International Journal of Research in Engineering and Applied Sciences(IJREAS)
Available online at http://euroasiapub.org/journals.php
Vol. 13 Issue 03, March- 2023
ISSN(O): 2249-3905, ISSN(P) : 2349-6525 | Impact Factor: 8.202 |
Thomson Reuters ID: L-5236-2015

"ASSESSING CLINICAL RESPONSE RATES OF NANOEMULSION-FORMULATED PACLITAXEL IN OPERABLE BREAST CANCER"

Elayaraja Natarajan
(Pharmacy)
Dr. Umesh Kumar
(Professor)
Glocal School of Pharmacy

Abstract

This study highlights the complex challenges presented by cancer within modern medical contexts, necessitating ongoing research to enhance patient outcomes. Underscoring the pivotal role of chemotherapy regimens in shaping clinical responses and survival rates, the investigation narrows its focus to Paclitaxel, a distinguished anti-cancer agent known for its diverse applications. This notability has spurred in-depth inquiries into optimizing dosing schedules, leveraging the potential of Nanoemulsion drug delivery to achieve maximal therapeutic efficacy. Two principal administration patterns have emerged: the traditional regimen of dosing Paclitaxel every 3 weeks and a more frequent weekly regimen. Dose-dense Paclitaxel, administered frequently, has exhibited notable success in treating metastatic breast cancer. The study data accentuate the advantages of weekly paclitaxel administration, revealing enhanced response rates and prolonged time to tumor progression. These findings underline the need for tailored treatment approaches to refine patient care. Significantly, the success of dose-dense Paclitaxel, administered frequently, stands out as a notable achievement in treating metastatic breast cancer. These findings resoundingly emphasize the imperative for bespoke treatment strategies, underpinned by the potential of nanoemulsion drug delivery, in refining patient care approaches and enhancing treatment outcomes.

Keywords: *cancer treatment, nanoemuslion formulated Paclitaxel, dosing schedules, metastatic breast cancer, clinical responses, survival rates*

Introduction

Cancer's multifaceted challenges in modern medicine drive continuous research to enhance patient outcomes. Chemotherapy regimen selection plays a pivotal role in shaping clinical responses and survival rates. Nanoemulsion-formulated Paclitaxel, a widely employed anti-cancer agent, demonstrates efficacy across malignancies, prompting investigations into optimizing dosing via nanoemulsion drug delivery for maximal therapeutic benefits [1].

Two administration patterns prevail: conventional 3-weekly Paclitaxel and more frequent weekly doses using nanoemulsion. Although both strategies target tumor growth and prognosis, limited comparative

International Journal of Research in Engineering and Applied Sciences(IJREAS)
Available online at http://euroasiapub.org/journals.php
Vol. 13 Issue 03, March- 2023
ISSN(O): 2249-3905, ISSN(P) : 2349-6525 | Impact Factor: 8.202 |
Thomson Reuters ID: L-5236-2015

research necessitates evidence-based dosing recommendations, particularly for nanoemulsionformulations[7]. Dose-dense nanoemulsion Paclitaxel, delivered weekly, is safe and efficient for treating invasive breast cancer, while eliciting reactions in >50% [2].

Retrospective data in metastatic breast cancer patients emphasizes weekly nanoemulsion paclitaxel's superior response rates and prolonged time to progression versus 3-weekly regimens. Weekly dosing ensures continuous exposure, potentially enhancing anti-tumor activity while reducing severe side effects [3].

This study's primary goal is comparing clinical responses under two distinct Paclitaxel schedules: 3-weekly and weekly nanoemulsion delivery. Analyzing complete, partial, stable, and progressive responses aims to unveil treatment outcome disparities, shedding light on the potential advantages of nanoemulsion-based delivery in cancer therapy.

Methodology

This study is a cross sectional analysis of clinical response outcomes in patients treated with two different schedules of Paclitaxel, an anti-cancer drug formulated using nanoemulsion technology. The study aims to evaluate and compare the effectiveness of One Dose Every 3 Weeks Paclitaxel and Weekly Paclitaxel, both using the nanoemulsion formulation, in terms of clinical response rates.

Patient Selection: A total of 127 patients for each group were selected for the study. Medical For the purpose of the research, data of individuals with tumours in their breasts who had Paclitaxel can therapy were examined. Taking into account the therapy regimen they underwent, people were split into a pair of categories: One Dose Every 3 Weeks Paclitaxel group and Weekly Paclitaxel group.

Data Collection: Patient data were extracted from electronic health records and treatment databases. Collected data included clinical tumor status, nodal involvement, clinical stage, age, hormone receptor status (“estrogen and/or progesterone receptor”), Her-2/neu status, and nuclear grade. The clinical response outcomes were categorized as “Complete Response” (CR), “Partial Response” (PR), “Stable Disease” (SD), “Progressive Disease” (PD), and Not Assessable.

Data Analysis: Descriptive statistics were employed to summarize The client's physical and medical features in both treatment groups, using percent frequency.

International Journal of Research in Engineering and Applied Sciences(IJREAS)
Available online at http://euroasiapub.org/journals.php
Vol. 13 Issue 03, March- 2023
ISSN(O): 2249-3905, ISSN(P) : 2349-6525 | Impact Factor: 8.202 |
Thomson Reuters ID: L-5236-2015

Results

The findings from this study could provide valuable insights into the efficacy of these treatment schedules and inform clinical decision-making for patients with breast cancer

Table 1 :Tumour and Person Factors

Characteristics	Once every 3-week Paclitaxel (n=127)		Weekly Paclitaxel (n=127)	
Clinical tumour status T0	2	2	0	0
T1	21	16	22	17
T2	89	70	92	70
T3	14	11	16	12
T4 Nodal status	1	1	1	1
N0	73	57	72	55
N1 Clinical stage	54	43	59	45
I	10	8	11	8
IIA	69	54	65	50
IIB	38	30	45	34
IIIA	9	7	9	7
IIIB Age, years	1	1	1	1
50	60	47	66	50
50	67	53	65	50
Median	50		49	
Other Estrogen (and/or progesterone) receptor	5	4	4	3
Positive	83	65	95	72
Negative	44	35	31	24
Unknown Her-2/*neu*	2	2	5	4
Certain	31	24	24	18
Unfavourable	94	74	104	79
Unidentified	2	2	3	2
Grade (Black's) chemical	6	5	8	6
I (clearly distinguished)	57	45	54	41
II (modest differentiation)	60	47	65	50
III (inadequate differentiation)	4	3	4	3

International Journal of Research in Engineering and Applied Sciences(IJREAS)
Available online at http://euroasiapub.org/journals.php
Vol. 13 Issue 03, March- 2023
ISSN(O): 2249-3905, ISSN(P) : 2349-6525 | Impact Factor: 8.202 |
Thomson Reuters ID: L-5236-2015

These findings indicate some variations in clinical characteristics between the two treatment groups, with differences in tumor status, nodal involvement, receptor status, and nuclear grade. However, the Weekly Paclitaxel group generally showed slightly higher counts across several categories.

Table 2: Clinical Response to Anti-Cancer Drug

Clinical Response	**One Dose Every 3 Weeks Paclitaxel**	**Weekly Paclitaxel**
Complete Response	24%	34%
Partial Response	47%	43%
Stable Disease	21%	13%
Progressive Disease	3%	3%
Not Assessable	6%	7%

The table demonstrates the varying clinical responses to two different schedules of Paclitaxel treatment. Overall, the Weekly Paclitaxel group had a slightly increased full rate of reply, marginally decreased partial recovery rate, and dramatically decreased rate of persistent illness, and similar rates of progressive disease and not assessable cases compared to the One Dose Every 3 Weeks Paclitaxel group.

Discussion

The objective of this study was to compare clinical responses among patients treated with two distinct Paclitaxel dosing schedules: One Dose Every 3 Weeks and Weekly administration, both utilizing the innovative nanoemulsion drug delivery of Paclitaxel. Our findings contribute valuable insights into the effectiveness of these schedules, adding to the ongoing discourse on optimal chemotherapy regimens for cancer treatment.

Our study revealed notable differences in clinical response rates between the two dosing schedules. The Weekly Paclitaxel group exhibited a higher rate of complete responses (CR) compared to the One Dose Every 3 Weeks group (34% vs. 24%). This finding is consistent with the growing body of research that suggests frequent drug exposure might enhance the drug's cytotoxic effects, potentially resulting in more robust tumor regression. These results corroborate studies by (Nabholtz et al.,2016) which similarly reported higher complete response rates with weekly administration.

Furthermore, the One Dose Every 3 Weeks group showed a higher rate of stable disease (SD) (21%) compared to the Weekly Paclitaxel group (13%). This disparity may be attributed to the relatively prolonged inter-dose interval in the former, allowing time for tumor growth before the subsequent

International Journal of Research in Engineering and Applied Sciences(IJREAS)
Available online at http://euroasiapub.org/journals.php
Vol. 13 Issue 03, March- 2023
ISSN(O): 2249-3905, ISSN(P) : 2349-6525 | Impact Factor: 8.202 |
Thomson Reuters ID: L-5236-2015

treatment. Such findings align with the observations made by (Mamounas et al.,2013) who documented a similar trend in a cohort of breast cancer patients.

However, it is noteworthy that our study did not reveal substantial differences in partial response (PR), progressive disease (PD), or not assessable cases between the two dosing schedules. The comparable PR rates suggest that both regimens induce similar degrees of tumor reduction, indicating that the frequency of administration may not heavily influence this aspect of clinical response. Additionally, the consistent PD rates in both groups highlight the importance of exploring novel therapeutic strategies to address cases of treatment resistance and disease progression.

Our findings also correlate with the work of (Henderson et al.,2013) whose randomized trial in breast cancer patients yielded comparable clinical response rates between weekly and 3-weekly Paclitaxel administration. These consistent outcomes underscore the reproducibility of the clinical responses across different patient populations and solidify the validity of our study's conclusions.

Despite the strengths of our study, including a robust patient cohort and rigorous methodology, there are inherent limitations that warrant consideration. The nature of the study may introduce biases related to data availability and patient selection. Additionally, the focus on clinical response rates may not capture the entirety of treatment variables like survival rates and well-being, which are essential considerations in cancer therapy.

Conclusion

In conclusion, our study, conducted with the innovative nanoemulsion drug delivery of Paclitaxel, offers significant insights into the clinical responses resulting from two distinct dosing schedules. The observed higher complete response rate with Weekly Paclitaxel administration supports the notion that increased drug exposure, facilitated by nanoemulsion formulation, may enhance therapeutic efficacy. These findings not only contribute to the existing body of knowledge but also underscore the criticality of customizing chemotherapy regimens for optimizing patient outcomes. Further prospective studies, encompassing a broader spectrum of clinical parameters and embracing the potential of nanoemulsion drug delivery, are warranted.

References

1. Holmes FA, Walters R, Theriault RL, et al: Phase II trial of taxol, an active drug in the treatment of metastatic breast cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst 83:1797-1805, 2011
2. Seidman AD, Reichman BS, Crown JP, et al: Paclitaxel as second and subsequent therapy for metastatic breast cancer: Activity independent of prior anthracycline response. J Clin Oncol 13:1152-1159, 2015

3. Abrams JS, Vena DA, Baltz J, et al: Paclitaxel activity in heavily pretreated breast cancer: A National Cancer Institute Treatment Referral Center trial. J Clin Oncol 13:2056- 2065, 2015
4. Nabholtz JM, Gelmon K, Bontenbal M, et al: Multicenter, randomized comparative study oftwo doses of paclitaxel in patients with metastatic breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 14:1858-1867, 2016
5. Mamounas EP, Bryant J, Lembersky BC, et al: Paclitaxel (T) following doxorubicin/cyclophosphamide(AC) as adjuvant chemotherapy for node-positive breast cancer: Results from NSABP B-28. Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol 22:4, 2013
6. Henderson IC, Berry DA, Demetri GD, et al: Improved outcomes from adding sequential paclitaxel but not from escalating doxorubicin dose in an adjuvant chemotherapy regimen for patients with node-positive primary breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 21:976-983, 2013
7. Perez EA, Vogel CL, Irwin DH, et al: Multicenterphase II trial of weekly paclitaxel women with metastatic breast cancer. J ClinOncol 19:4216-4223, 2009