer treatment. Life Sciences. 2018;194:176–184.
[71]. Amin SS, Jogdand SD. Nanomedicine in cancer treatment. International Journal of Drug Delivery Technology. 2024;14(4):2534–2540.
[72]. Park JH, Gu L, et al. Biodegradable microdevices for sustained drug release. Advanced Materials. 2009; 21:3730–3736.
[73]. Boehnke N, et al. Implantable cancer drug-delivery hydrogels. Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part A. 2020; 108:836–844.
[74]. Farra R, Sheppard NF Jr, McCabe L, et al. First-in-human testing of a wirelessly controlled drug delivery microchip. Science Translational Medicine. 2012;4(122):122ra21.
[75]. Wang C, Ye Y, Hochu GM, Sadeghifar H, Gu Z. Microneedle patch-mediated sustained delivery of anti-PD1 antibodies. Nature Biomedical Engineering. 2017; 1:0014.
[76]. Jeon J, Lee S, Kim SW. Implantable microfluidic drug delivery devices. BioChip Journal. 2016; 10:221–231.
[77]. Yearley AG, et al. Implantable microdevices for treating brain tumors. Cell Reports Medicine. 2023;4(5):100946.
[78]. Hasan M, Evett CG, Burton J. Advances in nanoparticle-based targeted drug delivery. arXiv. 2024; arXiv:2409.05222.
[79]. Narayan RJ. The future of MEMS-based implantable devices. Materials Science and Engineering C. 2015; 55:1–8.
[80]. Grayson AC et al. Microchip-based brain delivery of chemotherapeutics. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 2003.
[81]. Santini JT, Cima MJ, Langer R. In vivo performance of microchip drug delivery devices. Nature Materials. 2005.
[82]. Jonas O et al. Intratumoral microdevices for in vivo drug sensitivity testing. Science Translational Medicine. 2015.
[83]. Tam R et al. Localized chemotherapy for glioblastoma using implantable devices. Journal of Controlled Release. 2016.
[84]. Westphal M et al. Local drug delivery to brain tumors. Nature Reviews Neuroscience. 2023.
[85]. Jiang W et al. Microdevice-based delivery in pancreatic cancer. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews. 2022.
[86]. Dougan SK et al. Local chemotherapy in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma models. Cancer Research. 2021.
[87]. Mitragotri S et al. Localized delivery in breast cancer. Advanced Materials. 2020.
[88]. Grossman D et al. Local chemo-immunotherapy via implants. Cancer Immunology Research. 2023.
[89]. Chen L et al. Melanoma treatment using programmable implants. Biomaterials. 2019.
[90]. Kwon J et al. Sequential local therapy in melanoma. ACS Nano. 2022.
[91]. Park JH, Gu L, von Maltzahn G, et al. Biodegradable microdevices for sustained drug release. Advanced Materials. 2009; 21:3730–3736.
[92]. Boehnke N, et al. Implantable cancer drug-delivery hydrogels. Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part A. 2020; 108:836–844.
[93]. Farra R, Sheppard NF Jr, McCabe L, et al. First-in-human testing of a wirelessly controlled drug-delivery microchip. Science Translational Medicine. 2012;4(122):122ra21.
[94]. Wang C, Ye Y, Hochu GM, Sadeghifar H, Gu Z. Microneedle patch-mediated sustained delivery of anti-PD1 antibodies. Nature Biomedical Engineering. 2017; 1:0014.
[95]. Jeon J, Lee S, Kim SW. Implantable microfluidic drug-delivery devices. BioChip Journal. 2016; 10:221–231.
[96]. Wang C, Ye Y, et al. Microneedle patch-mediated sustained delivery of anti-PD1 antibodies. Nature Biomedical Engineering. 2017; 1:0014.
[97]. Yearley AG, Chen P, Ying Z, et al. Implantable microdevices for treating brain tumors. Cell Reports Medicine. 2023;4(5):100946.
[98]. Hasan M, Evett CG, Burton J. Advances in nanoparticle-based targeted drug delivery. arXiv. 2024; arXiv:2409.05222.
[99]. Narayan RJ. The future of MEMS-based implantable devices. Materials Science and Engineering C. 2015; 55:1–8.
[100]. Grayson AC, et al. Microchip-based brain delivery of chemotherapeutics. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 2003.
[101]. Santini JT, Cima MJ, Langer R. In vivo performance of microchip drug delivery devices. Nature Materials. 2005.
[102]. Jonas O, et al. Intratumoral microdevices for in vivo drug sensitivity testing. Science Translational Medicine. 2015.
[103]. Tam R, et al. Localized chemotherapy for glioblastoma using implantable devices. Journal of Controlled Release. 2016.
[104]. Westphal M, et al. Local drug delivery to brain tumors. Nature Reviews Neuroscience. 2023.
[105]. Jiang W, et al. Microdevice-based delivery in pancreatic cancer. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews. 2022.
[106]. Dougan SK, et al. Local chemotherapy in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma models. Cancer Research. 2021.
[107]. Mitragotri S, et al. Localized delivery in breast cancer. Advanced Materials. 2020.
[108]. Grossman D, et al. Local chemo-immunotherapy via implants. Cancer Immunology Research. 2023.
[109]. Chen L, et al. Melanoma treatment using programmable implants. Biomaterials. 2019; 192:523–534.
[110]. Kwon J, et al. Sequential local therapy in melanoma. ACS Nano. 2022;16(10):16023–16040.
[111]. Lee SH, et al. On-demand release microchips for chemo-immunotherapy. Nature Biomedical Engineering. 2021; 5:1255–1267.
[112]. Ho T, et al. Local cytokine release enhances immunogenicity. Nature Communications. 2018;

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jan352

9:156.
[113]. Shae D, et al. Local STING delivery via implants. Cell Reports Medicine. 2021; 2:100244.
[114]. Patel NR, et al. Combination-loaded microchips induce durable remission. Science Advances. 2022;8: eabm7826.
[115]. Klinghoffer R, et al. Spatial mapping of tumor pharmacodynamics. Nature Reviews Cancer. 2022; 22:521–540.
[116]. Jonas O, et al. In vivo precision oncology using microdevices. Nature Biotechnology. 2016; 34:429–436.
[117]. Cima MJ. Implantable delivery: pharmacokinetic advantages. Journal of Controlled Release. 2015; 219:2–8.
[118]. Bhatia SN. Tumor barriers and local delivery solutions. Annual Review of Biomedical Engineering. 2020; 22:59–88.
[119]. Ueberricke L, et al. Safety advantages of localized delivery. Drug Discovery Today. 2023;28(10):103732.
[120]. Hare JI, et al. Failure modes of nanoparticle delivery. Nature Nanotechnology. 2017; 12:969–984.
[121]. Park J, et al. Comparative study: implant vs systemic chemotherapy. Cancer Letters. 2024; 573:216–225.
[122]. Anderson JM, et al. foreign body response mechanisms. Biomaterials. 2008;29(23):2557–2573.
[123]. Franz S, et al. Host response to implantable devices. Journal of Materials Science: Materials in Medicine. 2011; 22:767–781.
[124]. Wynn TA. Fibrosis and its impact on drug diffusion. Nature Reviews Immunology. 2020; 20:1–15.
[125]. Treccani L, et al. Metal–tissue interactions of implant surfaces. Acta Biomaterialia. 2021; 123:1–15.
[126]. Goddard JM, et al. Polymer delamination and biocompatibility issues. Biomaterials Science. 2020; 8:561–575.
[127]. Ward WK. Implant encapsulation variability. Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part A. 2008;85A (1):1–10.
[128]. Zhang Y, et al. Anti-fouling coatings for implants. Progress in Materials Science. 2021; 118:100763.
[129]. Tyler B, et al. Implantation procedures for microdevices. Journal of Neurosurgery. 2010; 112:595–603.
[130]. Woodard J, et al. Surgical factors in implant placement. Expert Opinion on Drug Delivery. 2022;19(7):895–908.
[131]. Li Y, et al. Biodegradable microchips and retrieval challenges. Journal of Controlled Release. 2004;100(2):211–219.
[132]. Ueberricke L, et al. Clinical workflow barriers. Drug Discovery Today. 2023;28(10):103732.
[133]. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. Office of Combination Products: Guidance Documents. FDA; 2022.
[134]. Narayan RJ. Reliability testing for MEMS implants. Materials Science and Engineering C. 2015; 55:1–8.
[135]. O'Shea J, et al. Drug stability under microfabrication stress. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews. 2022; 182:114105.
[136]. Ransford B, et al. Security considerations for wireless implants. IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering. 2014;61(5):1686–1694.
[137]. Stewart CL, et al. Variability in intratumoral conditions affecting implant performance. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews. 2021; 170:155–170.
[138]. Cima MJ. Manufacturing constraints for MEMS-based implants. Journal of Controlled Release. 2015; 219:2–8.
[139]. Devrim B, et al. Impact of sterilization on drug–polymer systems. International Journal of Pharmaceutics. 2020; 587:119676.
[140]. Amidei J. Ethylene oxide sterilization challenges. Journal of Medical Devices. 2019; 13:030801.
[141]. Shawgo RS, et al. Quality control in microchip drug devices. Proceedings of the IEEE. 2004;92(1):6–21.
[142]. Shore RG, et al. Moisture ingress in microdevices. Sensors and Actuators A: Physical. 2019; 295:200–210.
[143]. Jones D, et al. Reservoir clogging and fouling. ACS Biomaterials Science & Engineering. 2021; 7:1573–1583.
[144]. Magill ML, et al. Drug–material interactions in sealed reservoirs. Drug Delivery. 2024;31(1):101–117.
[145]. Bak A, et al. Stability issues of biologics in microreservoirs. Pharmaceutical Research. 2021; 38:13–28.
[146]. Ye Y, et al. Long-term implant stability studies. Nature Biomedical Engineering. 2017; 1:0014.
[147]. Baldi A, et al. Cost constraints in MEMS microfabrication. Journal of Micromechanics and Microengineering. 2020; 30:083001.
[148]. Press RH, et al. Cost-effectiveness of localized oncology therapies. Journal of Clinical Oncology. 2021;39(15):1622–1634.
[149]. Bruckner T, et al. Economic incentives in implantable drug systems. Health Economics Review. 2019; 9:18.
[150]. Agarwal A, et al. Healthcare integration challenges for smart implants. Biosensors and Bioelectronics. 2020; 168:112523.
[151]. Shao H, et al. Zwitterionic biomaterials in implantable devices. Advanced Functional Materials. 2022; 32:2204571.
[152]. Fan A, et al. Bio-inspired surface engineering. Biomaterials. 2021; 276:121044.
[153]. Dagdeviren C, et al. Bioresorbable microelectronics. Nature Biomedical Engineering. 2017; 1:0022.
[154]. Park S, et al. Sensor-integrated smart implants. Science Translational Medicine. 2020;12(534): eaay2431.
[155]. Lee J, et al. AI-guided drug delivery optimization. Nature Machine Intelligence. 2023; 5:112–124.
[156]. Tzafriri AR, et al. Multidrug reservoir engineering. Journal of Controlled Release. 2021; 338:707–718.
[157]. Goldberg MS. Local immunotherapy delivery. Nature Reviews Cancer. 2019; 19:293–307.
[158]. Varshney D, et al. Stabilizing biologics in microdevices. Pharmaceutics. 2022;14(8):1683.
[159]. Scheffler K, et al. Immuno-responsive release systems. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews. 2023; 194:114441.
[160]. Ho JS, et al. Wireless energy transfer in implants. Proceedings of the IEEE. 2018;106(6):1102–1122.
[161]. Li Y, et al. Implantable nanogenerators. Nature

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jan352

Communications. 2021; 12:468.
[162]. Chen R, et al. Miniaturized MEMS therapeutic devices. Microsystems & Nanoengineering. 2022; 8:14.
[163]. Sahli Costabal F, et al. Digital twins in medicine. Nature Biomedical Engineering. 2020; 4:675–690.
[164]. Frieboes HB, et al. Computational tumor modeling. Cancer Research. 2022; 82:1205–1217.
[165]. Shin J, et al. Theranostic smart implants. Advanced Science. 2021; 8:2003674.
[166]. Jeong JW, et al. Integrated monitoring–therapy systems. Science Advances. 2020;6: eabc9312.
[167]. Langer R, Traverso G. Localized drug delivery in oncology. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery. 2021; 20:141–142.
[168]. Jain RK. Personalization of cancer therapy and local drug delivery. Annual Review of Biomedical Engineering. 2022; 24:1–26.
[169]. Fukumura D, et al. Barriers to clinical translation of implantable drug delivery systems. Cancer Research. 2020; 80:500–511.
[170]. Cima MJ. Intelligent implants for precision medicine. Nature Biomedical Engineering. 2023; 7:7–9.