ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26oct801

Comprehensive Report on the Role of Protein Nano Particle in the Effective Treatment of Cancer

Supraja.S. A.[1]; Santhanalakshmi V.[2]; Dr. D. P. Sivasakti Balan[3]; R. J. Thayumanaswamy[4]

[1](Grade 11); [2]Mentor; [3](Principal); [4](CEO)

[1;2;3;4]KRM Public School, Sembium, Chennai

Publication Date: 2026/10/22

Abstract: Nanotechnology has emerged as a promising approach in modern medicine, particularly in targeted drug delivery and cancer treatment. Metal nanoparticles, such as gold, silver, and iron oxide nanoparticles, possess unique optical, magnetic, and chemical properties that make them useful in therapeutic and diagnostic applications. However, certain metal-based systems may face limitations, including potential toxicity, accumulation in organs, immune-system interactions, and difficulties in long-term clearance from the body. In contrast, protein-based nanoparticles, made from biocompatible materials such as albumin and gelatin, are being investigated as alternative drug-delivery systems. Their potential advantages include biodegradability, biocompatibility, and the ability to carry therapeutic substances. Nevertheless, their stability, drug-loading capacity, and effectiveness depend on their composition and design. This study aims to compare metal and protein-based nanoparticles in drug delivery by examining their mechanisms, advantages, limitations, safety concerns, and potential applications in cancer treatment. Through a review of existing scientific literature, the research seeks to understand whether protein-based nanoparticles offer meaningful advantages over metal-based and other systems and identify the challenges that must be addressed to improve the safety and effectiveness of nanomedicine. It also aims at promoting protein based nanoparticles for drug delivery in chemotherapy. The research is concluded by proposing protein-based nanoparticles as promising drug-delivery systems in cancer treatment, particularly due to their biocompatibility and ability to transport therapeutic agents.

Keywords: *Protein Nanoparticles, Cancer Treatment, Drug Delivery, Biocompatibility, Toxicity, Biodegradability, Immunogenicity, Nanotechnology, Albumin, Abraxane.*

How to Cite: Supraja.S. A.; Santhanalakshmi V.; Dr. D. P. Sivasakti Balan; R. J. Thayumanaswamy (2026) Comprehensive Report on the Role of Protein Nano Particle in the Effective Treatment of Cancer. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 11(10), 1351-1359. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26oct801

I. INTRODUCTION

Nanotechnology is the science of building, designing, and manipulating matter at an extremely small scale, typically between 1 and 100 nanometers, where materials exhibit unique physical, chemical, and biological properties. It has numerous applications across various fields, including medicine, electronics, materials science, energy, and environmental protection. In medicine, nanotechnology enables the development of smart drug-delivery systems, highly sensitive biosensors, and advanced imaging agents. In electronics, it supports the production of smaller and faster computer chips, high-capacity energy-storage devices, and flexible displays. In materials science, nanotechnology helps develop lighter, stronger, and self-cleaning materials for textiles, aerospace components, and construction. It also contributes to improving solar-cell efficiency, hydrogen storage, and water-purification membranes. One of its most promising applications is cancer treatment, where it offers innovative approaches to overcoming some of the limitations of conventional therapies such as chemotherapy, which can damage healthy tissues along with cancer cells. Nanocarriers, including liposomes, polymeric micelles, dendrimers, and metal-based nanoparticles, can transport anticancer drugs while protecting them from premature degradation in the bloodstream. These nanoparticles may accumulate in tumor tissues through passive targeting, which takes advantage of the abnormal blood vessels commonly found in tumors, or active targeting, in which surface molecules such as ligands or antibodies are designed to bind to specific receptors on cancer cells. By improving drug delivery to tumor tissues, certain nanomedicines may reduce exposure to healthy tissues and minimize some side effects, such as nausea, hair loss, and nerve damage. For example, albumin-bound paclitaxel, marketed as Abraxane, is a clinically used nanomedicine. Nanocarriers are also being investigated for overcoming drug resistance by helping drugs bypass cellular defense mechanisms, such as drug-efflux pumps, that remove

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26oct801

drugs from cancer cells. Additionally, certain engineered nanoparticles are being studied for their potential to cross biological barriers, including the blood–brain barrier, which presents a major challenge in treating brain tumors such as glioblastoma. Other approaches include photothermal therapy, in which materials such as gold nanoshells convert externally applied near-infrared light into heat to damage cancer cells, and magnetic nanoparticle-based techniques that use magnetic fields for therapeutic purposes. Nanotechnology also supports the development of gene-delivery systems that may help regulate or alter cancer-related genetic activity. In cancer diagnosis and monitoring, quantum dots and magnetic nanoparticles are being explored as imaging agents to improve tumor visualization through fluorescence imaging and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), while some nanoparticle-based contrast agents are being investigated for other imaging techniques, including computed tomography (CT). These technologies may assist in detecting tumors, identifying molecular features, and monitoring treatment responses. Despite these advances, nanotechnology-based cancer treatments have limitations, including possible toxicity, difficulties in large-scale production, variations in nanoparticle distribution, and challenges in delivering sufficient quantities of drugs to tumors. Therefore, further research is necessary to evaluate the safety, effectiveness, and clinical benefits of different nanoparticle systems and to determine how they can contribute to more precise, effective, and safer cancer treatments.

Cancer, particularly breast cancer, poses significant health challenges worldwide, especially in India where cases are on the rise. Existing treatments, including chemotherapy and targeted therapies, often come with complications such as side effects and drug resistance. To enhance treatment efficacy, research is exploring nanotechnology, which utilizes nanoparticles for precise drug delivery. Among various types, protein nanoparticles like albumin-bound paclitaxel are noteworthy due to their compatibility with human biology and ability to transport therapeutic agents effectively. This study focuses on evaluating the effectiveness of protein nanoparticles in breast cancer treatment by analyzing clinical trial data on their advantages compared to conventional drug formulations. The aim is to determine whether this approach offers measurable benefits and to identify further research opportunities to enhance cancer treatment safety and effectiveness.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Gradishar et al. (2005) – Albumin-Bound Paclitaxel in Breast Cancer Treatment Gradishar et al. (2005) conducted a Phase III clinical trial comparing albumin-bound paclitaxel with conventional paclitaxel in patients with metastatic breast cancer. The study reported a tumour response rate of 33% for albumin-bound paclitaxel, compared with 19% for conventional paclitaxel. The median time to disease progression was also longer in the albumin-bound paclitaxel group. These findings demonstrated the potential benefits of albumin-based drug delivery in cancer treatment, although certain adverse effects, including sensory neuropathy, were more frequent.

Comparative Study (2022) – Albumin-Bound Paclitaxel and Liposomal Paclitaxel A retrospective study involving 235 patients with invasive breast cancer compared the clinical outcomes of albumin-bound paclitaxel and liposomal paclitaxel. The study reported a higher pathological complete response rate in patients receiving albumin-bound paclitaxel. However, peripheral sensory neuropathy was also a concern in the albumin-bound paclitaxel group. These findings suggest that the effectiveness and safety of protein-based nanoparticle formulations should be evaluated together when comparing different drug-delivery systems.

Fan et al. (2024) – Protein-Based Cancer NanomedicineFan et al. (2024) reviewed developments in protein-based nanomedicine for cancer treatment. The review highlighted the potential of protein-based nanoparticles to carry anticancer drugs and other therapeutic molecules. It also discussed their possible advantages in biocompatibility and targeted drug delivery, while recognising challenges in manufacturing, stability and clinical translation. The review supports continued investigation of protein-based nanoparticles as promising drug-delivery systems.

Hua et al. (2024) – Protein Nanoparticles in Cancer Theranostics Hua et al. (2024) examined the applications of protein nanoparticles in cancer theranostics, which combines diagnosis and treatment. The review discussed the ability of protein nanoparticles to carry therapeutic agents and their potential advantages, including biodegradability and biocompatibility. It also highlighted the need for further research to improve their targeting performance, safety and clinical effectiveness. The findings indicate that protein nanoparticles may have important applications in future cancer diagnosis and treatment.

Meng et al. (2022) – Albumin Nanoparticles for Cancer Therapy Meng et al. (2022) examined the use of albumin nanoparticles as drug-delivery systems in cancer therapy. The research discussed their potential to improve the delivery of poorly water-soluble anticancer drugs and enhance the distribution of therapeutic agents. Albumin-based systems were identified as promising approaches, although challenges related to formulation stability, preparation methods and clinical translation remain. These findings support further investigation of albumin nanoparticles while highlighting the importance of evaluating their limitations alongside their potential benefits.

III. METHODOLOGY

This research was done by taking secondary data (that is the data collected from pre-existing sources) from secondary sources like Journal of Clinical Oncology,National Cancer Institute,National Center for Biotechnology Information and ScienceDirect and came to a conclusion that protein-based nanoparticles have significant potential to improve the delivery of drugs in cancer treatment. Their ability to carry anticancer medicines, protect them during transportation through the bloodstream, and release them near tumour tissues makes them a promising approach in modern cancer therapy.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26oct801

The main aim of this study is to evaluate the potential of protein-based nanoparticles, particularly albumin-based nanoparticles, in cancer drug delivery and compare their advantages and limitations with other nanoparticle systems. Metal-based nanoparticles, such as gold and silver nanoparticles, may raise concerns regarding toxicity and long-term accumulation in certain organs, depending on their physicochemical properties and formulation. Protein-based nanoparticles offer potential advantages, including biodegradability and biocompatibility. However, their effectiveness, safety, and ability to deliver drugs to specific tissues must be assessed using scientific evidence. This study therefore aims to determine whether protein-based nanoparticles offer measurable benefits over other drug-delivery systems in cancer treatment.

➢ *Hypothesis*:

Protein Nanoparticles improve the delivery of drugs to cancer cells.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS

Protein nanoparticles are superior to synthetic polymers, metallic, or inorganic nanoparticles in cancer drug delivery due to their unique biological and physicochemical properties.

➢ *Advantages Over Other Nanoparticles*

- High Biocompatibility and Biodegradability: Derived from natural or human-compatible sources (such as serum albumin, gelatin, or ferritin), protein nanoparticles break down safely into harmless amino acids inside the body. Synthetic or metallic nanoparticles can accumulate in organs and cause long-term toxicity.
- Low Toxicity and Immunogenicity: Endogenous proteins (like human albumin) are recognized as "self" by the immune system, avoiding the severe immune reactions or hypersensitivity seen with some synthetic solvents or inorganic carriers. For example, the FDA-approved albumin-bound paclitaxel (Abraxane) eliminates the need for toxic chemical solvents like Cremophor EL.
- Precise Surface Functionalization: Proteins possess well-defined primary structures and active surface functional groups. This allows easy attachment of targeting ligands (such as antibodies, peptides, or transferrin) to selectively bind to cancer cell receptors while sparing healthy tissue.
- Natural Capacity for Drug Binding: Proteins naturally bind both hydrophobic and hydrophilic anti-cancer drugs (such as paclitaxel or doxorubicin) with high capacity, protecting the cargo from early enzymatic degradation in the bloodstream and allowing sustained, controlled release at the tumor site.
- Mild Preparation Conditions: Protein nanoparticles can be synthesized via gentle methods (like desolvation or self-assembly) without harsh organic solvents or extreme temperatures that could damage sensitive therapeutic agents
- Elimination of Hypersensitivity: For example, the FDA-approved albumin-paclitaxel nanoparticle drug Abraxane delivers chemotherapy without requiring toxic solubilizers like Cremophor EL, which previously caused severe allergic reactions.
- Superior Surface Tunability: Proteins possess defined primary structures and active functional groups (such as amine and carboxyl groups). This makes it easy to attach targeting ligands, antibodies, or peptides to guide the nanoparticles straight to cancer cells while sparing healthy tissue. [1, 2, 3, 4]

➢ *Mutated Proteins in Cancer Cells Differ from that Proteins of Nano Particles*

- Proteins in cancer and protein nanoparticles differ fundamentally in their origin, biological role, scale, and purpose.
- Proteins in Cancer (Endogenous / Disease-Associated)
- Origin: Produced naturally by the body's own cells (or mutated genes within tumor cells).
- Role and Function: They drive cancer progression, signaling, and survival. This includes overexpressed receptors (like gp60 or transferrin receptors), signaling enzymes, or extracellular-matrix-cleaving "molecular scissors" (enzymes) that help tumors grow and metastasize.
- Structure: Individual, folded biomolecules (amino acid chains) functioning inside or around biological cells.
- Clinical Use: Often targeted by drugs, or used as biomarkers (e.g., detecting cancer-specific enzyme activity). [1, 2, 3, 4]
- Protein Nanoparticles (Engineered / Synthetic Vehicles)
- Origin: Artificially manufactured or self-assembled from natural, biocompatible proteins (such as human serum albumin, ferritin, or silk fibroin). [1, 2, 3]
- Role and Function: Act as a delivery system or therapeutic platform rather than a disease cause. They encapsulate or carry anti-cancer drugs (like paclitaxel or doxorubicin), imaging agents, or vaccines to tumor sites. [1, 2, 3]
- Scale and Structure: Engineered nanoscale structures (typically 20 to 200 nanometers) designed to circulate in the bloodstream, exploit leaky tumor vasculature (via the EPR effect), or bind actively to cancer cell surface receptors. [1, 2, 3]
- Clinical Use: FDA-approved formulations like Abraxane use albumin nanoparticlto safely transport chemotherapy into tumors with fewer side effects than free drugs.

Table 1 Comaprison of Protein and Protein Nanoparticle in Cancer Treatment

Feature	Proteins in Cancer	Protein Nanoparticles
Nature	Natural or mutated biological proteins inside the body	Engineered nanostructures made from natural proteins
Primary Function	Can cause, signal, or support tumor growth and invasion	Transport drugs, contrast agents, or antigens to fight tumors

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26oct801

Size	Molecular / single-protein scale	Nanometer scale (20–200 nm)
Goal in Medicine	To be blocked, inhibited, or detected	To deliver therapy or imaging agents selectively to cancer cells

V. DISCUSSION

The table compares proteins associated with cancer and protein nanoparticles based on their nature, primary function, size, and medical purpose. Proteins in cancer are natural or mutated biological proteins that may support tumour growth and invasion. In contrast, protein nanoparticles are engineered nanostructures made from natural proteins. While cancer-associated proteins may need to be blocked, inhibited, or detected, protein nanoparticles are designed to transport drugs, contrast agents, or antigens to help fight tumours. Furthermore, proteins exist at the molecular or individual-protein scale, whereas protein nanoparticles are structures at the nanometre scale. Thus, the two differ in their nature and roles in cancer medicine.

Protein nanoparticles (such as albumin, ferritin, or silk fibroin) act as targeted, biodegradable carriers that transport cancer drugs directly to tumor sites while sparing healthy tissue.

➢ *How they Work*

- Carriers for Payloads: Protein nanoparticles have an interior cavity or structural network that can be loaded with chemotherapy drugs, small molecules, or genetic material (like siRNA).
- Targeted Delivery:

✓ Passive Targeting: They exploit the EPR effect (enhanced permeability and retention), slipping through the leaky, poorly formed blood vessels typical of tumor tissues and staying trapped inside.
✓ Active Targeting: Their outer surface can be decorated with specific ligands, peptides, or antibodies that lock onto mutated or overexpressed receptors unique to the cancer cells.

- Cellular Uptake: Once the nanoparticle binds to the cancer cell surface, the cell engulfs it via endocytosis, pulling the particle inside.
- Stimuli-Responsive Release: Inside the acidic or enzyme-rich environment of the cancer cell (or its internal waste-disposal system, the lysosome), the protein structure breaks down or disassembles, releasing the therapeutic drug right where it is needed.
- Degradation of Undruggable Mutated Proteins: Newer platforms, such as NPTACs (nanoparticle-mediated targeting chimeras), use antibody-decorated nanoparticles to physically drag disease-driving or mutated cell-surface proteins into the cell's lysosome to be completely destroyed.
- Protein nanoparticles improve cancer drug delivery by increasing tumor-specific accumulation, reducing toxicity to healthy tissues, and safely carrying difficult-to-dissolve medications.
- Ways By Which Protein Nanoparticles Improve Cancer Therapy
- Biocompatibility and Biodegradability: Natural proteins (such as albumin) break down safely into harmless amino acids inside the body, avoiding the long-term toxicity or accumulation linked to some synthetic polymers or inorganic materials.
- Enhanced Drug Loading (Hydrophobic Drugs): Many effective anti-cancer drugs do not dissolve well in water. Protein nanoparticles have binding pockets or interior cavities that can reversibly trap and transport these hydrophobic drugs through the bloodstream. A prime clinical example is Abraxane—an albumin-bound paclitaxel nanoparticle approved by the FDA for metastatic breast cancer.
- Active and Passive Targeting:

✓ Passive targeting takes advantage of the leaky, poorly formed blood vessels and poor lymphatic drainage inside tumors (known as the EPR effect), allowing nanoparticles to slip out of the blood and gather in tumor tissue more easily.
✓ Active targeting is achieved by attaching specific ligands (like antibodies or peptides) to the outer surface of the protein nanoparticle. These ligands lock onto receptors found on the surface of cancer cells, increasing uptake directly inside the tumor and sparing normal cells.

- Protection of Sensitive Cargo: Protein carriers shield fragile therapeutic payloads (such as small interfering RNAs or DNA) from being broken down by enzymes or cleared away by the immune system before they reach the cancer site. [1]
- Controlled and Stimuli-Responsive Release: The structure of protein nanoparticles can be engineered to disassemble or release their drug cargo in response to specific conditions inside the tumor microenvironment—such as a more acidic pH or high levels of specific enzymes.
- Protein nanotechnology in India is clinically used and researched primarily for breast cancer, non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC), and pancreatic cancer.
- Clinically Available Protein Nanotechnology
- Abraxane (Albumin-bound Paclitaxel / nab-paclitaxel):

✓ Uses natural human albumin (a protein) as a carrier to deliver the chemotherapy drug paclitaxel without harmful solvents.
✓ Approved and used in India for metastatic breast cancer (Metastatic breast cancer is a late-stage form of breast cancer (Stage IV) in which cancer cells break away from the original tumor in the breast, travel through the bloodstream or lymphatic system, and form new tumors in distant parts of the body) , advanced non-small cell lung cancer (combined with carboplatin), and metastatic pancreatic adenocarcinoma (combined with gemcitabine) Protein nanotechnology—specifically nanoparticle

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26oct801

albumin-bound (nab) paclitaxel (commonly known by brand names like Abraxane, Nab Celtax, Albumaps, and others)—is clinically used in India for the treatment of metastatic breast cancer.

➢ *How Protein Nanotechnology Works in Breast Cancer*

- Albumin-Bound Delivery: The chemotherapy drug paclitaxel is bound to human serum albumin to form tiny nanoparticles (roughly 130 nanometers in size).
- No Toxic Solvents: Unlike standard taxanes that require harsh chemical solvents (like Cremophor EL) which can cause severe allergic reactions, this protein formulation allows higher drug concentrations to accumulate directly inside tumor tissues.
- Clinical Indications: It is used in India and globally for metastatic or advanced breast cancer—particularly when the disease has relapsed or progressed after prior combination chemotherapy. Availability in India
- Marketed Brands: Protein-bound paclitaxel formulations are available across major Indian hospitals, oncology clinics, and specialized pharmacies under various generic and brand labels (such as Nab Celtax, Albumaps, Mitotax, and licensed versions of Abraxane via partnerships like Biocon Limited).
- Emerging Research: Indian research institutions (such as IIT Madras and the Agharkar Research Institute in Pune) are also actively developing next-generation pre-clinical and clinical nanotechnologies—including silicon nanotube drug-delivery platforms and gold nanoparticle formulations—to further improve precision targeting in breast cancer.
- Emerging & Pre-Clinical Research in India
- Indian research institutions are actively developing novel protein- and nano-based drug delivery platforms targeting additional cancer types:
- Breast Cancer: Researchers at IIT Madras and partner universities have developed "nanoinjection" and nanoarchaeosome platforms to target breast cancer cells directly with lower systemic toxicity. Other labs are working on light-activated nanobots and gene-silencing nanoparticles for breast tumors.
- Glioblastoma (Brain Cancer): IIT Delhi has researched specialized nano-formulations using antibody-functionalized nanoparticles to train the immune system against brain tumors in pre-clinical studies.
- Lung Cancer: Studies evaluated bovine serum albumin (BSA) nanoparticles functionalized with targeting ligands for improved delivery in lung cancer model.

➢ *Type of Nano Technology Leads to Curing Breast Cancer*

Liposomes and polymeric nanoparticles (along with albumin-bound protein nanoparticles) are the most widely used and clinically translated nanotechnology-based drug delivery systems for treating and managing metastatic breast cancer.

➢ *Major Nanotechnology Types Used in Metastatic Breast Cancer*

- Liposomes: Spherical vesicles made of a phospholipid bilayer that encapsulate anti-cancer drugs (such as doxorubicin in Doxil). They improve drug stability, prolong circulation time in the blood, and accumulate passively in tumor tissues via the enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect while reducing toxic side effects like cardiotoxicity.
- Polymeric Nanoparticles and Micelles: Engineered polymer-based carriers that deliver chemotherapeutic agents or gene-silencing payloads directly to metastatic sites (such as the lungs, bones, or liver). They can be functionalized with specific ligands or antibodies (active targeting) to bind directly to receptors overexpressed on cancer cells.
- Albumin-Bound Nanoparticles: Protein-based nanoformulations like Abraxane (paclitaxel-bound albumin) that eliminate the need for toxic chemical solvents, allowing higher local concentrations of the drug to reach tumor and metastatic lesions.
- Emerging Biomimetic and Smart Systems: Cell membrane-coated nanoparticles (using red blood cells, immune cells, or cancer cell membranes) and pH- or light-responsive nanocarriers are actively researched to better evade the immune system and target microenvironments in metastatic tissues.

Table 2 A Comparison of all Types of Nanoparticles

Feature	Protein-Based Nanoparticles (PNPs)	Metal Nanoparticles (MNPs) (e.g., Gold, Silver)	Synthetic Polymeric Nanoparticles (e.g., PLGA)	Lipid-Based Nanoparticles (LNPs) (e.g., Liposomes)
Composition	Natural or recombinant proteins (albumin, gelatin, silk fibroin, ferritin)	Inorganic noble metals or magnetic oxides (Au, Ag, Fe_3O_4)	Synthetic polymers (PLGA, PLA, chitosan)	Phospholipids, cholesterol, lipid bilayers
Biocompatibility & Toxicity	High; naturally degrades into harmless amino acids/peptides	Moderate to low; risk of ion release, oxidative stress, or cellular toxicity (e.g., Ag/Au)	Variable; depends on the degradation byproducts of the polymer	High to moderate; generally safe, though lipid composition can trigger mild immune responses
Drug-Loading Capacity	High; rich in functional groups (-COOH, $-NH_2$) for binding diverse drugs	Good via surface conjugation, though	Moderate to high; entraps hydrophobic or hydrophilic agents	High for hydrophobic (in bilayer) or hydrophilic (in core) drugs

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26oct801

		limited internal volume unless porous/hollow		
Release Profile	Sustained and controlled release	Often burst or stimulus-triggered (light, magnetic field, pH)	Sustained, erosion- or diffusion-controlled	Controlled or rapid release upon cellular fusion
Main Applications	Targeted drug delivery, cancer therapy, vaccines, protein/gene carriage	Bioimaging, photothermal therapy, theranostics, antimicrobial coatings	Long-circulating drug carriers, gene delivery	mRNA delivery, vaccine vectors (e.g., COVID-19 vaccines), gene therapy
Key Limitations	Batch-to-batch variation, sensitivity to pH/temperature, potential immunogenicity	Long-term accumulation in organs (liver/spleen), potential cytotoxicity	Synthetic byproducts can cause minor inflammation; complex scale-up	Stability issues in various environments; prone to fusion or leakage

➢ *Discussion*

The comparison highlights the differences among protein-based, metal, synthetic polymeric, and lipid-based nanoparticles in terms of composition, biocompatibility, drug-loading capacity, release profile, applications, and limitations. Protein-based nanoparticles offer potential advantages in biocompatibility, biodegradability, and drug delivery, whereas metal nanoparticles are valuable for imaging and photothermal therapy. Polymeric nanoparticles can provide sustained drug release, while lipid-based nanoparticles have demonstrated important applications in mRNA delivery and vaccines. However, each type presents challenges related to safety, stability, manufacturing, or drug release. Protein-based nanoparticles therefore represent a promising approach to cancer treatment, but their superiority over other nanoparticle systems cannot be established universally without direct comparative evidence. Further studies are needed to determine which formulation offers the best balance of therapeutic effectiveness, safety, stability, and delivery efficiency for specific cancer applications.

➢ *Advantages & Disadvantages:*

- *Protein-Based Nanoparticles (PNPs):*

✓ Advantages: Built from natural or engineered proteins like Human Serum Albumin or silk fibroin, they break down safely via body enzymes into amino acids. They offer multiple binding sites for both water-loving (hydrophilic) and water-fearing (hydrophobic) drugs.

- Disadvantages: They can be sensitive to heat and pH changes, and manufacturing them consistently without batch variation is difficult.
- Metal Nanoparticles (MNPs):

✓ Advantages: Gold, silver, and magnetic iron oxide particles have unique optical and magnetic traits. This makes them useful for tracking cells under imaging (theranostics) or heating/destroying tumors with light (photothermal therapy).

- Disadvantages: They do not easily degrade and can leak toxic ions (such as silver ions causing oxidative stress), leading to safety concerns with long-term internal use.

- *Synthetic Polymeric & Lipid Nanoparticles:*

✓ Advantages: Polymeric particles (like PLGA) offer predictable, long-term drug release. Lipid nanoparticles (like liposomes) excel at encapsulating genetic material (mRNA or DNA) and fusing smoothly with cell membranes.
✓ Disadvantages: Synthetic polymers can leave behind acidic or irritating degradation byproducts, while lipid carriers can face shelf-stability and leakage challenges.

➢ *Biological Limits of Protein Nanoparticles:*

If the environmental conditions drift too far outside these ranges, the protein nanoparticles will stop working properly due to two major vulnerabilities:

- *Thermal Denaturation (Heat Failure):*

✓ The Limit: Most protein nanoparticles will begin to destabilize or fully unfold (denature) if exposed to temperatures above 50°C to 60°C.
✓ The Result: The nanoparticle permanently changes shape, loses its drug payload instantly, and can clump together (aggregate), making it completely useless and potentially dangerous to inject.

- *Isoelectric Aggregation (pH Failure):*

✓ The Limit: Every protein has an Isoelectric Point (pI)—a specific pH where the protein has a net neutral charge. For example, the pI of albumin is around 4.7.
✓ The Result: If the surrounding fluid hits the protein's exact pI, the nanoparticles lose their electrical repulsion, stick to each other, and instantly crash out of the solution as a visible clump. Engineers carefully choose or modify proteins to ensure their pI does not match the neutral pH of human blood.

➢ *Numerical Data:*

Clinical evidence indicates that protein-based nanotechnology, particularly albumin-bound paclitaxel, can improve tumour response compared with conventional paclitaxel in certain breast cancer settings. A randomized clinical trial reported response rates of 33% and 19%, respectively, demonstrating an absolute improvement of 14 percentage points.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26oct801

Also,a retrospective study published in 2022 compared albumin-bound paclitaxel with liposomal paclitaxel in 235 patients receiving treatment before surgery. The authors reported better pathological complete-response outcomes with the albumin-bound formulation, but also reported more peripheral sensory nerve toxicity.

A pathological complete response means that no residual invasive cancer is detected in the examined breast and lymph-node tissue after treatment. It is an important treatment outcome, but it does not guarantee that cancer will never return.

VI. RESULT

The analysis of secondary data from published research indicates that protein-based nanoparticles, particularly albumin-based nanoparticles, have promising potential in cancer drug delivery. The findings reveal measurable benefits in certain clinical settings, while also highlighting safety concerns and limitations that must be considered.

- *Improved Tumour Response in Breast Cancer Treatment*

A Phase III clinical trial published in the Journal of Clinical Oncology in 2005 compared albumin-bound paclitaxel with conventional solvent-based paclitaxel in patients with metastatic breast cancer. The reported tumour response rates were 33% and 19%, respectively, representing an absolute improvement of 14 percentage points with the albumin-bound formulation. The median time to tumour progression was also longer, at 23.0 weeks compared with 16.9 weeks. These results support the potential benefit of albumin-based drug delivery in this specific treatment setting.

- *Effectiveness Must be Balanced Against Safety*

The same clinical trial reported severe grade 4 neutropenia in 9% of patients receiving albumin-bound paclitaxel, compared with 22% receiving conventional paclitaxel. However, severe sensory neuropathy occurred in 10% of patients in the albumin-bound group, compared with 2% in the conventional group. These findings demonstrate that a drug-delivery system may improve certain treatment outcomes while increasing the risk of other adverse effects. Therefore, protein-based nanoparticles should not automatically be considered free from toxicity.

- *Comparison with Lipid-Based Nanoparticles*

A retrospective study published in 2022 involving 235 breast cancer patients compared albumin-bound paclitaxel with liposomal paclitaxel in neoadjuvant treatment. The study reported better pathological complete-response outcomes with albumin-bound paclitaxel, but also identified greater peripheral sensory nerve toxicity. This provides additional evidence that protein-based formulations may offer advantages in particular treatment settings. However, because the study was retrospective, the findings do not establish universal superiority.

- *Comparison of the Properties of Different Nanoparticle Systems*

The literature reviewed in this investigation identifies several potential advantages of protein-based nanoparticles, including biocompatibility, biodegradability and the ability to carry therapeutic molecules. Their limitations include sensitivity to environmental conditions, possible immunogenicity and challenges in maintaining consistent manufacturing quality.

Metal-based nanoparticles, including gold, silver and iron oxide systems, possess useful optical, magnetic and chemical properties that support applications such as imaging and photothermal therapy. Nevertheless, certain formulations may raise concerns about cellular toxicity and long-term accumulation in organs.

Polymeric nanoparticles can provide sustained drug release and support the delivery of therapeutic agents, although their performance depends on the polymer and its degradation characteristics. Lipid-based nanoparticles are useful for carrying hydrophobic drugs and genetic material, but may face formulation-stability, leakage and storage challenges.

These comparisons show that different nanoparticle systems have different strengths and limitations. Their suitability depends on the intended medical application, formulation and safety requirements.

- *Clinical Significance of Protein-Based Drug Delivery*

The clinical use of albumin-bound paclitaxel demonstrates that protein-based nanoparticle technology has moved beyond theoretical research into practical cancer treatment. Its use in selected cancer settings provides evidence that albumin can serve as a clinically useful drug carrier. However, the success of one albumin-based formulation cannot be generalised to every protein nanoparticle or every cancer type.

VII. FINDING

The findings support the potential of protein-based nanoparticles, particularly albumin-based formulations, as valuable drug-delivery systems in selected cancer treatments. The numerical evidence demonstrates improved tumour response compared with conventional paclitaxel in a specific clinical trial, while comparative research suggests potential benefits over a liposomal formulation in a particular treatment setting. At the same time, the reported adverse effects show that effectiveness and safety must be evaluated together.

Therefore, this investigation highlights the potential of protein-based nanoparticles as promising drug-delivery systems in cancer treatment, particularly due to their biocompatibility and ability to transport therapeutic agents. Although the available evidence may demonstrate advantages in certain aspects, their overall superiority over metal-, lipid- and polymer-based nano particles cannot be conclusively established without direct comparative studies. Further

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26oct801

research is required to identify the nanoparticle formulation that provides the best balance of therapeutic effectiveness, biocompatibility, biodegradability, targeting performance and safety for different cancer applications.

VIII. LIMITATIONS

As we know that the major disadvantage of protein based nano particles is that they are sensitive to pH and temperature, here are few recommendations to maintain the optimum pH and temperature:

- *Optimising pH Conditions*

The pH of a protein nanoparticle formulation should be selected according to the properties of the specific protein, the drug being carried and the preparation method. Suitable buffer systems can help control pH changes during preparation and storage. Because many proteins have reduced solubility near their isoelectric point (pI), aggregation may occur under these conditions. However, pH near the pI may be deliberately used in certain nanoparticle preparation methods. Therefore, the optimum pH should be determined experimentally rather than applying a single pH value to all protein nanoparticles.

- *Controlling Temperature*

Temperature should be appropriately controlled during nanoparticle preparation, storage and handling. Lower storage temperatures may help maintain the stability of some formulations, but the ideal temperature depends on the protein and the complete formulation. Excessive heat can cause changes in protein structure, aggregation or changes in nanoparticle size. Nevertheless, some preparation methods intentionally use heat to form nanoparticles. Therefore, temperature conditions should be selected and validated for the specific formulation instead of assuming that all proteins become unstable above a fixed temperature.

- *Monitoring Nanoparticle Stability*

The effectiveness of pH and temperature control should be assessed by measuring relevant properties, including particle size, particle-size distribution, aggregation, drug-loading efficiency and drug-release behaviour. Where appropriate, protein structure and biological activity should also be evaluated. These measurements can help researchers identify conditions that maintain nanoparticle quality during storage and use.

IX. CONCLUSION

With the data collected we can say that protein-based nanoparticles emerge as a promising approach to improving drug delivery in cancer treatment. Their potential biocompatibility, biodegradability, and ability to transport therapeutic drugs make them attractive alternatives to certain metal-based drug-delivery systems. Unlike some metal nanoparticles that may persist in tissues or raise concerns about long-term accumulation, suitably designed protein-based nanoparticles can be broken down by biological processes, potentially offering advantages in biological clearance and tolerability.

The findings suggest that protein-based nanoparticles deserve greater attention in the development of targeted cancer therapies. Their ability to carry anticancer drugs and facilitate their delivery to tumour tissues may help improve treatment efficiency while potentially limiting unnecessary exposure of healthy tissues. The clinical use of albumin-bound paclitaxel, marketed as Abraxane, demonstrates that protein-based drug-delivery technology has already moved beyond theoretical research into practical cancer treatment.

Although metal nanoparticles remain valuable for applications involving magnetic targeting, imaging, and photothermal therapy, protein-based systems offer a compelling combination of biological compatibility and drug-carrying potential. These characteristics make them particularly worthy of further development for drug-delivery applications where biodegradability and biological safety are important priorities.

Therefore, this investigation supports the hypothesis that protein-based nanoparticles may offer meaningful advantages over certain metal-based systems in cancer drug delivery. While they cannot be considered universally superior without further comparative evidence, promoting continued research and clinical evaluation of protein-based nanoparticles could contribute to safer, more effective, and more biologically compatible drug-delivery strategies in the future.

REFERENCES

[1]. Gradishar, W. J., et al. (2005). Phase III trial of nanoparticle albumin-bound paclitaxel compared with polyethylated castor oil-based paclitaxel in women with breast cancer. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 23(31), 7768–7771. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2005.08.002

[2]. Zha, X., et al. (2022). Nanoparticle albumin-bound paclitaxel is superior to liposomal paclitaxel in the neoadjuvant treatment of breast cancer. Nanomedicine. https://doi.org/10.2217/nnm-2022-0025

[3]. Hong, S., Choi, D. W., Kim, H. N., Park, C. G., Lee, W., & Park, H. H. (2020). Protein-based nanoparticles as drug delivery systems. Pharmaceutics, 12(7), 604. https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics12070604

[4]. Qu, N., Song, K., Ji, Y., & Liu, M. (2024). Albumin nanoparticle-based drug delivery systems. International Journal of Nanomedicine, 19, 6945–6980. https://doi.org/10.2147/IJN.S467876

[5]. Srivastava, A., & Prajapati, A. (2020). Albumin and functionalized albumin nanoparticles: Production strategies, characterization, and target indications. Asian Biomedicine, 14(6), 217–242. https://doi.org/10.1515/abm-2020-0032

[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, 14, 100268. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejmcr.2025.100268

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26oct801

[7]. Fan, Z., Iqbal, H., Ni, J., Khan, N. U., Irshad, S., Razzaq, A., Alfaifi, M. Y., Elbehairi, S. E. I., Shati, A. A., Zhou, J., & Cheng, H. (2024). Rationalized landscape on protein-based cancer nanomedicine: Recent progress and challenges. International Journal of Pharmaceutics: X, 7, 100238. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpx.2024.100238

[8]. Hua, Y., Qin, Z., Gao, L., Zhou, M., Xue, Y., Li, Y., & Xie, J. (2024). Protein nanoparticles as drug delivery systems for cancer theranostics. Journal of Controlled Release, 371, 429–444. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2024.06.004

[9]. Meng, R., Zhu, H., Wang, Z., Hao, S., & Wang, B. (2022). Preparation of drug-loaded albumin nanoparticles and its application in cancer therapy. Journal of Nanomaterials, 2022, Article 3052175. https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/3052175