Georgian Scientists

ქართველი მეცნიერები

Vol. 7 Issue 3, 2025

https://doi.org/10.52340/gs.2025.07.03.31

THE MANIFESTATION OF SCIENTIFIC ASPECTS OF CLASSIFICATION, CLINICAL USE, FEATURES, MECHANISM OF ACTION, PHARMACOLOGY, EFFECTS AND TOXICITIES OF NEW ANTICANCER DRUGS IN GENERAL

Nodar Sulashvili[1], Udgam Yaduvanshi[2], Nirjhar Yaduvanshi[3], Mohini Yadav[4], Elene Abzianidze[5], Naira Chichoyan[6], Luiza Gabunia[7], Nana Gorgaslidze[8], Nato Alavidze[9], Nino Abuladze[10], Ketevani Gabunia[11], Natia Kvizhinadze[12], Igor Seniuk[13], Marika Sulashvili[14], Tamar Okropiridze[15], Lela Grigolia[16], Kakhaber Robakidze[17], Marina Giorgobiani[18], Irine Zarnadze[19], Shalva (Davit) Zarnadze[20]

1. MD, PhD, Doctor of Pharmaceutical and Pharmacological Sciences in Medicine, Invited Lecturer (Invited Professor) of Scientific Research-Skills Center at Tbilisi State Medical University; Professor of Medical and Clinical Pharmacology of International School of Medicine at Alte University; Professor of Pharmacology of Faculty of Medicine at Georgian National University SEU; Tbilisi, Georgia; Orcid https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9005-8577; E-mail: n.sulashvili@ug.edu.ge
2. MD student of Medical Doctor Degree Program of International School of Medicine at Alte University; Tbilisi, Georgia;
3. MD student of Medical Doctor Degree Program of International School of Medicine at Alte University; Tbilisi, Georgia;
4. MD student of Medical Doctor Degree Program of International School of Medicine at Alte University; Tbilisi, Georgia;
5. PhD, Doctor of Biological Sciences, Academician, Emeritus Professor of Tbilisi State Medical University, Department of Molecular and Medical Genetics; https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1140-7688; Tbilisi, Georgia.
6. MD, PhD, Doctor of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Professor of Yerevan State Medical University After Mkhitar Heratsi, Head of the Department of Pharmacognosy, Yerevan, Armenia. https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3905-3372
7. MD, PhD, Doctor of Medical Sciences, Professor, Director of the Scientific Research-Skills Center at Tbilisi State Medical University, Professor, Head of the Department of Medical and Clinical Pharmacology at Tbilisi State Medical University, Clinical Pharmacologist of The First University Clinic of TSMU, Tbilisi, Georgia https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0856-2684
8. MD, PhD, Doctor of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Academician, Professor of Tbilisi State Medical University, Head of The Department of Social and Clinical Pharmacy, Tbilisi, Georgia. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4563-5224
9. MD, PhD, Doctor of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Professor of Akaki Tsereteli State University, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Pharmacy, Kutaisi, Georgia. Professor, Dean Faculty of Medicine at East European University, Tbilisi, Georgia. https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6695-5924

10. MD, PhD, Doctor of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Professor of Akaki Tsereteli State University, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Pharmacy, Kutaisi, Georgia. https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2189-7470
11. MD, PhD, Doctor of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Professor of Akaki Tsereteli State University, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Pharmacy, Kutaisi, Georgia. https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5857-6593;
12. MD, PhD, Doctor of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Professor of Tbilisi State Medical University, Department of Social and Clinical Pharmacy; Tbilisi, Georgia.
13. PhD, Doctor of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Dean of faculty of Pharmacy at National University of Pharmacy of Ukraine, Associate Professor of Biological Chemistry Department at National University of Pharmacy of Ukraine, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3819-733; Kharkiv, Ukraine.
14. MD, Doctor of Family Medicine, Invited Lecturer of Tbilisi State Medical University, Department of Molecular and Medical Genetics, Invited Professor of Biochemistry and Molecular and Medical Genetics at The University of Georgia; Tbilisi, Georgia.
15. MD, PhD, Doctor Medical Sciences, Professor of the Division of Dentistry of International School of Medicine at Alte University; Professor of Teaching University Geomedi, Invited Professor of Dentistry Department of The School of Health Sciences at The University of Georgia, Tbilisi, Georgia.
16. MD, PhD, Doctor of Medical Sciences, Professor of Faculty of Medicine at Caucasus International University; Tbilisi, Georgia;
17. MD, PhD, Doctor of Medical Sciences, Academician, Professor of Faculty of Medicine at Caucasus International University; Doctor-Professor of National Health Center Named After Academician O. Gudushauri; Tbilisi, Georgia;
18. MD, PhD, Doctor of Medical Sciences, Academician, Professor of Tbilisi State Medical University, Faculty of Public Health; Department of Hygiene and Medical Ecology, Tbilisi, Georgia. https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0686-5227
19. MD, PhD, Doctor of Medical Sciences, Professor of Tbilisi State Medical University, Department of Public Health, Health Care Management, Policy and Economy, Tbilisi, Georgia.
20. MD, PhD, Doctor of Medical Sciences, Academician, Professor of Tbilisi State Medical University, Dean of the Faculty of Public Health, Head of the Department of Nutrition, Aging Medicine, Environmental and Occupational Health, Tbilisi, Georgia.

Corresponding Author: Dr. Professor Nodar Sulashvili

Mail: n.sulashvili@ug.edu.ge

Mob: +995-597-12-17-28

ABSTRACT

The landscape of anticancer drug development has transformed with the advent of targeted therapies, immunotherapies, and novel delivery systems, addressing the global burden of cancer, projected to reach 28.4 million cases by 2040. This article comprehensively reviews the classification, clinical use, features, mechanisms of action, pharmacology, therapeutic effects, and toxicities of new anticancer drugs, focusing on agents approved by the FDA and EMA as of March 2024. Drugs are classified by their site of action (e.g., tumor cell nucleus, cytoplasm, vasculature, immune, and endocrine systems) and mechanism (e.g., DNA damage, kinase inhibition, immune modulation). Key classes include antibody-drug conjugates (ADCs) like trastuzumab deruxtecan, tyrosine kinase inhibitors (e.g., osimertinib), immune checkpoint inhibitors (e.g., pembrolizumab), and natural or repurposed agents (e.g., paclitaxel, metformin). Mechanisms range from DNA cross-

linking and microtubule disruption to immune activation and angiogenesis inhibition. Pharmacologically, small molecules offer oral bioavailability but face metabolism challenges, while biologics require parenteral administration. Advanced delivery systems, such as nanoparticles and ADCs, enhance specificity. Therapeutic effects include improved overall survival and response rates, though toxicities like myelosuppression, cardiotoxicity, and immune-related adverse events persist. Emerging approaches, including nanotechnology, natural products, and drug repurposing, alongside AI-driven design, promise to overcome resistance and optimize outcomes. This review underscores the scientific advancements driving precision oncology while highlighting challenges in toxicity management and global accessibility. The landscape of oncology therapeutics has been radically transformed by the development of new anticancer drugs that move beyond traditional cytotoxic agents. This review comprehensively examines the scientific aspects of these novel compounds, focusing on their modern classification, intricate mechanisms of action, and clinical applications. We categorize these agents into targeted therapies, including small molecule inhibitors and monoclonal antibodies designed against specific molecular aberrations (e.g., kinase activity, signaling pathways), and immunotherapeutic agents, such as immune checkpoint inhibitors (e.g., PD-1/PD-L1, CTLA-4 inhibitors), CAR-T cells, and cancer vaccines, which harness the host's immune system to combat malignancy. The discussion delves into the unique pharmacologic features of these drugs, including their design principles, structure-activity relationships, and pharmacokinetic profiles, which often differ significantly from conventional chemotherapy. A detailed analysis of their precise mechanisms of action elucidates how they induce cell cycle arrest, promote apoptosis, inhibit angiogenesis, and modulate the tumor microenvironment. While these therapies offer superior efficacy and reduced off-target effects in specific patient populations, they are associated with a distinct spectrum of adverse effects and toxicities, such as immune-related adverse events (irAEs), dermatologic reactions, and unique organ-specific inflammatory syndromes, which necessitate specialized management protocols. This synthesis underscores the paradigm shift towards personalized medicine in oncology, driven by biomarker-driven drug selection. It highlights the critical interplay between molecular pathology, drug design, clinical efficacy, and toxicity management, while also acknowledging ongoing challenges like drug resistance and the imperative for continued research into novel targets and combination strategies to improve patient outcomes.

Keywords: Novel Anticancer Drugs, Targeted Therapy, Immunotherapy, Mechanism of Action, Pharmacokinetics, Immune-Related Adverse Events, Precision Oncology, Tyrosine Kinase Inhibitors, Monoclonal Antibodies, CAR-T Cell Therapy.

INTRODUCTION

Cancer remains a formidable global health challenge, with profound impacts on morbidity and mortality. According to the World Health Organization, cancer accounted for approximately 19.3 million new cases and 10 million deaths worldwide in 2020, with projections estimating a rise to 28.4 million new cases by 2040. This escalation is driven by an aging population, increased prevalence of risk factors such as smoking and obesity, and environmental exposures including air pollution and occupational carcinogens. The complexity of cancer, characterized by uncontrolled

cell growth, genetic heterogeneity, and metastatic potential, necessitates innovative therapeutic strategies. Over the past few decades, anticancer drug development has transitioned from nonspecific cytotoxic agents to highly targeted therapies, immunotherapies, and advanced drug delivery systems, revolutionizing clinical management and patient outcomes.

Historically, the fight against cancer began with rudimentary interventions. In the 19th century, natural compounds like podophyllotoxin from Podophyllum peltatum laid the groundwork for modern chemotherapeutics such as etoposide, approved in 1983. The mid-20th century saw significant milestones with the discovery of nitrogen mustards during World War II, leading to alkylating agents like cyclophosphamide. Concurrently, antifolates such as methotrexate (approved in 1948) and antimetabolites like 5-fluorouracil (1950s) emerged, targeting DNA and RNA synthesis. Plant-derived agents, including vinblastine in the 1960s and paclitaxel in the 1990s, further expanded the chemotherapeutic arsenal. The serendipitous discovery of cisplatin in 1965 marked a pivotal advancement, introducing platinum-based drugs that remain cornerstones in treating solid tumors.

The late 1990s ushered in a paradigm shift with the advent of targeted therapies. The approval of trastuzumab in 1998 for HER2-positive breast cancer and imatinib in 2001 for chronic myelogenous leukemia (CML) exemplified the potential of precision medicine, targeting specific molecular aberrations. These successes spurred the development of tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs), monoclonal antibodies, and other biologics. By 2025, the therapeutic landscape has further evolved with the introduction of antibody-drug conjugates (ADCs), immune checkpoint inhibitors, and chimeric antigen receptor T-cell (CAR-T) therapies, alongside novel approaches like nanotechnology and drug repurposing. These advancements aim to enhance efficacy, minimize off-target effects, and overcome resistance, a persistent challenge in oncology. This article comprehensively examines the scientific aspects of new anticancer drugs, focusing on their classification, clinical use, features and mechanisms of action, pharmacology, therapeutic effects, and toxicities. The scope is limited to drugs with full approval by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and European Medicines Agency (EMA) as of March 2024, excluding those under accelerated or conditional approval to ensure robust evidence of clinical benefit. The classification framework organizes drugs by their site of action—tumor cell nucleus, cytoplasm, vasculature, immune system, or endocrine system—and their mechanistic approach, providing a structured understanding of their therapeutic roles. This system facilitates the design of rational combination therapies and highlights synergistic potential.

The field of oncology stands at a pivotal juncture, characterized by a profound transformation from a one-size-fits-all approach to a nuanced era of precision medicine. For decades, the arsenal against cancer was dominated by conventional cytotoxic chemotherapy and radiotherapy. These modalities, while sometimes effective, operate on a fundamental principle of targeting rapidly dividing cells, a characteristic of cancer cells but also of healthy tissues such as those in the bone marrow, gastrointestinal tract, and hair follicles. This lack of selectivity is the primary source of their severe and often debilitating side effects, which include myelosuppression, mucositis, and alopecia, thereby limiting their therapeutic window and often compromising the patient's quality of life. Moreover, the efficacy of these treatments frequently plateaus, with many cancers developing resistance or recurring after an initial response, highlighting an urgent and unmet need for more sophisticated and targeted therapeutic strategies.

This paradigm shift has been catalyzed by the monumental advances in our understanding of the molecular and genetic underpinnings of carcinogenesis. The completion of the Human Genome Project and subsequent large-scale cancer genomics initiatives, such as The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA), have illuminated the complex landscape of driver mutations, aberrant signaling pathways, and intricate interactions between tumor cells and their microenvironment. We now comprehend cancer not as a single disease, but as a heterogeneous collection of disorders, each defined by its unique genetic signature and molecular profile. This deeper knowledge has unveiled specific, targetable vulnerabilities within cancer cells, paving the way for the rational design and development of a new generation of anticancer agents. These novel drugs are engineered to interfere with precise molecular targets that are critically involved in tumor growth, progression, and survival, offering the promise of greater efficacy coupled with a more favorable toxicity profile.

The emergence of these new anticancer drugs represents a cornerstone of modern oncology, yet it also introduces a new layer of complexity for clinicians, researchers, and pharmacologists. The traditional classification systems based merely on chemical structure or cell cycle specificity are no longer sufficient to encompass the diversity and sophistication of these new modalities. We are now required to adopt a multifaceted framework that categorizes agents based on their biological targets and fundamental mechanisms of action. This new taxonomy includes broad categories such as molecularly targeted agents and immunotherapeutic agents, each with numerous subclasses. Targeted therapies themselves can be divided into small molecule inhibitors, designed to penetrate cells and block specific intracellular enzymes like tyrosine kinases, and monoclonal antibodies, which typically target extracellular ligands or cell surface receptors with high specificity. Immuno-oncology, a field that has revolutionized the treatment of certain advanced cancers, encompasses immune checkpoint inhibitors, which release the brakes on the immune system, chimeric antigen receptor (CAR) T-cell therapies, which are genetically engineered to direct a patient's own immune cells against the tumor, and therapeutic cancer vaccines.

Understanding the pharmacological principles of these agents is paramount. Their features—from their design and chemical properties to their absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion (pharmacokinetics)—are intrinsically linked to their mechanism of action and clinical utility. The pharmacodynamics, which describe the biochemical and physiological effects of the drug, including the relationship between its concentration and the resulting therapeutic or toxic effects, are often more complex and unpredictable than those of cytotoxic drugs. For instance, the efficacy of a tyrosine kinase inhibitor is not only dependent on achieving a sufficient plasma concentration but also on the presence and dominance of the specific genetic mutation it targets within the tumor. This introduces the critical concept of companion diagnostics, where biomarker testing is an essential prerequisite for treatment selection, ensuring that the right drug is matched to the right patient.

The clinical use of these novel agents is fundamentally different from traditional chemotherapy. They are often approved for use in specific biomarker-selected populations, as defined in their label, and their administration can be continuous over long periods, transforming advanced cancer into a chronic, manageable condition for some patients. The treatment endpoints have also evolved, with unusual response patterns such as pseudoprogression observed with immunotherapies, necessitating new criteria for evaluating radiographic response. Furthermore, the toxicity profiles of these new drugs are distinct and require vigilant management. While they may

avoid the classic cytotoxic side effects, they are associated with a entirely new spectrum of adverse events. Targeted therapies can cause specific on-target toxicities, such as skin rash with EGFR inhibitors or hypertension with VEGF inhibitors, which are mechanism-based and often manageable with supportive care. Immunotherapies can lead to immune-related adverse events (irAEs), which are autoimmune-like phenomena that can affect any organ system, including the colon (colitis), lungs (pneumonitis), liver (hepatitis), and endocrine glands (thyroiditis, hypophysitis). These irAEs demand early recognition and intervention with immunosuppressive agents like corticosteroids to prevent life-threatening complications.

Therefore, a comprehensive exploration of the scientific aspects of these new anticancer drugs is not merely an academic exercise but a clinical imperative. This review aims to provide a detailed synthesis of the current landscape, delving into the modern classification schemes that bring order to this diverse therapeutic arena. It will elaborate on the intricate mechanisms by which these drugs exert their antitumor effects, from inhibiting proliferative signals and inducing apoptosis to unleashing a potent immune response. The discussion will extend to the fundamental pharmacological properties that govern their behavior within the body, their established and emerging clinical applications across a spectrum of malignancies, and the nuanced management of their unique and often unpredictable toxicities. By integrating insights from molecular biology, pharmacology, and clinical medicine, this analysis seeks to illuminate the remarkable progress achieved in the fight against cancer while also acknowledging the ongoing challenges—such as primary and acquired resistance, the high cost of development, and access to treatment—that must be addressed to fully realize the potential of this new era in oncology. The journey from a non-specific cytotoxic attack to a precise, biomarker-guided strategic intervention marks one of the most significant advancements in modern medicine, offering renewed hope and extended survival for countless patients worldwide.

Emerging drug classes, such as ADCs (e.g., trastuzumab deruxtecan), combine the specificity of monoclonal antibodies with potent cytotoxic payloads, offering improved tumor targeting. Immune checkpoint inhibitors, including anti-PD-1/PD-L1 agents like pembrolizumab and nivolumab, have transformed treatment for cancers like melanoma and non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) by unleashing T-cell responses. TKIs, such as osimertinib for EGFR-mutated NSCLC, target specific oncogenic pathways, while natural products (e.g., paclitaxel, curcumin) and repurposed drugs (e.g., metformin, statins) offer cost-effective alternatives with novel mechanisms. Advances in drug delivery, including nanoparticles, liposomes, and microneedles, address challenges like poor bioavailability and systemic toxicity, enhancing therapeutic precision.

Despite these advancements, significant challenges persist. Drug resistance, driven by mechanisms such as target mutations (e.g., EGFR T790M), pathway bypassing, and tumor microenvironment interactions, limits long-term efficacy. Toxicities, ranging from myelosuppression and cardiotoxicity to immune-related adverse events, necessitate careful management through dose optimization, supportive care, and pharmacogenomic profiling. The high failure rate of drug candidates—over 90.

The global burden of cancer also raises ethical and accessibility concerns. High costs of novel therapies, particularly biologics and CAR-T, limit access in low- and middle-income countries, exacerbating health disparities. Efforts to repurpose existing drugs, such as metformin for its antimetabolic effects or disulfiram for glycolysis inhibition, aim to provide affordable options.

Additionally, natural products like artemisinin derivatives and betulinic acid are being explored for their multitargeted effects, offering potential in resource-limited settings. This article synthesizes current knowledge on new anticancer drugs, drawing from clinical trials, pharmacological studies, and emerging trends up to 2025. It explores how these agents are reshaping oncology through precision medicine, while addressing the scientific, clinical, and societal challenges that remain. By examining the interplay of molecular mechanisms, pharmacological properties, and clinical outcomes, this review aims to provide a comprehensive resource for researchers, clinicians, and policymakers navigating the evolving landscape of cancer therapeutics.

The following sections delve into the detailed classification of anticancer drugs, their historical context, and the scientific principles underpinning their development. Subsequent discussions cover specific mechanisms of action, pharmacological profiles, clinical applications, therapeutic effects, and toxicity profiles, with a focus on recent innovations and future directions. This holistic approach underscores the transformative potential of new anticancer drugs while acknowledging the complexities of translating scientific advancements into equitable, effective clinical practice.

Evolution of Anticancer Drug Development

The evolution of anticancer drugs reflects a convergence of serendipity, scientific rigor, and technological innovation. Early chemotherapeutics were derived from chemical warfare agents, with nitrogen mustards demonstrating cytotoxic effects during World War II. These findings led to the development of alkylating agents, which covalently bind DNA to prevent replication. The discovery of methotrexate, an antifolate, emerged from observations of folate deficiency in leukemia patients, highlighting the role of metabolic pathways in cancer therapy. The 1960s and 1970s saw the introduction of plant-derived agents, such as vinca alkaloids and taxanes, which targeted microtubules to disrupt mitosis. These agents, while effective, lacked specificity, causing significant off-target toxicities. The molecular biology revolution of the late 20th century shifted focus to targeted therapies. The identification of oncogenes like BCR-ABL in CML paved the way for imatinib, a TKI that selectively inhibits aberrant kinase activity. Similarly, the discovery of HER2 amplification in breast cancer led to trastuzumab, a monoclonal antibody that improved survival rates. These milestones marked the dawn of precision oncology, where therapies are tailored to specific genetic or molecular profiles.

In recent years, the integration of genomics and immunology has accelerated progress. The completion of the Human Genome Project and advancements in next-generation sequencing have enabled the identification of driver mutations, facilitating the development of drugs like osimertinib for EGFR-mutated NSCLC. Immunotherapies, such as PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitors, have leveraged the immune system's potential to recognize and destroy cancer cells, achieving durable responses in previously refractory diseases.

Current Trends in Anticancer Drug Development

As of 2025, anticancer drug development is characterized by several key trends. First, the rise of ADCs has revolutionized targeted therapy by combining antibody specificity with cytotoxic payloads. Drugs like sacituzumab govitecan for triple-negative breast cancer deliver potent agents directly to tumor cells, minimizing systemic toxicity. Second, immunotherapies, particularly

checkpoint inhibitors and CAR-T therapies, have expanded treatment options for previously intractable cancers. Pembrolizumab, for instance, has shown durable responses in microsatellite instability-high (MSI-H) tumors across multiple cancer types.

Third, the exploration of natural products and repurposed drugs offers novel therapeutic avenues. Compounds like curcumin and artemisinin derivatives target multiple pathways, including PI3K/Akt/mTOR and oxidative stress, respectively. Repurposed drugs, such as metformin, leverage metabolic vulnerabilities in cancer cells, providing cost-effective alternatives. Finally, advances in drug delivery, including nanotechnology and hydrogels, enhance pharmacokinetic profiles and reduce adverse effects. These trends reflect a multidisciplinary approach, integrating genomics, immunology, and materials science to address the multifaceted nature of cancer.

Challenges and Opportunities of Anticancer Drug

Despite progress, several challenges hinder the full potential of new anticancer drugs. Drug resistance remains a critical barrier, with mechanisms including efflux pumps, target mutations, and tumor microenvironment adaptations. For example, EGFR T790M mutations confer resistance to first-generation TKIs, necessitating next-generation agents like osimertinib. Toxicity profiles, such as cardiotoxicity from anthracyclines or immune-related colitis from checkpoint inhibitors, require vigilant monitoring and management strategies.

Opportunities for advancement include AI-driven drug discovery, which accelerates the identification of novel targets and optimizes molecular design. Targeting cancer stem cells (CSCs) via pathways like Wnt, Hedgehog, and Notch offers potential to prevent relapse. Additionally, the role of the microbiome in modulating drug response is an emerging field, with studies suggesting that gut microbiota influence immunotherapy efficacy. Addressing global disparities in access to these therapies is also critical, with initiatives like drug repurposing and biosimilar development aiming to reduce costs.

Cancer remains a formidable global health challenge, with profound impacts on morbidity and mortality. According to the World Health Organization, cancer accounted for approximately 19.3 million new cases and 10 million deaths worldwide in 2020, with projections estimating a rise to 28.4 million new cases by 2040. This escalation is driven by an aging population, increased prevalence of risk factors such as smoking and obesity, and environmental exposures including air pollution and occupational carcinogens. The complexity of cancer, characterized by uncontrolled cell growth, genetic heterogeneity, and metastatic potential, necessitates innovative therapeutic strategies. Over the past few decades, anticancer drug development has transitioned from nonspecific cytotoxic agents to highly targeted therapies, immunotherapies, and advanced drug delivery systems, revolutionizing clinical management and patient outcomes.

Historically, the fight against cancer began with rudimentary interventions. In the 19th century, natural compounds like podophyllotoxin from Podophyllum peltatum laid the groundwork for modern chemotherapeutics such as etoposide, approved in 1983. The mid-20th century saw significant milestones with the discovery of nitrogen mustards during World War II, leading to alkylating agents like cyclophosphamide. Concurrently, antifolates such as methotrexate (approved in 1948) and antimetabolites like 5-fluorouracil (1950s) emerged, targeting DNA and RNA synthesis. Plant-derived agents, including vinblastine in the 1960s and paclitaxel in the 1990s, further expanded the chemotherapeutic arsenal. The serendipitous discovery of cisplatin in 1965 marked a

pivotal advancement, introducing platinum-based drugs that remain cornerstones in treating solid tumors.

The late 1990s ushered in a paradigm shift with the advent of targeted therapies. The approval of trastuzumab in 1998 for HER2-positive breast cancer and imatinib in 2001 for chronic myelogenous leukemia (CML) exemplified the potential of precision medicine, targeting specific molecular aberrations. These successes spurred the development of tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs), monoclonal antibodies, and other biologics. By 2025, the therapeutic landscape has further evolved with the introduction of antibody-drug conjugates (ADCs), immune checkpoint inhibitors, and chimeric antigen receptor T-cell (CAR-T) therapies, alongside novel approaches like nanotechnology and drug repurposing. These advancements aim to enhance efficacy, minimize off-target effects, and overcome resistance, a persistent challenge in oncology.

This article comprehensively examines the scientific aspects of new anticancer drugs, focusing on their classification, clinical use, features, and mechanisms of action, pharmacology, therapeutic effects, and toxicities. The scope is limited to drugs with full approval by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and European Medicines Agency (EMA) as of March 2024, excluding those under accelerated or conditional approval to ensure robust evidence of clinical benefit. The classification framework organizes drugs by their site of action—tumor cell nucleus, cytoplasm, vasculature, immune system, or endocrine system—and their mechanistic approach, providing a structured understanding of their therapeutic roles. This system facilitates the design of rational combination therapies and highlights synergistic potential.

Emerging drug classes, such as ADCs (e.g., trastuzumab deruxtecan), combine the specificity of monoclonal antibodies with potent cytotoxic payloads, offering improved tumor targeting. Immune checkpoint inhibitors, including anti-PD-1/PD-L1 agents like pembrolizumab and nivolumab, have transformed treatment for cancers like melanoma and non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) by unleashing T-cell responses. TKIs, such as osimertinib for EGFR-mutated NSCLC, target specific oncogenic pathways, while natural products (e.g., paclitaxel, curcumin) and repurposed drugs (e.g., metformin, statins) offer cost-effective alternatives with novel mechanisms. Advances in drug delivery, including nanoparticles, liposomes, and microneedles, address challenges like poor bioavailability and systemic toxicity, enhancing therapeutic precision.

Despite these advancements, significant challenges persist. Drug resistance, driven by mechanisms such as target mutations (e.g., EGFR T790M), pathway bypassing, and tumor microenvironment interactions, limits long-term efficacy. Toxicities, ranging from myelosuppression and cardiotoxicity to immune-related adverse events, necessitate careful management through dose optimization, supportive care, and pharmacogenomic profiling. The high failure rate of drug candidates—over 90% due to insufficient efficacy or unacceptable toxicity—underscores the need for innovative approaches, including artificial intelligence (AI)-driven drug design, cancer stem cell targeting, and microbiome modulation.

The global burden of cancer also raises ethical and accessibility concerns. High costs of novel therapies, particularly biologics and CAR-T, limit access in low- and middle-income countries, exacerbating health disparities. Efforts to repurpose existing drugs, such as metformin for its antimetabolic effects or disulfiram for glycolysis inhibition, aim to provide affordable options. Additionally, natural products like artemisinin derivatives and betulinic acid are being explored for their multitargeted effects, offering potential in resource-limited settings.

This article synthesizes current knowledge on new anticancer drugs, drawing from clinical trials, pharmacological studies, and emerging trends up to 2025. It explores how these agents are reshaping oncology through precision medicine, while addressing the scientific, clinical, and societal challenges that remain. By examining the interplay of molecular mechanisms, pharmacological properties, and clinical outcomes, this review aims to provide a comprehensive resource for researchers, clinicians, and policymakers navigating the evolving landscape of cancer therapeutics.

The following sections delve into the detailed classification of anticancer drugs, their historical context, and the scientific principles underpinning their development. Subsequent discussions cover specific mechanisms of action, pharmacological profiles, clinical applications, therapeutic effects, and toxicity profiles, with a focus on recent innovations and future directions. This holistic approach underscores the transformative potential of new anticancer drugs while acknowledging the complexities of translating scientific advancements into equitable, effective clinical practice.

Scope and Objectives of This Review

This review aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of new anticancer drugs, focusing on their scientific underpinnings and clinical implications. By classifying drugs based on their site of action and mechanism, it offers a framework for understanding their therapeutic roles and potential synergies. The article examines key drug classes, including ADCs, TKIs, immunotherapies, natural products, and repurposed agents, detailing their mechanisms, pharmacology, clinical applications, effects, and toxicities. It also explores emerging approaches, such as nanotechnology and AI-driven design, and addresses future directions in overcoming resistance and improving accessibility. Through this detailed exploration, the article seeks to serve as a valuable resource for researchers, clinicians, and policymakers. It highlights the transformative potential of new anticancer drugs while acknowledging the scientific and societal challenges that must be addressed to realize their full impact in the global fight against cancer.

Through this detailed exploration, the article seeks to serve as a valuable resource for researchers, clinicians, and policymakers. It highlights the transformative potential of new anticancer drugs while acknowledging the scientific and societal challenges that must be addressed to realize their full impact in the global fight against cancer.

To further elaborate on the historical evolution, let's consider the role of key discoveries in shaping current therapies. The identification of the Philadelphia chromosome in 1960 led to the understanding of BCR-ABL fusion in CML, culminating in imatinib's approval. Similarly, the discovery of EGFR mutations in NSCLC in 2004 paved the way for gefitinib and erlotinib. These examples illustrate how basic science translates to clinical breakthroughs.

In the context of immunotherapies, the Nobel Prize-winning work on immune checkpoints by Honjo and Allison in 2018 has led to widespread adoption of PD-1 inhibitors. The success of sipuleucel-T in 2010 as the first cancer vaccine set the stage for personalized neoantigen vaccines, now in advanced trials. These developments underscore the shift from empirical to mechanism-based drug design.

Moving to targeted therapies, the approval of PARP inhibitors like olaparib in 2014 for BRCA-mutated cancers exploited synthetic lethality, a concept rooted in genetic interactions. This

has expanded to other DNA repair inhibitors, highlighting the importance of biomarker-driven approaches.

For ADCs, the evolution from gemtuzumab ozogamicin in 2000 to modern agents like enfortumab vedotin demonstrates improvements in linker technology and payload potency, reducing toxicity while enhancing efficacy.

Repurposed drugs represent a cost-effective strategy. Metformin, originally for diabetes, inhibits mTOR signaling, showing promise in breast cancer trials. Aspirin reduces colorectal cancer risk through COX inhibition, illustrating how existing drugs can be leveraged for oncology.

Natural products continue to inspire. Taxanes from yew trees and vinca alkaloids from periwinkle plants remain staples, with new derivatives like cabazitaxel addressing resistance.

Drug delivery innovations, such as liposomal doxorubicin, reduce cardiotoxicity by altering pharmacokinetics. Nanotechnology enables tumor-specific accumulation via the enhanced permeability and retention effect.

Challenges in drug development include high attrition rates, with only 5% of oncology candidates reaching approval. Regulatory pathways like FDA's accelerated approval facilitate faster access but require post-marketing confirmation.

Global disparities are stark, with 70% of cancer deaths in low-income countries. Initiatives like the WHO's Global Medicine Access program aim to bridge this gap.

GOALS

The primary aim of this comprehensive review is to provide a detailed and systematic examination of the new generation of anticancer therapeutics. To achieve this overarching aim, we have established the following specific goals:

- **To Establish a Modern Classification Framework:** To move beyond traditional chemotherapy-based classification and propose a coherent, mechanism-driven taxonomy that accurately categorizes novel anticancer drugs into logical groups such as targeted therapies (e.g., small molecule inhibitors, monoclonal antibodies) and immunotherapies (e.g., checkpoint inhibitors, CAR-T cells, cancer vaccines), including their respective subclasses.
- **To Delineate Precise Mechanisms of Action:** To elucidate the molecular and cellular mechanisms by which these new agents exert their antitumor effects. This includes detailed explanations of how they interact with specific targets, disrupt critical signaling pathways (e.g., MAPK, PI3K/AKT, JAK/STAT), inhibit angiogenesis, modulate the cell cycle, induce apoptosis, and engage the host immune system to recognize and destroy cancer cells.
- **To Analyze Fundamental Pharmacological Properties:** To describe the key pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic features that define these drugs, including their absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion (ADME) profiles, their structure-activity relationships (SAR), and the principles of drug-receptor interactions that underpin their selectivity and efficacy.
- **To Review and Synthesize Clinical Applications:** To survey the established and emerging clinical uses of these agents across a spectrum of hematological and solid tumor malignancies. This goal emphasizes the practice of biomarker-driven, personalized medicine, detailing how specific genetic alterations or protein expressions (e.g., HER2 amplification, PD-L1 status, BRCA mutations) guide drug selection and combination strategies to optimize patient outcomes.

- **To Characterize Unique Toxicity Profiles:** To catalog and explain the distinct spectra of adverse events associated with different classes of new anticancer drugs. This includes a focus on "on-target" toxicities of targeted agents and immune-related adverse events (irAEs) from immunotherapies, providing insights into their pathophysiology, clinical presentation, and established guidelines for proactive monitoring and management.
- **To Identify Current Challenges and Future Directions:** To critically appraise the limitations of current therapies, including the pervasive problems of innate and acquired resistance, tumor heterogeneity, and high financial toxicity. Furthermore, this review aims to highlight promising avenues of ongoing research, such as the development of novel targets (e.g., KRAS G12C), next-generation immunotherapies, bispecific antibodies, and strategies to overcome the immunosuppressive tumor microenvironment.

By fulfilling these goals, this review endeavors to serve as a valuable educational and reference resource for oncologists, clinical pharmacists, researchers, and students, facilitating a deeper understanding of the scientific principles that govern the use of modern anticancer drugs and ultimately contributing to improved patient care.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The systematic review of the contemporary literature reveals a profoundly transformed oncological therapeutic landscape, defined by a departure from broadly cytotoxic strategies towards an era of precision medicine. This paradigm shift is underpinned by a sophisticated understanding of cancer biology, which has enabled the development of drugs designed with exquisite specificity for molecular targets. The results of this analysis are organized to reflect the interconnected nature of drug classification, mechanism, pharmacology, clinical application, and toxicological profile, demonstrating that these aspects are not discrete but rather form a cohesive scientific narrative.

Recent FDA Approvals in Oncology (2024-2025)

In 2024, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved 50 novel drugs, with 15 specifically targeting cancer treatment or supportive care, reflecting a robust year for oncology innovations. By mid-2025, additional approvals have further expanded therapeutic options. On June 18, 2025, tafasitamab-cxix (Monjuvi) was approved in combination with lenalidomide and rituximab for adults with relapsed or refractory diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (DLBCL) and other lymphomas. In the second quarter of 2025, 13 new oncology approvals were granted, addressing rare cancers, head and neck squamous cell carcinoma, and supportive care needs.

Notable approvals include vimseltinib (Romvimza) for tenosynovial giant cell tumor, mirdametinib (Gomekli) for neurofibromatosis type 1 with symptomatic plexiform neurofibromas, and suzetrigine (Journavx) for pain management in cancer patients. Encorafenib combined with cetuximab and mFOLFOX6 was approved for first-line treatment of BRAF V600E-mutated metastatic colorectal cance. In January 2025, approvals included fam-trastuzumab deruxtecan-nxki for HER2-positive solid tumors, acalabrutinib for mantle cell lymphoma, datopotamab deruxtecan for TROP2-positive non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC), and treosulfan for conditioning regimens in stem cell transplants.

Biologics and biosimilars dominated early 2025 approvals, with pembrolizumab expanded for gastric and gastroesophageal junction (GEJ) adenocarcinoma. Research from Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center contributed to 11 approvals in 2024, underscoring academic-industry collaboration. Small-molecule drugs like aprocitentan (Tryvio), though not exclusively for cancer, highlight the diversity of therapeutic advancements. Fast-tracked drugs in May 2025 included ISB 2001 for multiple myeloma and ADRX-0706 for cervical cancer, reflecting accelerated pathways for unmet needs. In 2024, 32 new chemical entities and 18 biologics were approved, with oncology leading therapeutic categories. First-in-class drugs projected for 2025 include donidalorsen, fitusiran, ivonescimab, and others, promising further innovation. Alectinib's approval for ALK-positive NSCLC in Q2 2024 exemplifies continued progress in targeted therapies.

Mechanisms of Action

New anticancer drugs target cancer hallmarks through diverse mechanisms. Antibody-drug conjugates (ADCs) like fam-trastuzumab deruxtecan-nxki deliver cytotoxic payloads (e.g., topoisomerase I inhibitors) to HER2-expressing cells, inducing DNA damage and apoptosis. Tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs) such as vimseltinib inhibit colony-stimulating factor 1 receptor (CSF1R), disrupting tumor-associated macrophages in tenosynovial giant cell tumors. Immune checkpoint inhibitors, like pembrolizumab, block PD-1/PD-L1 interactions, enhancing T-cell activity against tumors such as gastric cancers. Bispecific antibodies, such as tafasitamab, engage CD19 on B-cells and CD3 on T-cells, promoting cytotoxic immune responses. MEK inhibitors like mirdametinib target the RAS/MAPK pathway, critical in neurofibromatosis type 1.

Natural compounds and repurposed drugs exhibit multitargeted effects. Peptides, for instance, enhance chemotherapy efficacy while reducing resistance by modulating signaling pathways. Anthracyclines like doxorubicin intercalate DNA and damage chromatin, disrupting replication. Off-target effects contribute to both efficacy and toxicity, necessitating careful design. Resistance mechanisms include drug inactivation, efflux pump upregulation, and pathway alterations (e.g., EGFR mutations), which limit long-term efficacy. Recent studies advocate for chromatin-damaging agents to minimize systemic toxicity, offering a novel approach to improve safety profiles.

Pharmacology and Clinical Use

Pharmacologically, small molecules like acalabrutinib, a Bruton's tyrosine kinase (BTK) inhibitor, offer high oral bioavailability and selectivity, used in mantle cell lymphoma. Biologics, such as pembrolizumab and ADCs, require intravenous administration, with half-lives ranging from days to weeks, influencing dosing schedules. Drug delivery systems, including nanoparticles and cleavable linkers in ADCs, enhance tumor specificity and reduce systemic exposure.

Clinical use is increasingly biomarker-driven. Datopotamab deruxtecan targets TROP2 in NSCLC, achieving significant response rates in pretreated patients. Combinations, such as encorafenib with cetuximab, improve progression-free survival in BRAF-mutated colorectal cancer. Repurposed drugs, like metformin, leverage metabolic vulnerabilities, offering cost-effective options with reduced toxicity. Natural compounds, such as curcumin, modulate pathways like PI3K/Akt/mTOR, showing promise in preclinical models. Drug interactions, particularly via

CYP3A4 metabolism, affect TKI pharmacokinetics, requiring careful monitoring. Class effects, such as shared toxicities among CDK4/6 inhibitors, allow interchangeability but demand vigilance.

Therapeutic Effects

Therapeutic effects are evidenced by improved objective response rates (ORR) and overall survival (OS). Pembrolizumab demonstrates durable responses in gastric/GEJ adenocarcinoma, with ORR exceeding 30% in MSI-H tumors. ADCs like trastuzumab deruxtecan achieve ORR above 40% in HER2-low breast cancer, expanding treatment options. In a comprehensive analysis of 52 drugs approved between 2019 and 2022, 213 clinical endpoints were identified, including OS, progression-free survival, and ORR, though many trials lacked placebo controls, complicating efficacy assessments.

Mechanistically, these drugs induce apoptosis, inhibit angiogenesis, or activate immune responses. Ion channel modulators, an emerging class, alter tumor cell membrane potentials, enhancing cytotoxic effects. Combination therapies, such as checkpoint inhibitors with TKIs, synergize to improve outcomes, particularly in NSCLC and melanoma. Natural products like artemisinin derivatives upregulate tumor suppressors, while repurposed drugs like disulfiram inhibit glycolysis, offering novel mechanisms. These effects collectively shift treatment paradigms toward less toxic, more effective regimens, aligning with precision medicine goals.

Toxicities and Side Effects

Toxicities remain a significant challenge. ADCs like trastuzumab deruxtecan are associated with interstitial lung disease and neutropenia, requiring proactive monitoring. TKIs such as acalabrutinib cause bleeding risks and infections, particularly in immunocompromised patients. Immune checkpoint inhibitors induce immune-related adverse events, including colitis and pneumonitis, with incidence rates up to 20% in some cohorts. Anthracyclines contribute to cardiotoxicity, limiting cumulative doses.

Off-target effects are a leading cause of clinical trial failures, with over 90% of candidates failing due to toxicity or insufficient efficacy. Strategies to mitigate toxicity include neutralizing cell-free chromatin to reduce chemotherapy-induced systemic damage. Newer agents, like suzetrigine, cause drowsiness and gastrointestinal upset, necessitating supportive care. Combination therapies reduce individual drug dosages, mitigating toxicities while maintaining efficacy. Understanding class effects, such as myelosuppression in alkylating agents, aids in predicting and managing adverse events. Pharmacogenomic profiling further optimizes dosing to minimize toxicity in diverse patient populations.

Discussion on Challenges and Future Directions

Despite advancements, only about 50% of critical clinical trials for new anticancer drugs are completed before approval, raising concerns about long-term efficacy and safety data. Resistance, driven by mechanisms like target mutations and tumor microenvironment adaptations, limits durability of responses. Toxicities, particularly from ADCs and immunotherapies, necessitate improved management strategies.

Future directions include leveraging artificial intelligence (AI) for drug design, identifying novel targets, and optimizing pharmacokinetics. Microbiome modulation is emerging as a strategy

to enhance immunotherapy efficacy, with gut microbiota influencing PD-1 inhibitor responses. Natural compounds and peptides offer promise for reducing toxicity and overcoming resistance, with preclinical data supporting their multitargeted effects. Global access remains a critical issue, with high costs of biologics and CAR-T therapies limiting availability in low- and middle-income countries. Repurposing drugs like metformin and developing biosimilars aim to address this gap.

Emerging approaches also focus on targeting cancer stem cells (CSCs) via pathways like Wnt and Hedgehog, potentially preventing relapse. Nanotechnology, including liposomes and microneedles, improves drug delivery, enhancing bioavailability and reducing off-target effects. Ethical considerations, such as equitable access and informed consent in trials, are paramount as oncology advances.

Detailed Analysis of Specific Drugs

Tafasitamab-cxix (Monjuvi): This bispecific antibody targets CD19 and CD3, promoting T-cell-mediated lysis of B-cells. Administered intravenously with a half-life of approximately 17 days, it achieves an ORR of 55% in relapsed DLBCL. Toxicities include infusion-related reactions and cytopenias, manageable with premedication and dose adjustments.

Vimseltinib (Romvimza): A CSF1R inhibitor, vimseltinib is orally administered once daily, achieving tumor shrinkage in 70% of tenosynovial giant cell tumor patients. Common toxicities include edema and fatigue, with low-grade severity in most cases.

Mirdametinib (Gomekli): This MEK1/2 inhibitor targets the RAS/MAPK pathway in neurofibromatosis type 1. It improves symptoms in plexiform neurofibromas, with toxicities like rash and diarrhea managed through supportive care.

Fam-Trastuzumab Deruxtecan-nxki: This ADC targets HER2, delivering a topoisomerase I inhibitor payload. It achieves high ORR in HER2-positive and HER2-low cancers but carries risks of interstitial lung disease, requiring vigilant monitoring.

Pembrolizumab: Expanded for gastric/GEJ adenocarcinoma, this PD-1 inhibitor enhances T-cell responses, with durable responses in MSI-H tumors. Immune-related toxicities, such as colitis, are managed with corticosteroids.

Combination Therapies and Resistance

Combination therapies enhance efficacy by targeting multiple pathways. For example, encorafenib with cetuximab and mFOLFOX6 improves survival in BRAF-mutated colorectal cancer by inhibiting MAPK signaling and enhancing cytotoxic effects. However, resistance mechanisms, such as EGFR T790M mutations in NSCLC, necessitate next-generation TKIs like osimertinib. Tumor microenvironment factors, including hypoxia and stromal interactions, further contribute to resistance, highlighting the need for integrated approaches.

Future Innovations

AI-driven drug discovery accelerates target identification and optimizes molecular design, reducing development timelines. Microbiome-based interventions, such as probiotics, enhance immunotherapy outcomes by modulating immune responses. CSC-targeted therapies, like Hedgehog inhibitors (e.g., vismodegib), aim to prevent tumor recurrence. Nanotechnology advances, including pH-sensitive nanoparticles, improve drug delivery to acidic tumor

microenvironments. These innovations promise to address resistance and toxicity while improving global access through cost-effective solutions like repurposed drugs and biosimilars.

Recent FDA approvals and clinical data underscore the transformative potential of new anticancer drugs, from ADCs and TKIs to immunotherapies and natural compounds. While therapeutic effects are promising, toxicities and resistance remain significant hurdles. Future directions leveraging AI, microbiome modulation, and advanced delivery systems offer hope for more effective, accessible treatments. Integrated strategies combining precision medicine with supportive care will be critical to optimizing outcomes in oncology.

Classification of New Anticancer Agents

The traditional classification of anticancer drugs based on their origin or their effect on the cell cycle has been rendered obsolete by the new generation of therapeutics. A modern, scientifically coherent taxonomy must be rooted in the fundamental mechanism of action and the biological target. This framework yields two primary, overarching categories: molecularly targeted therapy and cancer immunotherapy, each encompassing a diverse array of drug classes.

Molecularly targeted therapies are agents designed to interfere with specific molecules that are crucial for tumor growth, progression, and survival. This broad category can be further subdivided based on the nature of the agent and its target. Small molecule inhibitors are typically orally bioavailable compounds that penetrate the cell membrane to bind to specific intracellular targets, most commonly the adenosine triphosphate (ATP)-binding site of enzyme domains. A paramount example is the class of tyrosine kinase inhibitors, which block the aberrant signaling of growth factor receptors such as the epidermal growth factor receptor, the breakpoint cluster region-Abelson kinase, and the anaplastic lymphoma kinase, among many others. Other critical intracellular targets include kinases in the mitogen-activated protein kinase pathway and the phosphoinositide 3-kinase pathway, as well as proteins involved in cell cycle regulation like cyclin-dependent kinases. Another major subclass within targeted therapy is monoclonal antibodies. These are large, biologic agents administered intravenously or subcutaneously that are exquisitely specific for extracellular targets. They function through several mechanisms, including blocking ligand-receptor interactions, delivering cytotoxic payloads as antibody-drug conjugates, or recruiting immune effector cells to mediate antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity. A third, increasingly important subclass is a group of drugs targeting the DNA damage response pathway, most notably poly (ADP-ribose) polymerase inhibitors, which exploit a synthetic lethal relationship in cancers with homologous recombination deficiencies, such as those harboring BRCA mutations.

Cancer immunotherapy, the second major category, represents a conceptual revolution rather than a mere incremental advance. These agents do not directly attack the tumor cell but instead potentiate the patient's own immune system to recognize and eliminate cancer. The most clinically impactful class to date is the immune checkpoint inhibitors. These are monoclonal antibodies that block inhibitory receptors on T-cells, such as programmed death-1 and cytotoxic T-lymphocyte-associated protein 4, or their corresponding ligands on tumor and immune cells, such as programmed death-ligand 1. By disrupting these "brakes" on the immune system, these agents can reinvigorate a pre-existing but suppressed anti-tumor T-cell response. Another transformative modality is adoptive cell transfer, most notably chimeric antigen receptor T-cell therapy. This highly personalized approach involves genetically engineering a patient's T-cells to express a receptor that recognizes a specific tumor-associated antigen, thereby generating a powerful, living

drug capable of profound antitumor activity. Further immunotherapeutic strategies include cancer vaccines, designed to prime an immune response against tumor-specific antigens, and oncolytic viruses, which selectively infect and lyse tumor cells while simultaneously stimulating an immune response within the tumor microenvironment.

Mechanisms of Action: A Molecular Perspective

The mechanistic basis for these new drug classes is both intricate and elegant, reflecting a deep understanding of oncogenic signaling. Targeted small molecule inhibitors achieve their effect through competitive or allosteric inhibition of enzymatic activity. For instance, tyrosine kinase inhibitors bind to the ATP-binding pocket of hyperactive kinases, preventing the phosphorylation and subsequent activation of downstream proteins in critical proliferative and anti-apoptotic pathways. This interruption in signal transduction cascades leads to cell cycle arrest, induction of apoptosis, and inhibition of angiogenesis. The mechanism of monoclonal antibodies is more multifaceted. Naked monoclonal antibodies can simply act as receptor antagonists, sterically hindering a growth factor from binding to its receptor and initiating downstream signaling. Alternatively, they can cause receptor internalization and degradation, effectively downregulating the target from the cell surface. Furthermore, the constant fragment of the antibody can engage immune cells like natural killer cells and macrophages, leading to complement-dependent cytotoxicity or antibody-dependent cellular phagocytosis, thereby leveraging the immune system for tumor cell killing. Antibody-drug conjugates represent a clever hybrid approach, combining the targeting precision of a monoclonal antibody with the potent cytotoxic payload of a traditional chemotherapeutic agent. The antibody delivers the warhead directly to tumor cells expressing the target antigen, where it is internalized, and the cytotoxic agent is released, resulting in a localized cell kill while theoretically sparing healthy tissues.

The mechanism of action of immunotherapy is distinct from any direct cytotoxic effect. Immune checkpoint inhibitors function by blocking the interaction between inhibitory receptors on T-cells and their ligands. Under normal physiological conditions, these checkpoints are crucial for maintaining self-tolerance and preventing autoimmunity. Tumors co-opt these pathways to evade immune surveillance. By administering an antibody that binds to PD-1, for instance, the inhibitory signal is prevented, effectively "releasing the brakes" on antigen-specific T-cells that have infiltrated the tumor. This can lead to the reactivation and proliferation of these T-cell clones, enabling them to mount a potent attack on cancer cells. The mechanism of CAR T-cells is more direct. These engineered T-cells express a synthetic receptor that binds to a specific tumor cell surface antigen. Upon engagement, the intracellular signaling domains of the CAR activate the T-cell, triggering its cytolytic machinery and cytokine production, leading to the destruction of the antigen-positive tumor cell. This represents a form of passive cellular immunotherapy, creating a targeted and potent immune response independent of the endogenous T-cell receptor.

Pharmacological Principles: ADME and Beyond

The pharmacological profiles of these novel agents differ markedly from traditional chemotherapy, with significant implications for their clinical use. The pharmacokinetics—what the body does to the drug—of small molecule inhibitors are characterized by oral administration, good bioavailability, and often high volume of distribution, allowing them to reach intracellular targets. They are typically metabolized extensively by the hepatic cytochrome P450 enzyme system,

particularly the CYP3A4 isoform, making them highly susceptible to drug-drug interactions with other agents that induce or inhibit this pathway. This necessitates careful review of a patient's concomitant medications. Their elimination half-lives can vary widely, from a few hours to several days, informing their dosing schedule, which is often continuous on a daily basis.

In contrast, large biologic agents like monoclonal antibodies have distinctly different pharmacokinetics. Due to their protein nature, they must be administered parenterally, as they would be digested in the gastrointestinal tract. They are not metabolized by cytochrome P450 enzymes but are instead degraded into peptides and amino acids via proteolytic catabolism throughout the body, often involving the reticuloendothelial system. Their large size confines them primarily to the plasma and interstitial fluid, resulting in a low volume of distribution. A key feature of monoclonal antibody pharmacokinetics is their long elimination half-life, often stretching to weeks or even months, which is attributable to protection from catabolism by neonatal Fc receptor-mediated recycling. This allows for less frequent, intermittent dosing schedules, such as every two, three, or four weeks.

The pharmacodynamics—what the drug does to the body—are equally complex. For targeted therapies, the relationship between drug concentration and effect is often linked to the saturation of the target pathway. The therapeutic effect is not always directly proportional to the maximum concentration achieved but is more closely related to the time during which the drug concentration remains above a threshold required for target inhibition. This has led to the concept of a target trough concentration for many tyrosine kinase inhibitors, which is monitored to ensure continuous pathway suppression. For immunotherapies, the pharmacodynamic relationship is even more complex and delayed. The administration of a checkpoint inhibitor does not immediately lyse tumor cells. Instead, it initiates a biological process that requires time for T-cell activation, clonal expansion, and migration to tumor sites. This explains the characteristically delayed onset of clinical response and the unusual patterns of response such as pseudoprogression, where tumors may appear to grow initially due to immune cell infiltration before subsequently regressing.

Clinical Applications and the Paradigm of Precision Medicine

The clinical deployment of these agents has fundamentally altered treatment algorithms and patient outcomes across a vast spectrum of malignancies. The efficacy of these drugs is inextricably linked to the presence of the specific molecular target they are designed to inhibit, cementing the role of comprehensive biomarker testing as a standard of care in modern oncology. Tumor genotyping via next-generation sequencing panels is now routine to identify actionable mutations, and immunohistochemistry is used to detect protein expression levels of targets like HER2 or PD-L1.

The success of targeted therapy is exemplified in diseases such as chronic myeloid leukemia, where BCR-ABL inhibitors have transformed a once-fatal diagnosis into a chronic, manageable condition with near-normal life expectancy. In non-small cell lung cancer, the identification of driver alterations in genes like EGFR, ALK, ROS1, and BRAF has created multiple subsets of the disease, each with a corresponding highly effective targeted therapy, leading to unprecedented response rates and progression-free survival compared to historical chemotherapy standards. Similarly, the use of PARP inhibitors in ovarian and breast cancers with BRCA mutations demonstrates the powerful clinical application of the synthetic lethality principle.

Immunotherapy, particularly checkpoint inhibition, has produced durable, long-term remissions in a subset of patients with advanced cancers that were previously considered uniformly fatal. This has been most dramatically observed in melanoma, renal cell carcinoma, and non-small cell lung cancer, where anti-PD-1 agents have become cornerstone therapies. The approval of checkpoint inhibitors is often tied to the measurement of PD-L1 expression levels, though other biomarkers such as tumor mutational burden and microsatellite instability status are also used to predict response. CAR T-cell therapy has achieved remarkable success in certain hematological malignancies, leading to high rates of complete and lasting remission in patients with chemorefractory acute lymphoblastic leukemia and diffuse large B-cell lymphoma, a feat previously thought unattainable.

These advances have reshaped clinical trial design and treatment endpoints. Therapies are increasingly studied in biomarker-selected populations. The traditional dose-escalation phase I trial designed to find the maximum tolerated dose is sometimes replaced with trials seeking the optimal biological dose for targeted agents. Furthermore, the chronic administration of these drugs, often for years, has shifted the treatment paradigm for advanced cancer from an acute, palliative intent to a chronic disease management model for a significant number of patients.

Toxicities and Their Management: A New Clinical Challenge

The toxicity profiles of these novel agents are as distinctive as their mechanisms, requiring oncologists to develop a new skillset for recognition and management. The adverse events associated with targeted therapies are often mechanism-based "on-target" effects, resulting from the inhibition of the intended target in healthy tissues that rely on the same pathway for normal function. For example, inhibitors of the epidermal growth factor receptor almost universally cause a characteristic papulopustular rash and diarrhea, as EGFR plays a key role in skin and gastrointestinal epithelial homeostasis. Inhibitors of the vascular endothelial growth factor pathway frequently lead to hypertension, proteinuria, and impaired wound healing due to their effect on normal angiogenesis. These toxicities are generally dose-dependent and manageable with supportive care, dose modifications, or treatment interruptions.

The toxicities of immunotherapy, however, are fundamentally different and are classified as immune-related adverse events. These arise from the breaking of peripheral immune tolerance and the unleashing of autoreactive T-cells, leading to a spectrum of autoimmune-like phenomena that can affect any organ system. Common irAEs include dermatologic toxicities like rash and pruritus; gastrointestinal toxicities such as colitis, which can present with severe diarrhea; endocrine toxicities including hypophysitis, thyroiditis, and adrenal insufficiency; and hepatic toxicities manifesting as hepatitis. More rarely, but with greater severity, pneumonitis, myocarditis, and neurological toxicities can occur. The management of these events is based on their grade of severity and involves the use of corticosteroids and other immunosuppressive agents like infliximab. The paramount principles are early recognition, prompt intervention, and patient education, as delays can lead to life-threatening complications. This requires a high index of suspicion and a multidisciplinary approach to care.

The management of toxicities from CAR T-cell therapy presents another unique challenge, dominated by two primary syndromes: cytokine release syndrome and immune effector cell-associated neurotoxicity syndrome. Cytokine release syndrome is a systemic inflammatory response

caused by the massive activation and proliferation of CAR T-cells and the subsequent release of a flood of inflammatory cytokines. It presents with a spectrum of symptoms, from high fevers and flu-like symptoms to hypotension, capillary leak, and end-organ dysfunction. Immune effector cell-associated neurotoxicity syndrome can present with headaches, confusion, aphasia, seizures, and cerebral edema. Both syndromes require sophisticated supportive care in an acute setting and the judicious use of immunomodulatory agents like the interleukin-6 receptor antagonist tocilizumab.

The development and integration of new anticancer drugs based on scientific principles of tumor biology have irrevocably changed the practice of oncology. The results of this analysis demonstrate a clear evolution from non-specific cytotoxicity to targeted intervention and immune modulation. This has been made possible by a refined classification system, a deep understanding of molecular mechanisms, sophisticated pharmacological principles, and the clinical validation of precision medicine.

However, significant challenges persist. Primary and acquired resistance to targeted therapies remains a major obstacle, driven by tumor heterogeneity, clonal evolution, and the activation of bypass signaling pathways. Combination strategies, targeting multiple pathways simultaneously or sequentially, are a key area of ongoing research. For immunotherapy, the inability to predict response accurately and the fact that a majority of patients do not derive long-term benefit highlight the need for better biomarkers and strategies to overcome immunosuppressive tumor microenvironments. The logistical complexity and exceedingly high cost of these therapies also pose substantial challenges to healthcare systems worldwide.

Future directions are focused on next-generation innovations. These include the development of drugs targeting previously "undruggable" targets like KRAS, the creation of more sophisticated bispecific T-cell engagers and next-generation CAR T-cells with improved safety profiles and efficacy against solid tumors, and the exploration of novel immunotherapeutic targets beyond PD-1 and CTLA-4. The journey of discovery continues, driven by the relentless pursuit of translating scientific insight into tangible clinical benefit for patients afflicted with cancer.

The Intricacies of Targeted Therapy: A Deep Dive into Key Pathways

A more granular examination of specific targeted pathways reveals the sophistication and challenges of modern cancer drug development. The epidermal growth factor receptor pathway serves as a paradigmatic example. First-generation EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors, such as erlotinib and gefitinib, demonstrated remarkable efficacy in non-small cell lung cancer harboring activating EGFR mutations. However, their clinical utility was inevitably curtailed by the emergence of resistance, most commonly through the acquisition of a secondary T790M mutation within the ATP-binding pocket. This knowledge directly fueled the development of second-generation irreversible inhibitors like afatinib, designed to covalently bind the kinase domain, and subsequently, third-generation osimertinib, which is specifically optimized to target the T790M mutant receptor while sparing wild-type EGFR, thereby mitigating dose-limiting toxicities like skin rash. This iterative process—from initial efficacy to understanding resistance and engineering a superior solution—epitomizes the dynamic nature of oncology drug development in the targeted therapy era.

Another illustrative pathway is the mitogen-activated protein kinase pathway, a key driver in melanoma and other cancers. BRAF inhibitors, such as vemurafenib and dabrafenib, produce dramatic tumor regressions in patients whose melanomas harbor the BRAF V600E mutation. However, the response is frequently short-lived, as tumors rapidly activate bypass tracks, often through upstream or parallel signaling nodes. This understanding led to the rational combination of BRAF inhibitors with MEK inhibitors, such as cobimetinib or trametinib. This dual-pathway blockade not only enhances the depth and duration of response but also paradoxically reduces the cutaneous toxicities associated with BRAF inhibition alone, such as verrucous keratoses and squamous cell carcinomas, which are mediated through paradoxical MAPK pathway activation in wild-type cells. This example underscores a critical principle: rational drug combinations, informed by a deep understanding of signaling network feedback loops, are essential to overcome the adaptive resilience of cancer cells.

The development of cyclin-dependent kinase 4/6 inhibitors for hormone receptor-positive breast cancer demonstrates the successful targeting of the cell cycle machinery. Drugs like palbociclib, ribociclib, and abemaciclib arrest the cell cycle in the G1 phase by inhibiting the phosphorylation of the retinoblastoma protein. Their clinical success is not as monotherapies but in combination with endocrine therapy, where they profoundly delay disease progression. The pharmacological differences between these agents, such as abemaciclib's greater single-agent activity and distinct toxicity profile (higher incidence of diarrhea, lower incidence of neutropenia), highlight how subtle variations in drug selectivity and pharmacokinetics can lead to meaningful clinical differences, offering clinicians choices to tailor therapy based on individual patient profiles and comorbidities.

The Evolving Landscape of Immunotherapy: Beyond Checkpoint Inhibition

While immune checkpoint blockade has rightfully garnered immense attention, the field of cancer immunotherapy is far broader. Adoptive cell therapy, particularly CAR T-cell therapy, represents a pinnacle of personalized medicine. The process involves leukapheresis, genetic modification of a patient's T-cells ex vivo to express a synthetic receptor targeting an antigen like CD19 or BCMA, lymphodepleting chemotherapy, and subsequent reinfusion of the engineered cells. The results in certain B-cell malignancies are unprecedented, with high rates of complete and durable remission in patients with otherwise refractory disease. However, the challenges are significant. The products are complex and costly to manufacture, leading to logistical hurdles and delays. The toxicities, CRS and ICANS, require management in specialized centers. Furthermore, the efficacy of CAR T-cells in solid tumors has been limited, due to factors such as tumor antigen heterogeneity, a suppressive tumor microenvironment, and inadequate T-cell trafficking and persistence. Next-generation strategies are focusing on arming CAR T-cells with capabilities to overcome this immunosuppression, such as secreting cytokines or including safety switches to mitigate toxicity.

Antibody-drug conjugates represent a masterclass in leveraging the specificity of antibodies to deliver potent cytotoxicity. The therapeutic index of an ADC is a delicate balance determined by three components: the antibody (determining targeting specificity), the linker (determining

stability in circulation and cleavage efficiency in the target cell), and the payload (the warhead, often a derivative of a traditional chemotherapeutic with a mechanism of action such as tubulin inhibition or DNA damage). The clinical success of ADCs like trastuzumab deruxtecan, particularly in cancers with low-level HER2 expression, has introduced the concept of the "her2-low" breast cancer subtype, effectively creating a new biomarker-defined population for treatment. This highlights how new drugs can redefine disease classification. A key toxicity of ADCs is off-target effects, which can occur if the linker is unstable in the plasma, releasing the payload prematurely and causing systemic toxicities reminiscent of traditional chemotherapy, such as neutropenia or thrombocytopenia.

The Pervasive Challenge of Resistance Mechanisms

The development of resistance is a near-universal phenomenon that ultimately limits the benefit of both targeted and immunotherapeutic agents. The mechanisms of resistance to targeted therapies are multifaceted. On-target resistance involves mutations in the drug's binding site that reduce drug affinity, as seen with the aforementioned T790M and C797S mutations in EGFR, or gatekeeper mutations in other kinases. Off-target resistance involves the activation of alternative signaling pathways that bypass the inhibited target. For example, MET amplification can drive resistance to EGFR inhibitors by reactivating the downstream PI3K/AKT pathway. Phenotypic transformation, such as the epithelial-to-mesenchymal transition, can also confer a more aggressive, drug-resistant state. Finally, tumor heterogeneity ensures that pre-existing resistant clones are selected for under the selective pressure of therapy.

Resistance to immunotherapy is equally complex and less well-characterized. It can be categorized into primary resistance (no initial response) and acquired resistance (response followed by progression). Mechanisms include a lack of tumor immunogenicity, often due to a low tumor mutational burden or defects in antigen presentation machinery. The tumor microenvironment can be a physical and functional barrier, populated with immunosuppressive cells like regulatory T-cells, myeloid-derived suppressor cells, and M2 macrophages, and characterized by the expression of other inhibitory immune checkpoints beyond PD-1/CTLA-4. T-cell exhaustion, a state of dysfunction characterized by progressive loss of effector function and sustained expression of inhibitory receptors, can render infiltrating T-cells incapable of mounting an effective attack. Strategies to overcome these barriers are the focus of intense research, including combinations of different immunotherapies, therapies to modulate the tumor microenvironment, and engineered cellular therapies designed to resist exhaustion.

The Art and Science of Combination Therapies

Given the inevitability of resistance, combination therapies have become the cornerstone of clinical development. These strategies are designed to attack the cancer on multiple fronts, increasing the therapeutic index and delaying or preventing resistance. The rationale for combinations is multi-pronged.

Targeted therapy combinations, as with BRAF and MEK inhibition, aim to achieve vertical pathway inhibition to block feedback loops and escape routes. Another strategy is horizontal pathway combination, targeting two parallel oncogenic drivers. Combining agents that target different hallmarks of cancer, such as angiogenesis and cell proliferation, is also a validated

approach, exemplified by the combination of an anti-VEGF antibody with chemotherapy in many solid tumors.

Combining targeted therapy with immunotherapy is a particularly enticing but challenging strategy. Targeted agents can potentially enhance the immunogenicity of the tumor by inducing cell death and antigen release or by modulating the immunosuppressive microenvironment. For instance, some BRAF inhibitors have been shown to increase T-cell infiltration into melanoma tumors. However, these combinations can also be limited by overlapping toxicities, and the optimal sequencing of these modalities remains an open question for ongoing clinical trials.

Immunotherapy combinations, most notably the pairing of anti-CTLA-4 and anti-PD-1 antibodies, leverage non-redundant mechanisms of action. CTLA-4 inhibition is thought to act primarily in the lymphoid organs, boosting the priming and activation of T-cells, while PD-1 inhibition acts predominantly at the tumor bed, reversing T-cell exhaustion. This combination has proven highly effective in cancers like melanoma and renal cell carcinoma but at the cost of significantly increased immune-related adverse events, necessitating careful patient selection and expert toxicity management.

Impact on Special Populations and Personalized Dosing

The advent of these new agents has necessitated a re-evaluation of treatment approaches in special populations, such as patients with organ dysfunction, the elderly, and those with brain metastases. The pharmacokinetics of small molecule inhibitors, heavily reliant on hepatic metabolism and biliary excretion, can be significantly altered in patients with liver impairment, often requiring dose modifications as detailed in prescribing information. Similarly, renal dysfunction can affect the clearance of agents or their metabolites, though this is a greater concern for cytotoxic chemotherapies than for most targeted agents. The management of immunotherapy in patients with underlying autoimmune diseases was initially a contraindication due to fears of flare, but growing clinical experience suggests that with close monitoring and collaboration with specialists, many of these patients can still safely receive and benefit from treatment.

The treatment of central nervous system metastases has been revolutionized by targeted agents with high CNS penetration. EGFR and ALK inhibitors with improved brain bioavailability, such as osimertinib and lorlatinib, have demonstrated significant intracranial activity, often obviating or delaying the need for whole-brain radiation and its associated neurocognitive sequelae. Similarly, immunotherapy has shown activity in brain metastases, particularly in melanoma and lung cancer, challenging the long-held notion of the brain as an immune-privileged sanctuary site.

The field is moving towards more refined dosing strategies. The traditional paradigm of using the maximum tolerated dose for all patients is being questioned for targeted and immunotherapeutic agents, where the maximum efficacious dose may be lower and where long-term management of chronic toxicities is paramount. Strategies such as therapeutic drug monitoring, pharmacogenomics to predict metabolism and toxicity risk, and adaptive dosing based on toxicity are areas of active investigation to further personalize treatment and optimize the patient's quality of life.

This continued exploration into the nuances of drug classes, resistance, combinations, and special patient care underscores the immense complexity and exciting progress within modern

oncology. The journey from a one-size-fits-all approach to a nuanced, biomarker-driven, and increasingly personalized discipline represents one of the most significant achievements in contemporary medicine. The ongoing dialogue between basic science discovery, translational research, and clinical application ensures that this evolution will continue, offering ever-greater hope to patients.

Emerging Frontiers: Novel Modalities and Platforms

Beyond the established classes of targeted therapies and immunotherapies, the oncological therapeutic arsenal is expanding to include entirely new platforms that operate on distinct principles. Among the most promising are proteolysis-targeting chimeras (PROTACs), a novel technology that represents a paradigm shift from inhibiting protein function to catalyzing its complete destruction. Unlike traditional small molecule inhibitors that occupy an active site and require sustained binding to block function, PROTACs are heterobifunctional molecules. One end binds to the target protein of interest, while the other end recruits an E3 ubiquitin ligase. This forced proximity facilitates the ubiquitination of the target protein, marking it for degradation by the proteasome. This mechanism offers several potential advantages: it can target proteins that lack a defined active site and are therefore considered "undruggable" by conventional means; it achieves a more complete and sustained ablation of the target, potentially overcoming resistance caused by protein overexpression or mutations that reduce drug-binding affinity; and it operates catalytically, meaning a single PROTAC molecule can facilitate the degradation of multiple target proteins. While still largely in preclinical and early clinical development, PROTACs hold immense potential to significantly expand the universe of druggable targets in oncology.

Another frontier is the development of radioligand therapies, which combine the precision of targeted delivery with the potent cell-killing power of radiation. This approach involves a targeting moiety (often a small molecule or peptide) that binds with high affinity to a tumor-associated antigen, linked to a radioactive isotope. The compound is administered systemically, hones in on tumor cells expressing the target, and delivers localized radiation, causing DNA damage and cell death. The recent success of Lutetium-177 dotatate for neuroendocrine tumors and Lutetium-177 PSMA-617 for metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer validates this platform. The "crossfire" effect of radiation can kill neighboring tumor cells that may not express the target antigen, addressing the challenge of tumor heterogeneity. However, this also necessitates careful dosimetry and monitoring to mitigate off-target radiation exposure to critical organs, particularly the kidneys and bone marrow.

Furthermore, the field of cancer vaccines is experiencing a renaissance, propelled by mRNA technology. Unlike preventive vaccines, therapeutic cancer vaccines aim to stimulate a pre-existing immune response or initiate a de novo response against tumor-specific antigens. mRNA-based vaccines offer compelling advantages: they are highly specific, rapidly and inexpensively manufactured, and can encode for multiple neoantigens simultaneously. The recent clinical validation of mRNA technology in infectious diseases has accelerated its application in oncology. Personalized neoantigen vaccines, created by sequencing a patient's tumor to identify unique mutations and then manufacturing a vaccine encoding for those specific neoantigens, represent the ultimate form of personalized medicine. When combined with checkpoint blockade, these vaccines

can act as a catalyst, expanding and directing a repertoire of T-cells specifically against the patient's tumor, potentially overcoming primary resistance to immunotherapy.

The Tumor Microenvironment: The Next Therapeutic Battleground

It is increasingly clear that a tumor is not merely a mass of malignant cells but a complex organ, or "ecosystem," comprising a diverse array of non-malignant cells, signaling molecules, and extracellular matrix that constitute the tumor microenvironment. This microenvironment is not a passive bystander but plays an active and often suppressive role in tumor progression and therapy resistance, making it a critical therapeutic target.

A major cellular component of the TME is cancer-associated fibroblasts. These activated fibroblasts are co-opted by the tumor to support its growth. They secrete factors that promote cancer cell proliferation, remodel the extracellular matrix to create a physical barrier to drug penetration and immune cell infiltration, and secrete cytokines that directly suppress immune effector functions. Strategies to target CAFs are challenging because they are a heterogeneous population with both tumor-promoting and tumor-restraining subsets; indiscriminate depletion may therefore be counterproductive. Current research is focused on disrupting specific pro-tumorigenic functions of CAFs, such as targeting their contractile machinery or inhibiting the specific signaling pathways they use to communicate with cancer and immune cells.

The immune contexture of the TME is equally critical. Beyond the cytotoxic T-cells and checkpoint proteins, the TME is often enriched with immunosuppressive myeloid cells, such as tumor-associated macrophages and myeloid-derived suppressor cells. These cells secrete a range of immunosuppressive cytokines like IL-10 and TGF-β, deplete essential amino acids like tryptophan via IDO expression, and express checkpoint ligands themselves, creating a multi-faceted barrier to an effective anti-tumor immune response. Therapeutic efforts are underway to reprogram these myeloid cells from a pro-tumor (M2) to an anti-tumor (M1) phenotype, to deplete them, or to block their immunosuppressive mechanisms, often in combination with T-cell-directed immunotherapies.

The physical structure of the TME also presents a hurdle. High interstitial fluid pressure, abnormal and compressed blood vessels, and a dense fibrotic matrix can impede the delivery and distribution of therapeutic agents, both small molecules and biologics, to the tumor core. Strategies to normalize the tumor vasculature, such as using modified, low-dose anti-angiogenic therapy, or enzymes that degrade the matrix, like hyaluronidase, are being explored to enhance drug delivery and improve the efficacy of existing treatments.

The Role of Artificial Intelligence and Big Data in Drug Discovery and Development

The complexity of modern oncology, with its vast datasets from genomics, transcriptomics, proteomics, and digital pathology, has necessitated the adoption of advanced computational tools. Artificial intelligence and machine learning are now being integrated into every stage of the drug development pipeline, accelerating discovery and improving success rates.

In the early discovery phase, AI algorithms can analyze massive chemical libraries to predict novel compounds with high binding affinity for a target protein, significantly shortening the hit-to-lead process. Natural language processing models can scour the entirety of published scientific literature to identify previously unknown connections between genes, pathways, and diseases,

proposing novel drug targets. Furthermore, AI can design optimal drug combinations by modeling complex signaling networks and predicting which simultaneous inhibitions will be most synergistic and least toxic.

In clinical development, AI is transforming clinical trial design and patient selection. Machine learning models can analyze electronic health records and biomarker data to identify the patient subpopulations most likely to respond to an investigational therapy, enabling smarter, smaller, and more efficient basket trials. This enrichment strategy increases the probability of trial success and helps deliver the right drug to the right patient faster. AI-powered analysis of radiological images can provide more precise and automated measurements of tumor response, moving beyond RECIST criteria to detect subtle changes in tumor texture and density that may predict long-term benefit earlier than standard metrics.

Perhaps most profoundly, AI is enabling the synthesis of multi-omic data to generate a holistic view of an individual's cancer. By integrating genomic, transcriptomic, and proteomic data from a tumor biopsy, ML models can predict disease trajectory, resistance mechanisms, and optimal.

Decoding and Overcoming Therapeutic Resistance: A Systems Biology Approach

Despite the initial efficacy of many novel agents, the development of resistance remains the most formidable challenge in oncology. Moving beyond cataloging individual resistance mechanisms, a systems biology approach is essential to understand the complex, adaptive networks that tumors employ to survive therapeutic assault. This perspective views resistance not as a simple binary switch but as a dynamic, evolutionary process driven by Darwinian selection pressure within the tumor ecosystem.

Cellular plasticity and phenotypic switching have emerged as critical, non-mutational drivers of resistance. Under the selective pressure of targeted therapy, cancer cells can undergo dedifferentiation, transitioning from a more mature, drug-sensitive state to a primitive, stem-like state that is inherently resistant. This is frequently observed in cancers like melanoma and lung adenocarcinoma treated with kinase inhibitors, where a subset of cells adopts a slow-cycling, persistent state characterized by altered metabolic dependencies and upregulated drug efflux pumps. These "persister" cells are not genetically distinct but lie dormant, serving as a reservoir from which resistant clones eventually emerge. Similarly, under immune pressure, cancer cells can undergo immunoediting, downregulating the very antigens and antigen-presenting machinery that make them visible to the immune system, effectively becoming "invisible" to CAR T-cells and vaccine-primed T-cells. Targeting this plasticity requires therapies that lock cells into a differentiated, susceptible state or that specifically target the resistant stem-like population.

The concept of "bet-hedging" illustrates the tumor's intrinsic resilience. A single tumor is not a monolithic entity but a collection of subclones with diverse genetic and phenotypic profiles. Even before treatment begins, a minor subpopulation with inherent resistance mechanisms may exist. Therapies that are cytostatic rather than cytocidal exert a powerful selective pressure that favors the expansion of these pre-existing resistant clones. This underscores the critical importance of combination therapy upfront, to achieve a maximal cytotoxic response that obliterates the entire tumor ecosystem before adaptation can occur. Monitoring for the emergence of these resistant clones through non-invasive liquid biopsies, which track circulating tumor DNA, is becoming a vital

tool in clinical management, allowing for therapy to be switched or intensified at the earliest sign of clonal evolution.

The tumor microenvironment acts as a sanctuary and active instructor of resistance. Hypoxic regions within the tumor, far from functional blood vessels, are not only物理ical barriers to drug delivery but also create niches where low oxygen tension induces a quiescent, therapy-resistant cell state and upregulates pro-survival pathways. Furthermore, non-malignant cells in the TME can provide direct survival signals to cancer cells. For example, cancer-associated fibroblasts can secrete growth factors like hepatocyte growth factor, which activates the MET receptor on cancer cells and provides a bypass signal when the primary oncogenic driver is inhibited. Stromal cells can also offer metabolic support, exporting nutrients that rescue cancer cells from metabolic stress induced by therapy. Therefore, effective long-term control of cancer will require dual-targeting strategies that attack both the cancer cells and the supportive, resistance-conferring niche they depend on.

The Oncobiota: The Human Microbiome as a Modulator of Therapy Response

A surprising and revolutionary discovery in modern oncology is the profound influence of the human microbiome, particularly the gut microbiota, on the efficacy and toxicity of anticancer therapies. The trillions of bacteria residing in the gastrointestinal tract are no longer seen as passive inhabitants but as active participants in pharmacology, fundamentally altering treatment outcomes. The impact on immunotherapy is most striking. A compelling body of evidence from preclinical models and human studies has demonstrated that the composition of the gut microbiome can predict response to immune checkpoint inhibitors. Patients with a more diverse microbiome enriched in specific bacterial taxa, such as *Faecalibacterium prausnitzii* and *Akkermansia muciniphila*, exhibit significantly higher response rates and improved survival outcomes compared to patients with a less favorable microbial profile. The mechanisms are multifaceted: certain commensal bacteria are known to stimulate the innate immune system, leading to enhanced dendritic cell activation and improved priming of tumor-specific T-cells. Others can metabolize dietary fibers into short-chain fatty acids like butyrate, which systemically modulates the immune system, reducing inflammatory tone and enhancing the function of cytotoxic T-cells within the tumor microenvironment. Conversely, an unfavorable microbiome, or dysbiosis, often induced by broad-spectrum antibiotics, is consistently associated with poorer outcomes to immunotherapy.

The microbiome's influence extends to chemotherapeutic and targeted agents. Numerous conventional chemotherapies, such as cyclophosphamide and gemcitabine, rely on the gut microbiota for their metabolic activation or to stimulate supportive immune responses. Bacteria-derived enzymes can directly chemically modify drugs, altering their bioavailability, efficacy, and toxicity profile. For example, the severe diarrheal toxicity associated with the kinase inhibitor irinotecan is driven by bacterial beta-glucuronidase enzymes in the gut that reactivate the drug's toxic metabolite, causing damage to the intestinal epithelium. Strategies to manipulate the microbiome are therefore a major new therapeutic avenue. These include fecal microbiota transplantation from responding donors to non-responders, the use of defined bacterial consortia (probiotics), and precision prebiotics to nourish beneficial taxa, and the concomitant use of selective microbial inhibitors to block detrimental bacterial enzymes without causing broad dysbiosis. This research is forging a new field at the intersection of oncology and microbiology, where modulating

the oncobiota may become a standard adjuvant to enhance the therapeutic index of cancer treatments.

Paradigm Shifts in Clinical Trial Design for the Modern Era

The traditional phase I-II-III sequential clinical trial paradigm, designed for cytotoxic chemotherapies, is often too slow, inefficient, and ill-suited for evaluating the new generation of anticancer drugs. The field is rapidly adopting innovative, adaptive trial designs that are more flexible, efficient, and focused on biomarker-driven patient selection.

The umbrella and basket trial designs represent a fundamental shift from histology-based to biology-based testing. Basket trials evaluate the activity of a single targeted therapy across multiple different cancer types, all of which share a common molecular alteration. The landmark NCI-MATCH and ASCO TAPUR trials are prime examples, screening thousands of patients to assign them to treatment arms based on their tumor's genetic profile, regardless of where the cancer originated. This design efficiently identifies signal in rare tumor subtypes that could never be enrolled in a traditional histology-specific trial. Conversely, umbrella trials evaluate multiple different targeted therapies within a single cancer type. Patients with a specific cancer, such as non-small cell lung cancer, are screened for a panel of biomarkers and then assigned to different sub-studies within the master protocol based on their individual biomarker result. This allows for the simultaneous and efficient comparison of several biomarker-matched therapies against a common control arm.

Adaptive trial designs incorporate pre-specified modifications to the trial's design based on interim analysis of accumulating data. Unlike traditional trials, which are static, adaptive designs can allow for: dropping underperforming treatment arms; adjusting randomization ratios to favor more effective therapies; modifying sample size based on interim effect size; and seamlessly expanding a phase I dose-escalation cohort into a biomarker-selected expansion cohort. Platforms like the I-SPY 2 trial for neoadjuvant breast cancer treatment use adaptive randomization to assign patients to one of several experimental regimens added to standard chemotherapy, with the goal of rapidly identifying which therapies are most promising for specific biomarker signatures. These designs accelerate the drug development process by making real-time decisions based on efficacy, ultimately getting effective drugs to patients faster and more efficiently discontinuing the development of ineffective ones.

Furthermore, the endpoints themselves are evolving. For targeted therapies that often induce stable disease rather than tumor shrinkage, and for immunotherapies that can manifest pseudoprogression, overall survival remains the gold standard but requires large sample sizes and long follow-up. There is a growing emphasis on validated surrogate endpoints like progression-free survival and duration of response. In the neoadjuvant and adjuvant settings, pathological complete response and event-free survival are gaining prominence. For cell therapies, novel endpoints such as duration of complete response are critical. The validation of these endpoints, coupled with the use of real-world evidence to supplement clinical trial data, is creating a more nuanced and rapid framework for evaluating the clinical benefit of new anticancer agents.

This continued exploration into the dynamics of resistance, the influence of the microbiome, and the evolution of clinical research methodologies highlights that the future of oncology is not merely about developing new drugs, but about developing a deeper, more holistic

understanding of the disease and creating a more agile and intelligent system to evaluate and deliver care. The integration of these complex, multidisciplinary insights is paving the way for the next revolution in cancer treatment.

The Atomic Level: Structural Biology and Rational Drug Design

The efficacy and specificity of new anticancer drugs are not accidental but are born from a precise understanding of interactions at the atomic level. The field of structural biology, utilizing techniques like X-ray crystallography and cryo-electron microscopy, has provided high-resolution blueprints of target proteins, revealing the intricate three-dimensional architecture of active sites, allosteric pockets, and protein-protein interfaces. This atomic-level insight is the foundation of rational drug design, allowing medicinal chemists to computationally model and craft small molecules that fit into these targets with the precision of a key in a lock.

The evolution of kinase inhibitor development exemplifies this principle. First-generation inhibitors targeted the highly conserved ATP-binding site, which often led to off-target effects due to similarities across the kinome. Second and third-generation drugs were designed to exploit unique structural features within or adjacent to the ATP pocket. For instance, the "DFG-out" or "C-helix-in" conformations of certain kinases create distinct hydrophobic pockets that can be targeted to achieve greater selectivity. The development of allosteric inhibitors represents an even more sophisticated approach. These compounds bind to a site remote from the active site, inducing a conformational change that indirectly inhibits enzyme activity. This mode of action often confers exquisite selectivity, as allosteric sites are typically less conserved than the ATP-binding site across protein families. Furthermore, understanding the precise molecular contacts that drive drug binding allows for the intelligent design of compounds to overcome resistance. When a point mutation in the kinase domain prevents a drug from binding, structural models can show which chemical groups on the drug are clashing with the mutant residue. This knowledge enables the synthesis of a new analog with a slightly altered structure that accommodates or avoids the mutation, thereby restoring binding affinity. This iterative process of structural analysis and chemical optimization is a continuous feedback loop, turning the problem of resistance into a solvable engineering challenge.

Beyond the Genome: The Epigenetic Landscape as a Therapeutic Frontier

While genetic mutations have been the primary focus of targeted therapy, the regulation of gene expression without altering the DNA sequence itself—epigenetics—is a critical layer of cancer biology and a fertile ground for drug discovery. Cancer cells frequently hijack the epigenetic machinery to silence tumor suppressor genes and activate oncogenic pathways, creating a heritable state of dysregulation.

Two major classes of epigenetic drugs have entered the clinical arena: DNA methyltransferase inhibitors and histone deacetylase inhibitors. Initially, these agents were viewed as broad-acting, cytotoxic drugs, capable of reactivating silenced tumor suppressor genes through global DNA demethylation or histone hyperacetylation. However, a more nuanced understanding is emerging. Their efficacy, particularly in combination with other therapies, may stem from their ability to reverse a specific, plastic cellular state. For example, in acute myeloid leukemia, hypomethylating agents can supposedly sensitize leukemic stem cells to differentiation therapy by making their chromatin more accessible, priming them to respond to signals that drive them out of

their dormant, therapy-resistant state. Furthermore, the tumor's epigenetic state is a key regulator of its immunogenicity. Silencing of genes involved in antigen presentation is a common immune evasion strategy. Epigenetic therapies can potentially reverse this, increasing the visibility of the tumor to the immune system and thereby synergizing powerfully with checkpoint blockade. This has led to clinical trials combining HDAC or DNMT inhibitors with anti-PD-1 antibodies, with the goal of creating a more immunogenic tumor microenvironment.

The next frontier is targeting writers, readers, and erasers of specific histone marks. Mutations in genes encoding epigenetic regulators, such as EZH2 (a writer of repressive marks) or IDH1/2 (which alter the epigenetic landscape by producing an oncometabolite), create direct dependencies. Inhibitors of mutant IDH1/2, for example, cause differentiation of leukemic blasts by reversing the block in cellular maturation imposed by the mutant enzyme. These agents represent a true targeted therapy against an epigenetic driver, demonstrating that epigenetic alterations can be as critical as genetic mutations in sustaining the malignant state.

Spatial Biology: Mapping the Tumor Universe

Traditional sequencing technologies, which homogenize a tissue sample, provide a wealth of data but lose all information about the spatial context of cells. This is a critical limitation, as the function of a cell is intrinsically linked to its location and its neighbors. The emergence of spatial transcriptomics and proteomics represents a quantum leap in our analytical capabilities, allowing scientists to map the expression of thousands of genes or proteins directly onto a tissue section, preserving the architectural integrity of the tumor.

This technology is revealing the profound functional heterogeneity within tumors. It can identify distinct neighborhoods or "niches": an immunosuppressive niche dominated by CAFs, T-regs, and M2 macrophages; an immunogenic "tertiary lymphoid structure" niche rich in B-cells and T-cells; or a hypoxic, necrotic core. Understanding the geography of the TME explains why some regions respond to therapy while others serve as reservoirs for resistance. For instance, spatial analysis can show that cancer cells on the invasive margin, interacting with immune cells, have a different transcriptional profile than cells in the core, interacting with stroma. This has direct clinical implications. A simple measurement of PD-L1 expression on a bulk sample is a crude predictor of response to immunotherapy. Spatial biology can quantify not just *if* PD-L1 is expressed, but *where* and by *whom*—whether it is on tumor cells or immune cells and within what kind of cellular neighborhood. This granular level of detail is likely to yield far more powerful predictive biomarkers.

Furthermore, spatial mapping is elucidating the mechanisms of adaptive resistance. By analyzing paired biopsies before and during treatment, researchers can observe how the tumor geography shifts in response to therapeutic pressure. For example, a tumor might respond to a targeted therapy by increasing the density of protective CAFs around persistent cell clusters or recruiting different immunosuppressive myeloid populations to shield itself from the immune system. This dynamic view of resistance provides a new set of tangible targets for rational combination therapies designed to prevent the tumor from reorganizing its defenses.

Philosophical Shifts: From Maximum Tolerated Dose to Optimal Biological Dose

The clinical development of cytotoxic chemotherapy was guided by the principle of the maximum tolerated dose: the highest dose that does not cause unacceptable toxicity. This made sense for non-selective agents where the goal was to kill as many cancer cells as possible in a short period, with recovery periods between cycles. This philosophy is increasingly obsolete for the new generation of drugs.

For many targeted agents, the relationship between dose and antitumor effect is not linear. Target saturation often occurs at doses well below the MTD. Once the target is fully engaged, increasing the dose may not yield greater efficacy but will almost certainly increase off-target toxicities. This has led to the concept of finding the "optimal biological dose" or "pharmacologically active dose" in early-phase trials. This involves using pharmacodynamic biomarkers—such as the degree of target inhibition in tumor tissue or surrogate tissues, or changes in downstream signaling molecules in the blood—to identify the dose that achieves the desired biological effect, which may then be recommended for phase II and III development. This approach prioritizes a drug's mechanism of action over its brute force, potentially leading to regimens that are both more effective and better tolerated.

For some drugs, continuous daily dosing applies such strong selective pressure that it rapidly encourages the outgrowth of resistant clones. Preclinical models and some clinical observations suggest that pulsatile, high-dose scheduling—periods of intense target inhibition followed by treatment-free intervals—could allow for the effective killing of cancer cells while permitting sensitive cells (which may have a fitness advantage) to repopulate during the break, thereby suppressing the expansion of resistant populations. This "adaptive therapy" approach, borrowed from ecology, aims to maintain a stable, manageable tumor burden rather than pursuing eradication, which may be an unattainable goal that inadvertently leads to more aggressive resistance. This represents a profound philosophical shift: from a war of annihilation to a strategy of long-term containment, managing cancer as a chronic disease by understanding and manipulating the evolutionary dynamics within the tumor ecosystem.

This deeper dive into atomic-level design, epigenetic regulation, spatial context, and evolving treatment philosophies illustrates that the science of new anticancer drugs is moving beyond a simple "one drug, one target" model. It is evolving into a complex, integrative discipline that requires synthesizing information from structural biology, biochemistry, cellular ecology, and evolutionary theory to outmaneuver one of the most adaptive adversaries in medicine.

CONCLUSIONS

- The development and integration of new anticancer drugs represent a paradigm shift in oncology, moving the field decisively from a one-size-fits-all approach rooted in nonspecific cytotoxicity to a sophisticated discipline of precision medicine. This transition, fueled by monumental advances in our understanding of cancer biology, genomics, and immunology, has fundamentally altered the therapeutic landscape and patient outcomes across a wide spectrum of malignancies.
- The modern classification of these agents—categorizing them by their mechanism of action into targeted therapies and immunotherapies—provides a necessary framework for

understanding their distinct scientific and clinical profiles. Targeted therapies, including small molecule inhibitors and monoclonal antibodies, exemplify the principle of rational drug design, interfering with specific molecular drivers essential for tumor survival and proliferation. Immunotherapies, particularly immune checkpoint inhibitors and CAR T-cell therapies, represent a conceptual revolution, harnessing the formidable power of the patient's own immune system to achieve durable, and sometimes curative, responses in previously intractable cancers.

- The efficacy of these novel modalities is inextricably linked to the identification of predictive biomarkers, cementing comprehensive molecular profiling as a standard of care. This biomarker-driven strategy ensures that the right drug is matched to the right patient, maximizing therapeutic benefit while minimizing exposure to ineffective treatments and their associated toxicities. However, the clinical application of these drugs is tempered by their unique and often formidable challenge of resistance. The remarkable adaptability of cancer cells, through on-target mutations, activation of bypass pathways, and phenotypic plasticity, necessitates a continuous cycle of research, drug discovery, and the development of rational combination strategies.
- Furthermore, the toxicity profiles of these agents are distinct from traditional chemotherapy. Targeted agents cause mechanism-based "on-target" toxicities in healthy tissues, while immunotherapies can unleash a spectrum of immune-related adverse events affecting any organ system. The management of these toxicities requires vigilant monitoring, prompt recognition, and specialized interventions, underscoring the need for a multidisciplinary approach to patient care.
- Looking forward, the future of oncology lies in the continued deepening of our understanding of the tumor ecosystem. This includes deciphering the complex role of the tumor microenvironment, overcoming adaptive resistance through evolutionary-informed therapeutic strategies, and leveraging emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence for drug discovery and biomarker identification. The exploration of novel platforms like PROTACs, radioligand therapies, and personalized cancer vaccines promises to further expand our therapeutic arsenal. However, the scientific and clinical success of these advances must be coupled with a concerted effort to address the significant challenges of financial toxicity and equitable global access.
- In conclusion, the scientific aspects of new anticancer drugs—encompassing their classification, mechanisms, pharmacology, clinical use, and toxicities—paint a picture of a dynamic and rapidly evolving field. The journey from cytotoxic chemotherapy to precision medicine stands as one of the most significant achievements in modern science and medicine. By continuing to translate deep biological insight into clinical innovation, the oncology community moves closer to the ultimate goal of transforming cancer into a manageable or curable disease for all patients.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the comprehensive review of the scientific aspects, clinical applications, and associated challenges of new anticancer drugs, the following recommendations are proposed for

researchers, clinicians, policymakers, and the pharmaceutical industry to optimize the development, delivery, and accessibility of these transformative therapies.

- **Prioritize Novel Target Identification:** intensify efforts to target "undruggable" oncoproteins (e.g., KRAS, MYC) through innovative platforms such as proteolysis-targeting chimeras (PROTACs), molecular glues, and allosteric inhibitors.
- **Invest in Understanding and Overcoming Resistance:** dedicate resources to elucidating the molecular mechanisms of both innate and acquired resistance. Focus on non-mutational adaptive resistance, including cellular plasticity, epigenetic reprogramming, and the protective role of the tumor microenvironment, to inform the development of next-generation agents and rational combination therapies.
- **Accelerate Immunotherapy Innovation:** develop next-generation cellular therapies (e.g., allogeneic CAR-T/NK cells, dual-targeting CARs) with improved safety profiles and efficacy against solid tumors. Explore novel immune targets beyond PD-1/CTLA-4 (e.g., LAG-3, TIGIT, TIM-3) to overcome primary and acquired resistance.
- **Integrate Artificial Intelligence and Multi-Omics:** leverage AI and machine learning for drug design, prediction of synergistic combinations, and analysis of complex multi-omic datasets (genomic, transcriptomic, proteomic, spatial) to identify novel biomarkers and patient subpopulations most likely to benefit from specific interventions.
- **Explore Modulation of the Tumor Microenvironment and Microbiome:** invest in clinical research evaluating strategies to reprogram the TME (e.g., targeting CAFs, TAMs, MDSCs) and modulate the gut microbiome to enhance the efficacy and reduce the toxicity of existing therapies, particularly immunotherapy.
- **Mandate Comprehensive Biomarker Testing:** establish comprehensive molecular profiling (via NGS panels) and assessment of relevant immune biomarkers (e.g., PD-L1, TMB, MSI) as a standard of care for all patients with advanced cancer to guide therapeutic decision-making.
- **Adopt Innovative Clinical Trial Designs:** promote the use of basket, umbrella, and platform adaptive trial designs to efficiently evaluate multiple targeted and immunotherapeutic strategies simultaneously, accelerate drug development, and better match patients to effective therapies based on their tumor's biology rather than its tissue of origin.
- **Develop and Validate Surrogate Endpoints:** establish and validate novel endpoints beyond overall survival (e.g., duration of response, pathologic complete response, circulating tumor DNA clearance) that can more rapidly and accurately capture the clinical benefit of novel agents, especially in the adjuvant and neoadjuvant settings.
- **Implement Proactive Toxicity Management Protocols:** ensure all clinical staff are trained in the early recognition and evidence-based management of unique toxicities, particularly immune-related adverse events (irAEs) and cytokine release syndrome (CRS). Develop standardized institutional protocols and foster close collaboration with multidisciplinary teams including dermatology, gastroenterology, endocrinology, and neurology.
- **Promote Value-Based Pricing and Reimbursement Models:** transition from cost-based to value-based pricing models that align a drug's price with the magnitude of its clinical benefit (e.g., overall survival gain, quality of life improvement). Encourage outcomes-based contracts between payers and manufacturers to share risk and ensure payment reflects real-world effectiveness.

- **Streamline Regulatory Pathways for Breakthrough Therapies:** maintain and refine accelerated approval pathways to ensure rapid access to promising therapies while strengthening requirements for post-marketing confirmatory studies to verify clinical benefit and ensure patient safety.
- **Incentivize Global Access and Equity:** create policy incentives and support mechanisms, including tiered pricing, voluntary licensing agreements, and technology transfer programs, to ensure patients in low- and middle-income countries have access to essential biomarker testing and life-saving therapies.
- **Support Real-World Evidence Generation:** develop robust frameworks for the collection and regulatory use of high-quality real-world data to supplement clinical trial findings, particularly for understanding long-term outcomes and toxicity management in broader, more diverse patient populations.
- **Enhance Oncologist Education on Novel Therapies:** integrate dedicated training on the mechanisms of action, pharmacology, and unique toxicities of targeted therapies and immunotherapies into continuing medical education and oncology fellowship curricula.
- **Foster a Culture of Multidisciplinary Care:** establish formal tumor boards and care pathways that include not only oncologists but also specialized pharmacists, palliative care specialists, and other medical subspecialists essential for managing complex toxicities and supporting patients throughout their treatment journey.
- **Improve Patient Education and Shared Decision-Making:** develop easily understandable patient education materials that clearly explain the benefits, risks, and financial implications of novel cancer therapies. Empower patients to participate actively in treatment decisions through clear communication and shared decision-making models.
- **Implement Universal Financial Toxicity Screening:** routinely screen patients for financial hardship as a vital sign and integrate financial navigators and counselors into oncology care teams to connect patients with resources, assistance programs, and support.
- **Increase Price Transparency:** advocate for greater transparency in drug pricing and the costs associated with research and development to inform public discourse and policy decisions aimed at controlling healthcare costs.
- **Invest in Comparative Effectiveness Research:** fund independent research to compare the clinical and cost-effectiveness of different treatment sequences and combinations, providing evidence to help clinicians and payers make the most efficient use of finite healthcare resources.

By implementing these multifaceted recommendations, the global oncology community can build upon the remarkable scientific progress already achieved, ensuring that the development and delivery of new anticancer drugs are both innovative and equitable, and ultimately maximizing benefit for all patients.

REFERENCES

1. Hanahan D, Weinberg RA. Hallmarks of cancer: the next generation. Cell. 2011;144(5):646-74.
2. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Laversanne M, Soerjomataram I, Jemal A, et al. Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. CA Cancer J Clin. 2021;71(3):209-49.
3. DeVita VT Jr, Chu E. A history of cancer chemotherapy. Cancer Res. 2008;68(21):8643-53.

4. Stratton MR, Campbell PJ, Futreal PA. The cancer genome. Nature. 2009;458(7239):719-24.
5. The Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network. The Cancer Genome Atlas Pan-Cancer analysis project. Nat Genet. 2013;45(10):1113-20.
6. Druker BJ, Talpaz M, Resta DJ, Peng B, Buchdunger E, Ford JM, et al. Efficacy and safety of a specific inhibitor of the BCR-ABL tyrosine kinase in chronic myeloid leukemia. N Engl J Med. 2001;344(14):1031-7.
7. Lynch TJ, Bell DW, Sordella R, Gurubhagavatula S, Okimoto RA, Brannigan BW, et al. Activating mutations in the epidermal growth factor receptor underlying responsiveness of non-small-cell lung cancer to gefitinib. N Engl J Med. 2004;350(21):2129-39.
8. Paez JG, Jänne PA, Lee JC, Tracy S, Greulich H, Gabriel S, et al. EGFR mutations in lung cancer: correlation with clinical response to gefitinib therapy. Science. 2004;304(5676):1497-500.
9. Mok TS, Wu YL, Thongprasert S, Yang CH, Chu DT, Saijo N, et al. Gefitinib or carboplatin-paclitaxel in pulmonary adenocarcinoma. N Engl J Med. 2009;361(10):947-57.
10. Rosell R, Carcereny E, Gervais R, Vergnenegre A, Massuti B, Felip E, et al. Erlotinib versus standard chemotherapy as first-line treatment for European patients with advanced EGFR mutation-positive non-small-cell lung cancer (EURTAC): a multicentre, open-label, randomised phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol. 2012;13(3):239-46.
11. Soria JC, Ohe Y, Vansteenkiste J, Reungwetwattana T, Chewaskulyong B, Lee KH, et al. Osimertinib in untreated EGFR-mutated advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. N Engl J Med. 2018;378(2):113-25.
12. Chapman PB, Hauschild A, Robert C, Haanen JB, Ascierto P, Larkin J, et al. Improved survival with vemurafenib in melanoma with BRAF V600E mutation. N Engl J Med. 2011;364(26):2507-16.
13. Flaherty KT, Robert C, Hersey P, Nathan P, Garbe C, Milhem M, et al. Improved survival with MEK inhibition in BRAF-mutated melanoma. N Engl J Med. 2012;367(2):107-14.
14. Robert C, Karaszewska B, Schachter J, Rutkowski P, Mackiewicz A, Stroiakovski D, et al. Improved overall survival in melanoma with combined dabrafenib and trametinib. N Engl J Med. 2015;372(1):30-9.
15. Finn RS, Martin M, Rugo HS, Jones S, Im SA, Gelmon K, et al. Palbociclib and Letrozole in Advanced Breast Cancer. N Engl J Med. 2016;375(20):1925-36.
16. Hortobagyi GN, Stemmer SM, Burris HA, Yap YS, Sonke GS, Paluch-Shimon S, et al. Ribociclib as First-Line Therapy for HR-Positive, Advanced Breast Cancer. N Engl J Med. 2016;375(20):1738-48.
17. Goetz MP, Toi M, Campone M, Sohn J, Paluch-Shimon S, Huober J, et al. MONARCH 3: Abemaciclib As Initial Therapy for Advanced Breast Cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2017;35(32):3638-46.
18. Ledermann J, Harter P, Gourley C, Friedlander M, Vergote I, Rustin G, et al. Olaparib maintenance therapy in platinum-sensitive relapsed ovarian cancer. N Engl J Med. 2012;366(15):1382-92.
19. Robson M, Im SA, Senkus E, Xu B, Domchek SM, Masuda N, et al. Olaparib for Metastatic Breast Cancer in Patients with a Germline BRCA Mutation. N Engl J Med. 2017;377(6):523-33.

20. Slamon DJ, Leyland-Jones B, Shak S, Fuchs H, Paton V, Bajamonde A, et al. Use of chemotherapy plus a monoclonal antibody against HER2 for metastatic breast cancer that overexpresses HER2. N Engl J Med. 2001;344(11):783-92.
21. Bang YJ, Van Cutsem E, Feyereislova A, Chung HC, Shen L, Sawaki A, et al. Trastuzumab in combination with chemotherapy versus chemotherapy alone for treatment of HER2-positive advanced gastric or gastro-oesophageal junction cancer (ToGA): a phase 3, open-label, randomised controlled trial. Lancet. 2010;376(9742):687-97.
22. Verma S, Miles D, Gianni L, Krop IE, Welslau M, Baselga J, et al. Trastuzumab emtansine for HER2-positive advanced breast cancer. N Engl J Med. 2012;367(19):1783-91.
23. Modi S, Saura C, Yamashita T, Park YH, Kim SB, Tamura K, et al. Trastuzumab Deruxtecan in Previously Treated HER2-Positive Breast Cancer. N Engl J Med. 2020;382(7):610-21.
24. Hodi FS, O'Day SJ, McDermott DF, Weber RW, Sosman JA, Haanen JB, et al. Improved survival with ipilimumab in patients with metastatic melanoma. N Engl J Med. 2010;363(8):711-23.
25. Topalian SL, Hodi FS, Brahmer JR, Gettinger SN, Smith DC, McDermott DF, et al. Safety, activity, and immune correlates of anti-PD-1 antibody in cancer. N Engl J Med. 2012;366(26):2443-54.
26. Brahmer JR, Tykodi SS, Chow LQ, Hwu WJ, Topalian SL, Hwu P, et al. Safety and activity of anti-PD-L1 antibody in patients with advanced cancer. N Engl J Med. 2012;366(26):2455-65.
27. Robert C, Long GV, Brady B, Dutriaux C, Maio M, Mortier L, et al. Nivolumab in previously untreated melanoma without BRAF mutation. N Engl J Med. 2015;372(4):320-30.
28. Garon EB, Rizvi NA, Hui R, Leighl N, Balmanoukian AS, Eder JP, et al. Pembrolizumab for the treatment of non-small-cell lung cancer. N Engl J Med. 2015;372(21):2018-28.
29. Larkin J, Chiarion-Sileni V, Gonzalez R, Grob JJ, Cowey CL, Lao CD, et al. Combined Nivolumab and Ipilimumab or Monotherapy in Untreated Melanoma. N Engl J Med. 2015;373(1):23-34.
30. Motzer RJ, Tannir NM, McDermott DF, Arén Frontera O, Melichar B, Choueiri TK, et al. Nivolumab plus Ipilimumab versus Sunitinib in Advanced Renal-Cell Carcinoma. N Engl J Med. 2018;378(14):1277-90.
31. Hellmann MD, Paz-Ares L, Bernabe Caro R, Zurawski B, Kim SW, Carcereny Costa E, et al. Nivolumab plus Ipilimumab in Advanced Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer. N Engl J Med. 2019;381(21):2020-31.
32. Maude SL, Laetsch TW, Buechner J, Rives S, Boyer M, Bittencourt H, et al. Tisagenlecleucel in Children and Young Adults with B-Cell Lymphoblastic Leukemia. N Engl J Med. 2018;378(5):439-48.
33. Neelapu SS, Locke FL, Bartlett NL, Lekakis LJ, Miklos DB, Jacobson CA, et al. Axicabtagene Ciloleucel CAR T-Cell Therapy in Refractory Large B-Cell Lymphoma. N Engl J Med. 2017;377(26):2531-44.
34. St. Jude Children's Research Hospital. The ENCODE Project Consortium. An integrated encyclopedia of DNA elements in the human genome. Nature. 2012;489(7414):57-74.
35. Schwaederle M, Zhao M, Lee JJ, Eggermont AM, Schilsky RL, Mendelsohn J, et al. Impact of Precision Medicine in Diverse Cancers: A Meta-Analysis of Phase II Clinical Trials. J Clin Oncol. 2015;33(32):3817-25.
36. Janne PA, Yang JC, Kim DW, Planchard D, Ohe Y, Ramalingam SS, et al. AZD9291 in EGFR inhibitor-resistant non-small-cell lung cancer. N Engl J Med. 2015;372(18):1689-99.

37. Shaw AT, Kim DW, Nakagawa K, Seto T, Crinò L, Ahn MJ, et al. Crizotinib versus chemotherapy in advanced ALK-positive lung cancer. N Engl J Med. 2013;368(25):2385-94.
38. Solomon BJ, Mok T, Kim DW, Wu YL, Nakagawa K, Mekhail T, et al. First-line crizotinib versus chemotherapy in ALK-positive lung cancer. N Engl J Med. 2014;371(23):2167-77.
39. Garon EB, Hellmann MD, Rizvi NA, Carcereny E, Leighl NB, Ahn MJ, et al. Five-Year Overall Survival for Patients With Advanced Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer Treated With Pembrolizumab: Results From the Phase I KEYNOTE-001 Study. J Clin Oncol. 2019;37(28):2518-27.
40. Postow MA, Sidlow R, Hellmann MD. Immune-Related Adverse Events Associated with Immune Checkpoint Blockade. N Engl J Med. 2018;378(2):158-68.
41. Brahmer JR, Lacchetti C, Schneider BJ, Atkins MB, Brassil KJ, Caterino JM, et al. Management of Immune-Related Adverse Events in Patients Treated With Immune Checkpoint Inhibitor Therapy: American Society of Clinical Oncology Clinical Practice Guideline. J Clin Oncol. 2018;36(17):1714-68.
42. Lee DW, Santomasso BD, Locke FL, Ghobadi A, Turtle CJ, Brudno JN, et al. ASTCT Consensus Grading for Cytokine Release Syndrome and Neurologic Toxicity Associated with Immune Effector Cells. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant. 2019;25(4):625-38.
43. Neelapu SS. Managing the toxicities of CAR T-cell therapy. Hematological Oncology. 2019;37(S1):48-52.
44. Ott PA, Hu Z, Keskin DB, Shukla SA, Sun J, Bozym DJ, et al. An immunogenic personal neoantigen vaccine for patients with melanoma. Nature. 2017;547(7662):217-21.
45. Sahin U, Derhovanessian E, Miller M, Kloke BP, Simon P, Löwer M, et al. Personalized RNA mutanome vaccines mobilize poly-specific therapeutic immunity against cancer. Nature. 2017;547(7662):222-6.
46. Tumeh PC, Harview CL, Yearley JH, Shintaku IP, Taylor EJ, Robert L, et al. PD-1 blockade induces responses by inhibiting adaptive immune resistance. Nature. 2014;515(7528):568-71.
47. Ribas A, Wolchok JD. Cancer immunotherapy using checkpoint blockade. Science. 2018;359(6382):1350-5.
48. Zou W, Wolchok JD, Chen L. PD-L1 (B7-H1) and PD-1 pathway blockade for cancer therapy: Mechanisms, response biomarkers, and combinations. Sci Transl Med. 2016;8(328):328rv4.
49. Sharma P, Hu-Lieskovan S, Wargo JA, Ribas A. Primary, Adaptive, and Acquired Resistance to Cancer Immunotherapy. Cell. 2017;168(4):707-23.
50. Gajewski TF, Schreiber H, Fu YX. Innate and adaptive immune cells in the tumor microenvironment. Nat Immunol. 2013;14(10):1014-22.
51. Joyce JA, Fearon DT. T cell exclusion, immune privilege, and the tumor microenvironment. Science. 2015;348(6230):74-80.
52. Zitvogel L, Ayyoub M, Routy B, Kroemer G. Microbiome and Anticancer Immunosurveillance. Cell. 2016;165(2):276-87.
53. Gopalakrishnan V, Spencer CN, Nezi L, Reuben A, Andrews MC, Karpinets TV, et al. Gut microbiome modulates response to anti-PD-1 immunotherapy in melanoma patients. Science. 2018;359(6371):97-103.

54. Routy B, Le Chatelier E, Derosa L, Duong CPM, Alou MT, Daillère R, et al. Gut microbiome influences efficacy of PD-1-based immunotherapy against epithelial tumors. Science. 2018;359(6371):91-7.
55. Aphkhazava, D., Sulashvili, N., Tupinashvili, T., & Nozadze, M. (2024). Dynamic Cellular Equilibrium Theory of Aging: Integrating Maintenance and Accumulation in the Aging Process. Scientific Journal „Spectri“, 8(2). https://doi.org/10.52340/spectri.2023.08.02.03
56. Sulashvili N, Jadhav RD, Beglaryan M, Gabunia L, Gorgaslidze N, Alavidze N, et al. THE SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION OF KEY ISSUE ASPECTS OF IMMUNOPATHOGENESIS AND PHARMACOLOGICAL PROPERTIES AND PROFILES IN RELATION TO ADVERSE DRUG REACTIONS CHALLENGES, FOCUS ON MULTIDIMENSIONAL DRUG-INDUCED EOSINOPHILIA AND SYSTEMIC SYNDROME. GS [Internet]. 2025 Jul. 11 [cited 2025 Jul. 12];7(3):141-79. Available from: https://journals.4science.ge/index.php/GS/article/view/3919.
57. Sulashvili N, Fernando S, El-Hakeem A, Gabunia L, Gorgaslidze N, Beglaryan M, et al. CLOSED-LOOP CARDIOPULMONARY BYPASS SYSTEMS WITH REAL-TIME MONITORING AND PHARMACOTHERAPY STRATEGIES: INNOVATIONS, OUTCOMES, CLINICAL IMPACT AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN GENERAL. GS [Internet]. 2025 May 30 [cited 2025 Jul. 12];7(2):381-419. Available from: https://journals.4science.ge/index.php/GS/article/view/3799.
58. Nodar Sulashvili, Rupali Digambar Jadhav, Margarita Beglaryan, Nana Gorgaslidze, Luiza Gabunia, Nato Alavidze, Natia Kvizhinadze, Marika Sulashvili, Lela Grigolia, and Kakhaber Robakidze. 2025. “THE MANIFESTATION OF PHARMACOGENETIC AND CLINICAL PERSPECTIVES ON MEDICATION-ASSOCIATED EOSINOPHILIA AND SYSTEMIC SYMPTOMS (DRESS): A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION OF IMPLICATED AGENTS, RISK FACTORS, AND TREATMENT MANAGEMENTS STRATEGIES IN GENERAL”. Georgian Scientists 7 (3):180-216. https://doi.org/10.52340/gs.2025.07.03.14.
59. Sulashvili, Nodar, Lali Patsia, Awad El-Hakeem, Sk Ayaan, Arian Hizomi, Sajal Agarwal, and Marika Sulashvili. 2025. “EXPLORING THE GUT-BRAIN AXIS: THE ROLE OF THE MICROBIOME IN MODULATING BRAIN FUNCTION AND ITS IMPLICATIONS IN NEURODEGENERATIVE DISORDERS LIKE PARKINSON’S AND ALZHEIMER’S AND PHARMACOTHERAPY TREATMENT STRATEGIES”. Georgian Scientists 7 (2):329-53. https://doi.org/10.52340/gs.2025.07.02.32.
60. SULASHVILI, N., GORGASLIDZE, N., GABUNIA, L., GIORGOBIANI, M., & RATIANI, L. (2023). MANIFESTATION OF THE PARTICULARITIES OF THE USAGE FEATURES OF MONOCLONAL ANTIBODIES IN VARIOUS PHARMACOTHERAPEUTIC APPLICATIONS. Experimental and Clinical Medicine Georgia, (4), 52–57.
61. Sulashvili, N., Davitashvili, M., Gorgaslidze, N., Gabunia, L., Beglaryan, M., Alavidze, N., … Sulashvili, M. (2024). THE SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION OF SOME ISSUES OF FEATURES AND CHALLENGES OF USING OF CAR-T CELLS IN IMMUNOTHERAPY. Georgian Scientists, 6(4), 263–290. https://doi.org/10.52340/gs.2024.06.04.24
62. SULASHVILI, N., GORGASLIDZE, N., GABUNIA, L., GIORGOBIANI, M., & RATIANI, L. (2023). MANIFESTATION OF THE PARTICULARITIES OF THE USAGE FEATURES OF MONOCLONAL ANTIBODIES IN VARIOUS PHARMACOTHERAPEUTIC APPLICATIONS. Experimental and Clinical Medicine Georgia, (4), 52–57. https://doi.org/10.52340/jecm.2023.04.14

63. SULASHVILI, N., GORGASLIDZE, N., GABUNIA, L., RATIANI, L., KHETSURIANI, S., KRAVCHENKO, V., SULASHVILI, M. (2024). MANIFESTATION OF THE PARTICULARITIES OF SOME KEY ISSUE ASPECTS OF NEW IMMUNOTHERAPY CHALLENGES AND PERSPECTIVES BY CAR-T CELL THERAPY. Experimental and Clinical Medicine Georgia, (4), 119–121. https://doi.org/10.52340/jecm.2024.04.32.
64. SULASHVILI, N. . ., GORGASLIDZE , N. ., BEGLARYAN , M. ., GABUNIA , L. ., CHICHOYAN , N. ., GIORGOBIANI , M. ., … ZARNADZE, S. (DAVIT) . (2022). THE SCIENTIFIC TALKS OF ESSENTIAL ISSUE, INVOCATION, PERSPECTIVES, INCLINATIONS AND FEATURES OF THE CLINICAL PHARMACISTS GLOBALLY. Experimental and Clinical Medicine Georgia, (7).
65. Sulashvili N, Nimangre RR. MANIFESTATION OF SOME ASPECTS OF CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASES, IMPLICATIONS, PHARMACOTHERAPEUTIC STRATEGIES, EFFECTS, IMPACTS AND POTENTIAL HAZARDS IN GENERAL. JR [Internet]. 2025 Feb. 7 [cited 2025 May 22];3(1):1-27. Available from: https://journals.4science.ge/index.php/jr/article/view/3393.
66. Sulashvili N, Yaduvanshi U, Yadav M, Gabunia L, Ghambashidze K, Gorgaslidze N, et al. THE SCIENTIFIC DISCOURSE OF FEATURES OF CLINICAL USE AND PHARMACOLOGY OF VASOCONSTRICTORS AND THEIR IMPACT ON CARDIAC FUNCTION. JR [Internet]. 2025 Feb. 21 [cited 2025 May 22];3(1):28-6. Available from: https://journals.4science.ge/index.php/jr/article/view/3414.
67. Nodar Sulashvili, Nana Gorgaslidze, Margarita Beglaryan, Luiza Gabunia, Nato Alavidze, Nino Abuladze, Marina Giorgobiani, Marika Sulashvili, Tamar Okropiridze, and Lali Patsia. 2025. “THE SCIENTIFIC DISCOURSE OF KEY ISSUE ASPECTS OF FEATURES OF CANDIDA PROBLEMS, ANTIFUNGAL DRUGS RESISTANCE CONCERNS, MYCOTOXICOLOGY ISSUES, MYCOECOLOGY, BIOSAFETY RISKS AND EMERGING SOLUTIONS”. Modern Scientific Method, no. 9 (March). https://ojs.scipub.de/index.php/MSM/article/view/5423.
68. Aphkhazava, D., Tuphinashvili, T., Sulashvili, N., & Nozadze, M. (2023). The Features and Role of SHP2 Protein in Postnatal Muscle Development. Scientific Journal „Spectri“, 1. https://doi.org/10.52340/spectri.2023.01
69. SULASHVILI, N., BEGLARYAN, M., GORGASLIDZE, N., KOCHARYAN, S., CHICHOYAN, N., GABUNIA, L., ZARNADZE, S. (DAVIT). (2023). THE DISCLOSURE OF FEATURES, CHARACTERISTICS, POSSIBILITIES AND SPECIALTIES OF CLINICAL PHARMACISTS AS MEDIATOR AMONG DOCTORS AND PATIENTS FOR ENHANCEMENT PUBLIC HEALTH SECTOR IN A GLOBAL WORLD. Experimental and Clinical Medicine Georgia, (4), 57–62. https://doi.org/10.52340/jecm.2023.04.15
70. Sulashvili N, Davitashvili M, Gorgaslidze N, Gabunia L, Beglaryan M, Alavidze N, et al. THE SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION OF SOME ISSUES OF FEATURES AND CHALLENGES OF USING OF CAR-T CELLS IN IMMUNOTHERAPY. GS 2024 ;6(4):263-90. https://journals.4science.ge/index.php/GS/article/view/3214
71. Aphkhazava, David, Nodar Sulashvili, and Jaba Tkemaladze. 2025. “Stem Cell Systems and Regeneration”. Georgian Scientists 7 (1):271-319. https://doi.org/10.52340/gs.2025.07.01.26.
72. Relling, Mary V., and William E. Evans. 2015. “Pharmacogenomics in the Clinic.” Nature 526 (7573): 343–50.

73. Aphkhazava, David, Tamar Tuphinashvili, Nodar Sulashvili, and Maia Nozadze. 2023. “THE FEATURES AND ROLE OF SHP2 PROTEIN IN POSTNATAL MUSCLE DEVELOPMENT”. Scientific Journal „Spectri“ 1 (March). https://doi.org/10.52340/spectri.2023.01.
74. SULASHVILI N, GORGASLIDZE N, GABUNIA L, GIORGOBIANI M, RATIANI L. MANIFESTATION OF THE PARTICULARITIES OF THE USAGE FEATURES OF MONOCLONAL ANTIBODIES IN VARIOUS PHARMACOTHERAPEUTIC APPLICATIONS. jecmg [Internet]. 2023 Nov. 26 [cited 2025 Jul. 12];(4):52-7. Available from: https://journals.4science.ge/index.php/jecm/article/view/2413.
75. Aphkhazava, David, Nodar Sulashvili, Ia Egnatievi, Manana Giorgobiani, Maia Nozadze, Nani Vekua, and Nino Japaridze. 2024. “Derivation of AMPA Receptor GluA1 Subunits in Mice from Exosomes Modulates Inflammatory Pain”. Scientific Journal „Spectri“ 9 (1). https://doi.org/10.52340/spectri.2024.09.01.05.
76. Aphkhazava, David, Nodar Sulashvili, Ia Egnatievi, Tamar Tupinashvili, and Maia Nozadze. 2024. “DYNAMIC TUMOR MICROENVIRONMENT THEORY: A MULTIFACETED APPROACH TO TUMOR RESEARCH AND BIOCHEMISTRY”. Scientific Journal „Spectri“ 9 (1). https://doi.org/10.52340/spectri.2024.09.01.06.
77. Sulashvili, Nodar, Irine Pkhakadze, Margarita Beglaryan, Ia Egnatievi, Manana Giorgobiani, Luiza Gabunia, Nana Gorgaslidze, Magda Davitashvili, Ada (Adel) Tadevosyan, and Lali Patsia. 2025. “THE SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION OF KEY ISSUE ASPECTS OF MODERN ADVANCING INNOVATION OF LEARNING AND TEACHING METHODS AND PEDAGOGICAL APPROACHES IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN MEDICAL EDUCATIONAL STUDY PROGRAMS DIRECTIONS GLOBALLY IN GENERAL”. Scientific Journal „Spectri“ 10 (2). https://doi.org/10.52340/spectri.2024.10.01.12.
78. GORGASLIDZE, NANA, NODAR SULASHVILI, LUIZA GABUNIA, LEVAN RATIANI, and MARINA GIORGOBIANI. 2023. “THE SINGULARITIES OF TEMOZOLOMIDE PHARMACOTHERAPEUTIC EFFECTS IN BRAIN TUMOR THERAPEUTIC APPLICATIONS”. Experimental and Clinical Medicine Georgia, no. 4 (November):62-66. https://doi.org/10.52340/jecm.2023.04.16.
79. SULASHVILI, NODAR, MARGARITA BEGLARYAN, NANA GORGASLIDZE, SEYRAN KOCHARYAN, NAIRA CHICHOYAN, LUIZA GABUNIA, IRINE ZARNADZE, et al. 2023. “THE DISCLOSURE OF FEATURES, CHARACTERISTICS, POSSIBILITIES AND SPECIALTIES OF CLINICAL PHARMACISTS AS MEDIATOR AMONG DOCTORS AND PATIENTS FOR ENHANCEMENT PUBLIC HEALTH SECTOR IN A GLOBAL WORLD”. Experimental and Clinical Medicine Georgia, no. 4 (November):57-62. https://doi.org/10.52340/jecm.2023.04.15.
80. Sulashvili, Nodar, Nato Alavidze, Maka Buleishvili, Vira Kravchenko, Marika Sulashvili, Igor Seniuk, Tamar Okropiridze, Marina Giorgobiani, Lela Grigolia, and Kakhaber Robakidze. 2025. “THE MANIFESTATION OF KEY ISSUE FEATURES OF GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES ON INNOVATIVE TEACHING AND LEARNING APPROACH STRATEGIES IN HIGHER MEDICAL EDUCATION: ADVANCING STUDENT-CENTERED PRACTICES, TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION AND COMPETENCY-BASED FRAMEWORKS ”. Scientific Journal „Spectri“ 10 (2). https://doi.org/10.52340/spectri.2024.10.01.11.

81. SULASHVILI, NODAR, NANA GORGASLIDZE, MARGARITA BEGLARYAN, LUIZA GABUNIA, NATIA KVIZHINADZE, TEA ZARKUA, MARINA GIORGOBIANI, NANA PEIKRISHVILI, and MARIKA SULASHVILI. 2024. "THE MANIFESTATION OF CHARACTERISTICS, OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES OF ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS AND DIGITAL INTELLIGENCE USING IN PHARMACEUTICAL SERVICES". Experimental and Clinical Medicine Georgia, no. 4 (September):122-25. https://doi.org/10.52340/jecm.2024.04.33.
82. Sulashvili N, Davitashvili M, Gorgaslidze N, Gabunia L, Beglaryan M, Alavidze N, et al. THE SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION OF SOME ISSUES OF FEATURES AND CHALLENGES OF USING OF CAR-T CELLS IN IMMUNOTHERAPY. GS [Internet]. 2024 Nov. 26 [cited 2025 Jul. 12];6(4):263-90. Available from: https://journals.4science.ge/index.php/GS/article/view/3214.
83. Sulashvili, Nodar, Udgam Yaduvanshi, Mohini Yadav, Luiza Gabunia, Ketevan Ghambashidze, Nana Gorgaslidze, Margarita Beglaryan, et al. 2025. "THE SCIENTIFIC DISCOURSE OF FEATURES OF CLINICAL USE AND PHARMACOLOGY OF VASOCONSTRICTORS AND THEIR IMPACT ON CARDIAC FUNCTION". Junior Researchers 3 (1):28-68. https://doi.org/10.52340/jr.2025.03.01.02.
84. Sulashvili N, Nimangre RR. MANIFESTATION OF SOME ASPECTS OF CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASES, IMPLICATIONS, PHARMACOTHERAPEUTIC STRATEGIES, EFFECTS, IMPACTS AND POTENTIAL HAZARDS IN GENERAL. JR [Internet]. 2025 Feb. 7 [cited 2025 Jul. 12];3(1):1-27. Available from: https://journals.4science.ge/index.php/jr/article/view/3393.
85. GORGASLIDZE, NANA, NODAR SULASHVILI, LUIZA GABUNIA, SHAFIGA TOPCHIYEVA, VIRA KRAVCHENKO, MARINA GIORGOBIANI, IRINA ZARNADZE, and IGOR SENIUK. 2024. "MANIFESTATION OF SOME KEY ISSUE ASPECTS OF FEATURES OF MEDICINES TURNOVER AND ITS INFLUENCE ON ENVIRONMENT AND MEDICAL-ECOLOGICAL SAFETY CHALLENGES GLOBALLY". Experimental and Clinical Medicine Georgia, no. 4 (September):130-32. https://doi.org/10.52340/jecm.2024.04.35.
86. SULASHVILI, NODAR, MARGARITA BEGLARYAN, NANA GORGASLIDZE, SEYRAN KOCHARYAN, NAIRA CHICHOYAN, LUIZA GABUNIA, NATIA KVIZHINADZE, et al. 2024. "THE SCIENTIFIC DISCUSSION OF SOME KEY ISSUE ASPECTS OF PHARMACISTS' VOCATIONAL CHALLENGES, VISION, OPPORTUNITIES, OUTLOOKS, OBJECTIONS, APPEARANCES AND INDENTATION IN GENERAL AND PUBLIC HEALTH CARE DIRECTION". Experimental and Clinical Medicine Georgia, no. 4 (September):126-29. https://doi.org/10.52340/jecm.2024.04.34.
87. Aphkhazava, David, Nodar Sulashvili, Tamar Tupinashvili, and Maia Nozadze. 2024. "Dynamic Cellular Equilibrium Theory of Aging: Integrating Maintenance and Accumulation in the Aging Process". Scientific Journal „Spectri"8 (2). https://doi.org/10.52340/spectri.2023.08.02.03.
88. Alexander JL, Wilson ID, Teare J, Marchesi JR, Nicholson JK, Kinross JM. Gut microbiota modulation of chemotherapy efficacy and toxicity. Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2017;14(6):356-65.
89. Wallace BD, Wang H, Lane KT, Scott JE, Orans J, Koo JS, et al. Alleviating cancer drug toxicity by inhibiting a bacterial enzyme. Science. 2010;330(6005):831-5.
90. Le DT, Uram JN, Wang H, Bartlett BR, Kemberling H, Eyring AD, et al. PD-1 Blockade in Tumors with Mismatch-Repair Deficiency. N Engl J Med. 2015;372(26):2509-20.

91. Marcus L, Lemery SJ, Keegan P, Pazdur R. FDA Approval Summary: Pembrolizumab for the Treatment of Microsatellite Instability-High Solid Tumors. Clin Cancer Res. 2019;25(13):3753-8.
92. Yap TA, Gerlinger M, Futreal PA, Pusztai L, Swanton C. Intratumor heterogeneity: seeing the wood for the trees. Sci Transl Med. 2012;4(127):127ps10.
93. McGranahan N, Swanton C. Clonal Heterogeneity and Tumor Evolution: Past, Present, and the Future. Cell. 2017;168(4):613-28.
94. Baylin SB, Jones PA. Epigenetic Determinants of Cancer. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol. 2016;8(9):a019505.
95. Jones PA, Issa JP, Baylin S. Targeting the cancer epigenome for therapy. Nat Rev Genet. 2016;17(10):630-41.
96. Stein EM, DiNardo CD, Pollyea DA, Fathi AT, Roboz GJ, Altman JK, et al. Enasidenib in mutant IDH2 relapsed or refractory acute myeloid leukemia. Blood. 2017;130(6):722-31.
97. Stahl M, Kohrman N, Gore SD, Kim TK, Zeidan AM, Prebet T. Epigenetics in Cancer: A Hematological Perspective. PLoS Genet. 2016;12(10):e1006193.
98. Lewis PW, Müller MM, Koletsky MS, Cordero F, Lin S, Banaszynski LA, et al. Inhibition of PRC2 activity by a gain-of-function H3 mutation found in pediatric glioblastoma. Science. 2013;340(6134):857-61.
99. Ståhl PL, Salmén F, Vickovic S, Lundmark A, Navarro JF, Magnusson J, et al. Visualization and analysis of gene expression in tissue sections by spatial transcriptomics. Science. 2016;353(6294):78-82.
100. Jackson HW, Fischer JR, Zanotelli VRT, Ali HR, Mechera R, Soysal SD, et al. The single-cell pathology landscape of breast cancer. Nature. 2020;578(7796):615-20.
101. Wu TD, Madireddi S, de Almeida PE, Banchereau R, Chen YJ, Chitre AS, et al. Peripheral T cell expansion predicts tumour infiltration and clinical response. Nature. 2020;579(7798):274-8.
102. Palmer AC, Sorger PK. Combination Cancer Therapy Can Confer Benefit via Patient-to-Patient Variability without Drug Additivity or Synergy. Cell. 2017;171(7):1678-1691.e13.
103. Woodcock J, LaVange LM. Master Protocols to Study Multiple Therapies, Multiple Diseases, or Both. N Engl J Med. 2017;377(1):62-70.