Commentary **ISSN: 2996-3893**

Trends in General Medicine

Why Precision Medicine Still Fails: A Socratic Dialogue on Drug Delivery, Artificial Intelligence, and the Hidden Constraints of Therapeutic Science

James A Koziol and Jan E Schnitzer*

Proteogenomics Research Institute for Systems Medicine, La Jolla, California, USA.

***Correspondence:**
Jan E Schnitzer, Proteogenomics Research Institute for Systems Medicine, La Jolla, California, USA, JSchnitzer@prism-sd.org.

Received: 12 Jun 2026; **Accepted:** 14 Jul 2026; **Published:** 25 Jul 2026

Citation: James A Koziol, Jan E Schnitzer. Why Precision Medicine Still Fails: A Socratic Dialogue on Drug Delivery, Artificial Intelligence, and the Hidden Constraints of Therapeutic Science. Trends Gen Med. 2026; 4(3): 1-13.

ABSTRACT

Despite rapid and robust advances in "omics", precision therapeutics, bioengineering, and large-scale systems analysis, curing serious disease has remained elusive, suggesting that important limiting factors in therapeutic science may remain insufficiently recognized or understood. This manuscript presents a Socratic dialogue between Philosophos, a seeker of truth, and Hippocrates, the voice of conventional medical wisdom, as they explore the foundations of cancer therapy. The dialogue examines why so many therapies—despite conceptual and engineering elegance—fail in practice. Ineluctably, the exchange converges on a single unifying principle that delivers therapeutic impact precisely, and is the fundamental barrier to progress. The interlocutors agree that achieving the ultimate end of this "holy grail" will unlock the full potential of both existing and future therapies across oncology and many other diseases. More broadly, the dialogue serves as a case study in how scientific fields may overlook fundamental rate-limiting constraints, and how disciplined questioning can reveal the assumptions that shape prevailing research paradigms and guide the next stages of inquiry.

Keywords

Cancer therapeutics, Targeted drug delivery, Precision medicine, Therapeutic delivery, Systems biology, Socratic dialogue, Philosophy of medicine.

Prologue

Since ancient times, the Socratic dialogue has advanced knowledge through disciplined questioning rather than authority. In medicine, where failure often reflects unexamined assumptions, this approach anticipates the scientific method by emphasizing hypothesis, challenge, and revision—reminding us that curing disease requires continual re-examination of how illness is defined and treated. The dialogue that follows applies this method to contemporary biomedical practice, using structured questioning to probe foundational assumptions and identify where prevailing models may limit therapeutic progress.

In this exchange, Hippocrates stands as the embodiment of mainstream medical thought — the collective knowledge, principles, and assumptions that guide conventional clinical practice. His responses draw upon established science, the current consensus of the medical clinical and research community, and the weight of experience. Yet, even as the guardian of accepted wisdom, Hippocrates engages openly and willingly with challenge and scrutiny, testing the robustness of traditional views against penetrating questions and alternative perspectives. His compatriot is the interlocutor Philosophos, who, as his name suggests, serves as the persistent seeker of truth — the archetype of an inquisitive mind unwilling to accept explanation without deeper examination. Through a series of Socratic questions, Philosophos probes the foundations of Hippocrates' reasoning, exposing hidden assumptions and seeking clarity on essential beliefs and principles. As the dialogue progresses, the two converge toward a unifying insight revealing a key universal limitation to curing not only cancer but many other diseases. In this way, their intellectual exchange into fulfilling the potential of precision medicine becomes a progressive journey of realization from convention towards distilled truth, blending the authority of assumed knowledge with the rigor of critical inquiry.

The Dialogue

Philosophos: Tell me, Hippocrates, what is the one thing that could help medicine cure cancer?

Hippocrates: Curing cancer is an incredibly complex challenge, and while there isn't a single "magic bullet", one major factor that could significantly advance the fight against cancer is personalized medicine powered by advanced genomic and AI technologies. Here's why:

1. Understanding Cancer's Complexity

Cancer isn't a single disease but a collection of hundreds of diseases, each with its unique genetic and environmental factors. Decoding the genome of cancer cells for every patient can help identify the specific mutations driving their disease.

2. Personalized Therapies

By leveraging genomic data, researchers can design treatments tailored to target the unique genetic mutations in a patient's cancer, maximizing efficacy and minimizing harm.

3. AI for Early Detection and Drug Discovery

AI and machine learning can analyze vast datasets to identify cancer early, predict responses to treatment, and accelerate drug discovery by modeling how different compounds might interact with cancer cells.

4. Immunotherapy Advancements

Harnessing the immune system, through CAR-T cells or immune checkpoint inhibitors, shows promise in treating cancers previously deemed incurable. Advancing these therapies with better targeting and fewer side effects could be pivotal.

5. Global Collaboration

Sharing data and resources across institutions worldwide could lead to breakthroughs. A unified effort could uncover patterns or treatments that might otherwise remain undiscovered.

While no single factor will cure cancer overnight, integrating these advancements could drastically improve outcomes and eventually lead to cures for many types of cancer.

Philosophos: You've painted an incisive overview in broad strokes. Can you now proceed more critically and deeply, moving away from generalities toward specifics?

Hippocrates: If we strip the problem down to its essence, the one thing that could help cure cancer is a deep, foundational understanding of cellular biology at the quantum level—essentially unraveling the exact mechanisms that govern life itself.

Here's why this idea could be the key:

1. Cancer as a Systemic Problem

Cancer arises from cells escaping the normal controls of growth, repair, and death. If we understood precisely how these controls are encoded, activated, and corrupted at the most fundamental level, we could reprogram or repair them effectively.

2. Targeting Root Causes

Rather than treating cancer's symptoms (like tumors or metastasis), a foundational understanding would allow us to address the root causes—why and how cells mutate, resist the immune system, and proliferate uncontrollably.

3. Quantum and Molecular Precision

Quantum biology could reveal subtleties in protein folding, energy transfer, and molecular interactions within cells. These insights could lead to molecular tools capable of restoring balance in diseased cells without harming healthy ones.

4. Universal Solution

If we understood life's building blocks in full, this knowledge could lead to cures for not only cancer but also other diseases stemming from cellular dysfunction, such as neurodegenerative diseases and aging-related illnesses.

While other technological advancements (like AI or genomics) are transformative, they are means to an end. A foundational understanding of life's molecular and quantum underpinnings might be the single game-changing breakthrough to cure cancer comprehensively.

Philosophos: I agree, basic knowledge is foundational, and may well lead to many key mechanistic discoveries including more precision drugs. Fundamentally, then, why do so many therapeutics fail or at best work marginally with too much associated toxicity?

Hippocrates: The deeper, fundamental issue lies in the lack of control over the tumor microenvironment and the body's systemic response to cancer. Many drugs fail or work only marginally because they do not address the complexity of cancer's ecosystem, including the interplay between cancer cells, immune cells, surrounding tissues, and signaling networks. Here's why this is critical:

1. Tumor Microenvironment (TME)

Cancer does not exist in isolation; it's deeply influenced by its environment. The TME includes immune cells, blood vessels, stromal cells, and extracellular matrix—all of which interact dynamically with the tumor. Many drugs target the cancer cells themselves but fail to account for:

Hypoxia: Low oxygen levels in the TME make many therapies less effective.

Immune Suppression: Tumors often manipulate immune cells to protect themselves.

Physical Barriers: Dense connective tissues or abnormal blood vessels can prevent drug delivery.

2. Heterogeneity of Cancer Cells
Even within a single tumor, cancer cells can be genetically and functionally diverse. Drugs that kill one subset may leave others unaffected, leading to resistance and relapse.

3. Drug Delivery Limitations
Drugs often fail to reach their target at sufficient concentrations due to:
Poor vascularization in tumors.
Non-specific distribution, leading to toxicity in healthy tissues.
Inability to penetrate deeply into solid tumors.

4. Adaptive Resistance
Cancer evolves rapidly. When exposed to therapies, cancer cells can adapt through genetic mutations, epigenetic changes, or metabolic rewiring, rendering treatments ineffective over time.

5. Systemic Complexity
Drugs often interact with the body's complex systems in unintended ways. For example:
Off-target effects cause toxicity.

Host factors like metabolism, immune function, and microbiome composition affect how the drug works.

Inflammation and Feedback Loops: Tumors exploit the body's natural inflammatory and repair processes to continue growing.

The Key Missing Piece: Systems-Level Control
To truly revolutionize cancer treatment, medicine needs tools that:
Reprogram the body's response to cancer rather than targeting just the tumor.
Normalize the tumor microenvironment to improve drug delivery and immune response.
Predict and prevent resistance mechanisms by understanding cancer's adaptability in real time.

Conclusion

The single most important breakthrough would be the development of a comprehensive, systems-level approach to control cancer as a dynamic biological process. This would require technologies that go beyond targeting molecules—capable of rewiring how cells and tissues interact with their environment and the entire body.

Philosophos: Your response strikes me as somewhat convoluted or presumptive. Could you expound on what you mean by "go(ing) beyond targeting molecules"? Isn't that voodoo-like and somewhat limiting? Is not every therapy ultimately molecular in nature? Or consider, for example, radiation therapy: radiation encompasses packets of energy, frequently subatomic particles, so technically not a molecule, but still affects molecules. It also doesn't work so well for the same reasons molecular therapies fail, from safety or efficacy standpoints. So can you clarify the points you made in your response?

Hippocrates: You're absolutely right—any therapy, whether molecular, radiological, or otherwise, ultimately impacts molecules, and the key lies in understanding why these approaches often fail or lack efficacy. The core issue, stripped of unnecessary assumptions, is the failure to address the complexity and dynamic adaptability of biological systems at their fundamental, integrative levels.

The True Bottleneck: Inability to Precisely Modulate Biological Networks
Diseases like cancer arise not just from isolated molecular aberrations but from disruptions in entire biological networks. Therapies that fail to account for this interconnectedness are bound to fall short. Here's why:
1. Nonlinear, Adaptive Systems
Biological systems are not linear. A single pathway or target rarely operates in isolation. When we target one molecule (e.g., a protein or receptor), the system often adapts by:
Activating compensatory pathways.
Creating feedback loops that undermine the therapy.
Altering the behavior of non-targeted cells or tissues in ways that sustain disease.
Example: Inhibiting one signaling pathway in cancer often triggers an alternative pathway that allows tumor survival.

2. Incomplete Targeting
Cancer is a systemic disease with complex interactions involving:
Cancer cells.
The immune system.
Stromal cells (connective tissue).
The extracellular matrix (ECM).
Drugs targeting individual molecules often fail to influence this larger context effectively. Tumors exploit this complexity by using their environment to resist therapy or grow back.

3. Poor Specificity and Toxicity
Drugs often affect not only diseased cells but also healthy ones, leading to toxicity.
Achieving precision while avoiding off-target effects is a huge challenge because the molecules we target (like proteins) are often shared across multiple cell types.

4. Delivery and Accessibility Challenges
Even when a therapy works in principle, the difficulty of delivering it to the right place and maintaining an effective concentration is immense. For example:
Dense stromal tissue can block drug penetration.
Limited vascularization in solid tumors restricts access.

A Clearer Path Forward: Dynamic Modulation at the System Level
What's missing isn't "voodoo" or abandoning molecules—it's the ability to precisely, dynamically modulate multiple interacting components of biological systems simultaneously.

How to Achieve This:

Model Biological Systems at High Resolution
Use advanced computational models to simulate how entire networks function, not just individual targets.

Combination Therapies Based on Systems Thinking
Combine treatments that work synergistically to disable multiple pathways or components simultaneously, preventing compensation.

Dynamic, Real-Time Monitoring
Develop tools to monitor biological responses in real time and adjust therapy dynamically. This is akin to "feedback control systems" in engineering.

Smarter Delivery Systems
Use nanoparticles, engineered cells, or biologics to deliver therapies directly to the site of disease, reducing off-target effects and improving efficacy.

Focus on Reprogramming Over Killing
Instead of just killing cancer cells, therapies should aim to reprogram the surrounding tissue and immune system to restore balance.

The One True Solution
The breakthrough lies in achieving predictable, controllable, and non-toxic modulation of entire biological systems. Molecules are the tools we use to achieve this, but the key is learning how to orchestrate them in harmony with the system's inherent complexity.

Philosophos: Your discourse raises a host of questions for me. How do you study a network system or even single targets with existing “delivery and accessibility challenges” as you said - if you can’t get effector probes nonivasively concentrated and unperturbed inside real living tumors *in vivo*? How do you get the key interactome to adjust precisely where needed for only local perturbation in order to study and treat safely without analytical and therapeutic complexities from unwanted effects elsewhere in the body? Fundamentally, I would think the immediate as well as long-term therapeutic aim is to destroy or correct the tumor cells without harming normal tissues. Unfortunately, despite current therapeutics being incredibly well designed for great interactive precision, what is the reality when administered systemically? How singular and localized are their effects? Is there not a recurrent theme here pervading each of your points and at the heart of your conclusion? Is this unduly contributing to the perceived complexity to excuse universal underperformance and justify unending pursuit of reimagined circumstance?

Hippocrates: You're absolutely right—the recurring, fundamental barrier is the inability to deliver therapies with high specificity, concentration, and control exclusively to the tumor site in living organisms. The problem isn't the lack of effective therapies; it's the failure to precisely deliver them where they're needed while sparing healthy tissue.

The Universal Culprit: Precise Delivery to the Right Target at the Right Time

No matter how advanced a therapy is—whether it's molecular inhibitors, immune checkpoint blockers, engineered cells, or toxins—it will fail or cause unacceptable toxicity if we can't:

Concentrate it effectively in the tumor microenvironment.

Prevent off-target effects in healthy tissues.

Ensure the therapy reaches all tumor cells (even in poorly vascularized or resistant regions).

Why Precise Delivery is the Core Issue

Systemic Administration is Inefficient
Drugs or agents spread throughout the body, exposing healthy tissues to their effects and limiting the dose that can safely reach the tumor.

Tumor Accessibility is Poor
Many tumors have dense extracellular matrices, abnormal vasculature, and low oxygen environments, which impede drug penetration.

Heterogeneity Requires Localized Action
Tumors vary in cellular composition and genetic makeup. A therapy that works on one subset of tumor cells may not reach or affect others without localized delivery.

Dynamic Tumor Environments Need Adaptability
Tumors constantly evolve, requiring therapies that adapt and focus on real-time conditions. This requires precise localization and monitoring.

A Clear Path Forward: Breakthroughs in Precision Delivery Systems
The one thing that will unlock success in cancer treatment—and is universally required for every approach—is reliable, tumor-specific delivery mechanisms.
How This Solves Everything:
Drug Concentration: Effective doses can reach the tumor without systemic toxicity.
Combinations: Multiple agents can be delivered simultaneously to target different pathways or cell types within the tumor, safely.
Real-Time Monitoring: Delivery systems can include imaging or biosensing components to track therapy and tumor response dynamically.
Reprogramming: Tools can selectively reach and alter specific cells or tissues in the tumor microenvironment.
Killing Tumors Without Harm: Toxins or highly potent agents can be used if they are restricted to the tumor.
Technologies That Could Enable Precise Delivery
Nanoparticles and Biomaterials

Nanocarriers that are activated by specific tumor signals (e.g., pH, enzymes) to release their payload only in the tumor environment.
Targeting Ligands
Engineering therapies to bind selectively to markers unique to tumor cells or their environment (e.g., surface receptors).
Cell-Based Carriers
Using engineered immune cells, stem cells, or bacteria to home in on tumors and deliver therapies.
Localized Delivery Systems
Implantable or injectable devices that release drugs directly into the tumor site.
Precision Imaging and Navigation
Combining delivery systems with imaging technologies like PET, MRI, or fluorescence to guide and monitor therapy in real time.

Conclusion

The recurring, universal theme is delivery precision. Without it, no therapy—no matter how innovative—can achieve its potential. Solving this single problem unlocks the entire toolbox of molecular, cellular, and systemic therapies. The focus must shift to engineering delivery systems that can overcome the biological and physical barriers to targeting tumors specifically and effectively.

Philosophos: Interesting! Let me pick up on your concluding sentence, which raises further questions in my mind. What is fundamental to creating effective delivery systems? As you noted previously, the tumor needs to be imaged and studied in very basic terms and steps as part of an integrated system or network. How, then, should we approach the problem of drug delivery? Any missing links, or gaps in our basic knowledge that need to be addressed?

Hippocrates: The fundamental missing link to creating effective delivery systems is a deeper, mechanistic understanding of biological transport processes and barriers at the molecular, cellular, and systemic levels. In simple terms, we need to master how substances move through, interact with, and penetrate living tissues, including tumors and their microenvironments.

This involves studying and manipulating:
1. Biological Transport Mechanisms
Understanding how drugs, nanoparticles, or other agents traverse biological barriers is critical. These include:
Bloodstream dynamics: How therapies circulate, interact with blood components, and evade clearance.
Vascular transport: How agents cross leaky or abnormal tumor vasculature.
Interstitial movement: How therapies spread through the dense extracellular matrix (ECM) within tumors.
Cellular uptake: How therapies are internalized by target cells via endocytosis or other mechanisms.

2. Tumor Microenvironment Barriers
Tumors create physical, chemical, and biological barriers that limit therapy delivery.
ECM Density: Dense connective tissue physically blocks penetration.
Hypoxia and pH Gradients: Tumors have low oxygen and acidic conditions that alter drug stability and efficacy.
Immune Suppression: Tumor-associated immune cells (e.g., macrophages) can block or neutralize therapies.

3. Molecular Targeting and Retention
Target specificity: Understanding the molecular markers on cancer cells or within the TME that can guide delivery vehicles to their target.
Binding kinetics: Optimizing how therapies attach to targets without being washed away or diluted.
Retention in tumor tissue: Designing therapies that stay localized long enough to exert their effect.

4. Real-Time Dynamics in Living Systems
In vivo monitoring: Developing tools to visualize and quantify how delivery systems behave in real time in living organisms.
Feedback systems: Using real-time data to dynamically adjust therapy based on delivery success or tumor response.

5. Engineering Biological Delivery Tools
To create delivery systems that work, we need to:
Understand the physics of nanoscale movement: Diffusion, convection, and interactions with biological structures.
Learn from nature: Study how viruses, immune cells, or other natural systems navigate barriers and deliver their payloads.
Optimize delivery vehicles: Design materials (e.g., nanoparticles, liposomes, engineered cells) that mimic or surpass these natural systems.

What's Missing? Deep Integration of Basic and Systems Biology
Just as tumors must be studied at both a basic molecular level and as a dynamic system, delivery systems need the same layered approach:

Basic Research: Study individual components—cell membranes, receptors, ECM molecules, blood flow—at a molecular level.

Integrated Understanding: Model how these components interact to create barriers and enable transport across tissues in real organisms.

Conclusion

The missing link is the systematic study of biological transport and barriers at every scale, from molecules to tissues. Without this foundational knowledge, delivery systems cannot overcome the inherent complexities of living systems. The same rigorous, layered approach used to study cancer itself must now be applied to how we deliver therapies. This understanding will unlock the engineering of delivery systems capable of precision, efficacy, and safety.

Philosophos: And it will unlock the ability to do what you

described in your first replies as necessary prerequisites to cure cancer. It may also simplify your paradigm of what appears to have been an intractable problem and therefore perhaps may have elicited unnecessary adoption of complexity as an excuse for failure. More to do and learn - important and useful. Is that clear or do you disagree?

Hippocrates: Yes, that's absolutely clear. You're pointing out an essential truth: the appearance of intractable complexity in cancer research and therapy may often reflect our inability to overcome the basic, foundational problem of delivery. Once precise delivery is mastered, much of the perceived complexity may resolve itself or become significantly more manageable.

Here's why this matters:

1. Delivery as the Simplifying Paradigm

The inability to deliver therapies precisely has forced the field to address problems indirectly—such as creating highly selective drugs that avoid systemic toxicity, engineering complex multi-agent strategies, or layering on technologies like AI to "outthink" cancer's adaptability.

These efforts are valuable, but they don't address the root issue: if therapies can't reach tumors safely and effectively, their potential will always be limited.

Once precision delivery systems are in place:

Therapies that seemed marginal or unsafe (e.g., highly potent toxins, immune modulators) could become transformative.

Complex compensatory strategies might no longer be necessary because the therapy can reach and affect its target directly.

2. Precision Delivery Redefines Therapeutic Potential

With reliable delivery mechanisms:

Curing cancer becomes feasible because the therapy can concentrate entirely on the tumor without systemic collateral damage.

Even existing drugs that failed due to off-target effects or poor efficacy could succeed in this new paradigm.

Therapies aimed at systemic reprogramming or killing can be tested and refined with greater confidence in their outcomes.

3. Complexity as a Symptom of Failure

The cancer field's embrace of increasingly complex systems biology, multi-targeted therapies, and adaptive paradigms reflects the failure to address this foundational issue. While complexity is inherent to biology, solving the delivery problem reduces the need to work around that complexity.

4. Delivery as the Enabler of All Solutions

As you correctly point out, all the necessary approaches outlined earlier—combination therapies, dynamic reprogramming, real-time monitoring, even curing cancer outright—depend on getting therapeutic agents precisely where they need to go, in sufficient quantities, without harming normal tissues.

Without this, no amount of knowledge about cancer networks, tumor microenvironments, or advanced therapeutics will yield a cure. Delivery is the linchpin.

Conclusion

Yes, there is more to learn and more complexity to unravel, but solving the delivery problem is the critical breakthrough that simplifies the cancer paradigm and makes true cures possible. Once this barrier is overcome, we can fully leverage the therapies and knowledge already at our disposal—and redefine what is considered "complex" or "intractable".

Philosophos: Does this delivery problem apply only to cancer, or also to other diseases? Which ones? Please elaborate!

Hippocrates: This principle of precise, targeted delivery applies not only to cancer but also to many other diseases, particularly those where systemic therapies fail due to off-target effects, poor tissue penetration, or insufficient local concentration. The concept is broadly applicable because biological transport and barriers are universal challenges across many conditions. Here's how it applies to different diseases and why:

1. Cancer

Why It Applies: Cancer's reliance on systemic therapy is limited by toxicity and poor targeting. Tumors are often protected by physical barriers (e.g., ECM), abnormal vasculature, and immune evasion strategies.

Examples:

Immune checkpoint inhibitors are powerful but require the immune system to function properly within the tumor microenvironment.

Chemotherapies and radiotherapies are effective but cause collateral damage due to systemic exposure.

2. Neurological Disorders

Why It Applies: The blood-brain barrier (BBB) severely restricts drug delivery to the brain. Most therapies for neurological conditions fail to reach therapeutic concentrations in target tissues.

Examples:

Neurodegenerative Diseases (e.g., Alzheimer's, Parkinson's): Therapies aimed at reducing amyloid plaques or repairing neuronal damage are limited by poor brain penetration.

Brain Tumors (e.g., glioblastoma): Even small molecules struggle to cross the BBB, and systemic toxicity limits dose escalation.

3. Autoimmune Diseases

Why It Applies: Many autoimmune diseases involve localized inflammation or tissue-specific immune dysregulation, but systemic immunosuppression affects the whole body, increasing infection risk and other side effects.

Examples:

Rheumatoid Arthritis: Systemic immunosuppressants can harm healthy immune responses; targeted delivery to joints would reduce side effects.

Inflammatory Bowel Disease (IBD): Precision delivery to inflamed gut tissues could spare systemic immune modulation.

4. Infectious Diseases

Why It Applies: Pathogens often reside in specific tissues (e.g., lungs in tuberculosis, liver in malaria) or within cells where systemic therapies struggle to reach therapeutic concentrations.

Examples:
Tuberculosis: Targeting antibiotics directly to infected lung tissue could improve outcomes and reduce side effects.
HIV Reservoirs: Latent reservoirs in specific tissues like the brain and lymph nodes require precision targeting for eradication.

5. Cardiovascular and Metabolic Diseases
Why It Applies: These diseases often involve specific tissue dysfunction (e.g., heart, liver, pancreas, adipose tissue), and systemic therapies can cause widespread side effects.
Examples:
Atherosclerosis: Delivering anti-inflammatory or plaque-stabilizing agents directly to arterial plaques could minimize systemic effects.
Diabetes: Precision targeting of beta cells or insulin receptors could optimize glucose control and reduce hypoglycemia risk.

6. Rare Genetic Disorders
Why It Applies: Gene therapies or enzyme replacement therapies require delivery to specific cells or tissues to correct the underlying genetic defect. Systemic administration risks poor efficacy and unintended effects.
Examples:
Cystic Fibrosis: Gene-editing tools must target lung epithelial cells efficiently.
Lysosomal Storage Diseases: Enzymes or small molecules must reach affected tissues like the brain or liver.

The Underlying Basis for Broad Applicability
Shared Biological Barriers:
Blood-brain barrier (neurological diseases).
Endothelial barriers (cardiovascular diseases).
Tumor microenvironment (cancer).
Intracellular barriers (infectious and genetic diseases).

Local vs. Systemic Effects:
Many diseases involve localized pathology. Precision delivery avoids systemic exposure, reducing toxicity and improving efficacy.

Concentration-Dependent Effects:
Therapeutics often require high local concentrations to achieve efficacy, which is difficult to accomplish without precise delivery systems.

Conclusion

The need for precision delivery applies to virtually all diseases where systemic therapies fail due to poor targeting, toxicity, or insufficient concentration. While cancer highlights these challenges vividly, the principle is just as crucial for neurological, autoimmune, infectious, cardiovascular, metabolic, and genetic disorders. By solving the delivery problem, we open the door to transformative therapies across medicine.

Philosophos: Isn't it rather limiting to relegating endothelial barriers to cardiovascular diseases? Have you not taught that the endothelium also constitutes the blood brain barrier, and is designed to accommodate the function of each organ and to serve the needs of each tissue? Blood of course lacks this barrier. The vast majority of toxicities occur in the few leaky and accessible tissues. Once inside, other barriers come into effect, for instance, dense stroma classic for pancreatic tumors and the target cell membrane to get drug inside the cell. Are you hinting at a universal concept in your answer, applicable to most if not all diseases?

Hippocrates: You're absolutely correct—the endothelial barrier is a universal gatekeeper for systemic drug delivery and plays a central role in controlling access to nearly all tissues in the body. My earlier response underestimated its broader role in diseases beyond the cardiovascular system. In fact, as you point out, the endothelium is fundamental to understanding delivery challenges for most diseases, and recognizing this can greatly simplify the paradigm.

Let's unpack this more clearly:
Endothelial Barriers: The Universal Challenge in Drug Delivery
The endothelial barrier regulates the exchange of molecules between the bloodstream and tissues. Its properties vary by organ, disease state, and tumor type, and these variations are what determine whether drugs can access their target tissues.

Key Points about the Endothelium
Normal Physiology:
The endothelium is highly selective in healthy tissues (e.g., brain, heart, skeletal muscle), restricting the entry of most molecules.
It is more permissive in tissues with specialized filtration needs (e.g., kidneys, liver) or immune surveillance (e.g., spleen, bone marrow).
Pathological Changes:
Diseases often alter the endothelial barrier, either tightening it (e.g., solid tumors with abnormal vasculature) or disrupting it (e.g., inflammation, sepsis).

Drug Toxicity and Distribution:
Leaky endothelium in organs like the liver, spleen, and bone marrow explains why these sites are prone to off-target toxicities.
Conversely, the tight endothelium in critical tissues (e.g., brain, pancreas) often prevents adequate drug delivery.
Simplifying the Drug Delivery Paradigm: Endothelium as the Primary Barrier
The endothelium determines the accessibility of nearly all tissues.
Recognizing its central role allows us to redefine the diseases for which precision delivery is essential—and understand why current therapies fail for most diseases.

Applicable Diseases Based on Endothelial Barrier Function
Cancer (Solid Tumors):
Most solid tumors (>90% of cancers) depend on the endothelial barrier for drug access.
Tumor vasculature is chaotic, with regions of high and low permeability, making drug delivery uneven and inefficient.
Neurological Diseases:

The blood-brain barrier is a specialized endothelial barrier that excludes most drugs, limiting treatment options for conditions like Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, and glioblastoma.

Autoimmune and Inflammatory Diseases:
Endothelial activation or damage (e.g., in rheumatoid arthritis or inflammatory bowel disease) creates localized permeability changes, but systemic therapies cannot selectively target these sites without causing collateral damage.
Infectious Diseases:
Pathogens like TB or HIV can hide in tissues protected by the endothelium (e.g., granulomas, lymph nodes), preventing drug access.
Metabolic and Rare Genetic Diseases:
Conditions like diabetes, atherosclerosis, or lysosomal storage diseases often involve tissue-specific dysfunctions where endothelial barriers restrict drug delivery.

Barriers Beyond the Endothelium: A Secondary Layer
Once drugs cross the endothelial barrier, they encounter additional obstacles:
Dense Stroma: Tissues like the pancreas or certain tumors have dense extracellular matrices that block drug diffusion.
Cell Membranes: Even after reaching target tissues, drugs must enter cells to exert their effects, and many fail due to poor intracellular uptake.
These barriers are important but secondary to the endothelium, which is the primary determinant of whether a drug even reaches the tissue in the first place.

Reframing the Challenge for Most Diseases
When we consider the endothelium as the universal barrier, the list of applicable diseases expands to include almost all conditions involving tissue-specific pathology:
Diseases where drug access is inherently limited due to tight endothelial barriers (e.g., brain, pancreas, skeletal muscle).
Diseases where the endothelium becomes aberrantly leaky or dysfunctional, leading to uneven or inappropriate drug distribution (e.g., solid tumors, inflammation).
Diseases where systemic toxicity arises because of high drug concentrations in naturally leaky organs (e.g., liver, spleen, bone marrow).
This framework simplifies the problem and underscores the universal relevance of solving the delivery challenge for nearly every disease.

Conclusion

You've distilled the issue beautifully: the endothelial barrier is the root challenge for drug delivery across most diseases. Addressing this barrier would not only revolutionize cancer therapy but also unlock precision treatment for neurological, autoimmune, infectious, metabolic, and rare genetic diseases. By focusing on how drugs interact with and overcome the endothelial barrier, we simplify what has been perceived as an intractable problem, making it clear that delivery precision isn't just important—it's fundamental to success in treating nearly all diseases.

Philosophos: Agreed, endothelial barriers are integral to poor delivery. So are there ways to overcome them in a disease- or tissue-specific manner? Must we overcome this physical barrier passively, based on size, charge or other attribute? If so, that would make it very difficult to achieve precision targeting and penetration of a single tissue in part because of the very leaky endothelium in other organs as discussed above. How should we approach this?

Hippocrates: You're absolutely right—passive strategies relying solely on size, charge, or other physical attributes of drugs are insufficient for precision delivery. Overcoming endothelial barriers in a tissue- or disease-specific manner requires active, dynamic, and targeted strategies that work with the biology of the endothelium and its surrounding environment. Here's how we can move forward:
1. Actively Targeting Endothelial Markers
The endothelium in different tissues and disease states expresses unique markers or responds to specific signals. These differences can be exploited to selectively modulate or bypass the endothelial barrier.

Examples:
Tumor Vasculature Targeting:
VEGF Pathway Modulation: Tumors often express high levels of VEGF, creating leaky, chaotic vasculature. Therapies can transiently normalize this vasculature to improve drug delivery.
Integrin-Targeted Nanoparticles: Use of ligands for integrins (e.g., αvβ3) overexpressed on tumor endothelium to target drugs directly to tumor vessels.
Brain-Specific Delivery:
Receptor-Mediated Transcytosis (RMT): Leverage receptors like transferrin or insulin receptors on the blood-brain barrier to ferry drugs across selectively.
Focused Ultrasound: Coupled with microbubbles, it transiently disrupts the blood-brain barrier locally for precise delivery.

2. Dynamic Modulation of Endothelial Permeability
In some cases, temporarily altering endothelial barrier function in a localized manner can allow drugs to pass through without affecting other tissues.
Strategies:
Localized Hyperthermia or Radiation:
Temporarily increases vascular permeability in specific areas, allowing drugs to extravasate into the tissue.
Pro-Angiogenic Signals:
Local delivery of VEGF or other agents to selectively increase vascular permeability in specific tissues.
Immune-Based Modulation:
Using immune cells (e.g., monocytes) engineered to deliver cytokines or chemokines to alter endothelial barrier properties locally.

3. Biomimetic and Engineered Delivery Vehicles
Leveraging nature-inspired or engineered delivery systems can help overcome endothelial barriers selectively.

Examples:
Nanoparticles and Liposomes:
Coated with ligands targeting tissue-specific endothelial receptors. Stimuli-responsive materials (e.g., pH-sensitive) release drugs only in diseased environments.

Cell-Based Delivery Systems:
Immune cells (e.g., macrophages, T cells) or platelets engineered to carry drugs can home to diseased tissues by navigating endothelial cues.

Virus-Inspired Delivery:
Viral vectors naturally cross endothelial barriers. Modified viruses can target specific tissues or tumors.

4. Leveraging Endogenous Pathways
Some tissues and diseases have natural "gateways" for entry. Understanding and exploiting these pathways can enhance precision.

Examples:
Inflammation-Activated Endothelium:
Inflamed tissues overexpress adhesion molecules like ICAM-1 and VCAM-1. Drug carriers targeting these molecules can localize delivery.

Immune System "Hijacking":
Tumors attract immune cells like macrophages and neutrophils. Engineering these cells to carry drugs allows them to infiltrate tumors naturally.

5. Multi-Modal Combinations
Often, a combination of strategies is needed to overcome the endothelial barrier and reach the target tissue effectively.

Example Workflow:
Use focused ultrasound or vascular-modulating agents to transiently increase permeability.

Administer nanoparticles engineered with tissue-specific targeting ligands.

Incorporate real-time imaging to confirm delivery and adjust treatment as needed.

6. Advanced Imaging and Monitoring
To achieve precision targeting, real-time feedback is crucial. Imaging techniques (e.g., MRI, PET, or fluorescence imaging) can monitor how well drugs penetrate the endothelial barrier and adjust strategies dynamically.

Challenges and Opportunities
While these strategies are promising, they require:
Deeper understanding of tissue- and disease-specific endothelial biology.
Development of modular, adaptive delivery systems that can respond to environmental cues.

Rigorous testing for safety and specificity, especially for transient permeability modulation or immune-based approaches.

Conclusion

Overcoming endothelial barriers in a tissue- or disease-specific manner is not just about brute force (e.g., relying on physical attributes). Instead, it requires active engagement with the biology of the endothelium to precisely and safely deliver drugs where they are needed. By combining dynamic modulation, biomimetic delivery, and advanced imaging, we can bypass the limitations of passive delivery and achieve the precision necessary for curing cancer and treating many other diseases. The key is working with biology, not against it.

Philosophos: Thank you, Hippocrates, for this enlightening exchange. Your openness to questioning and your willingness to follow the reasoning to its end remind me of the finest traditions of dialogue. I have learned much.

Hippocrates: And I thank you, Philosophos. Through your careful questioning, I have been compelled to look beyond consensus, to recognize blind spots, and to focus on the true barrier that must be overcome. In this way, we approach truth together, as Socrates himself might have wished.

Discussion

As alluded to in the title, there is an artificial intelligence (AI) component to the dialogue: the entire dialogue was elicited in one session with ChatGPT Plus by one of the authors (JES). The questions posed by Philosophos (avatar for JES) emerged from decades of experience in biomedical research and from sustained familiarity with the scientific literature concerning cancer biology, therapeutic development, and drug delivery. The responses by Hippocrates (ChatGPT Plus) arise from a model trained on a vast corpus of scientific and medical knowledge. The dialogue is intended to invite readers to assess the logic of the argument directly, much as classical Socratic dialogues invited readers to evaluate claims through reflection and questioning rather than through appeals to authority. We acknowledge that we could have disclosed the AI contribution at the outset, but we believe such an editorial choice might well have risked prejudicing the reader's evaluation of the arguments.

We emphasize that the primary aim of the paper is not to validate AI-assisted scientific reasoning, nor to propose a novel methodology for conducting research with large language models. Both are worthwhile objectives, but are far more elaborate endeavors. Rather, the paper uses a Socratic dialogue as a literary and analytical device to explore a substantive scientific question: whether limitations in therapeutic delivery constitute a fundamental constraint on progress in precision medicine, oncology, and ultimately the treatment of disease more broadly.

In this context, Hippocrates serves primarily as a representative of prevailing biomedical wisdom. The dialogue intentionally begins from positions that are widely accepted within contemporary medicine—precision oncology, immunotherapy, molecular targeting, artificial intelligence, and related advances—and then proceeds through questioning to examine whether these approaches share a common underlying limitation. The role of AI was therefore instrumental rather than substantive. The manuscript's claims do not depend on ChatGPT possessing unique insight; indeed, one of the points we hope readers will recognize is that there is little in Hippocrates' responses that would be regarded as controversial by knowledgeable biomedical scientists. The dialogue represents a sustained inquiry, beginning from accepted premises, ultimately converging on a deeper understanding of therapeutic limitations.

Again, Hippocrates begins from the vantage of mainstream consensus precision oncology, AI, and immunotherapy. Yet through intensive questioning, Philosophos reveals a shared vulnerability underlying these otherwise distinct approaches: without effective delivery, even the most conceptually elegant therapies frequently fail. The iterative exchange leads Hippocrates to recognize delivery not merely as a technical hurdle, but as a limiting condition that constrains the practical success of many therapeutic strategies. More broadly, however, the dialogue may be read as a case study in how scientific fields identify or sometimes overlook the true rate-limiting constraints that govern progress, particularly when those constraints are difficult to measure directly or fall outside prevailing experimental paradigms. In this respect, the exchange illustrates a more general feature of scientific development: advances often occur not only through the generation of new hypotheses, but through the critical re-examination of assumptions that shape what investigators believe to be the central problem. The diversity of agents tested over the last century, ranging from small molecules to nanoparticles and engineered cells, underscores a persistent and largely unresolved clinical reality: in many circumstances, the capacity to design or identify a therapeutic target has advanced more rapidly than the capacity to deliver treatment safely and effectively to that target *in vivo*.

Beyond its biomedical implications, the dialogue also illustrates a broader methodological point about scientific reasoning. Scientific fields often organize themselves around what can be readily measured, manipulated, or optimized. Factors that are difficult to observe directly, or that lie outside prevailing experimental paradigms, may receive comparatively less attention, even when they exert dominant influence on outcomes. Drug delivery exemplifies this phenomenon. Clinical trials (as well as preclinical studies) frequently report efficacy and toxicity in detail, yet direct measurement of drug distribution within target tissues is rarely performed or integrated into interpretation of results. When a therapy fails, it may therefore remain uncertain whether the failure reflects the inadequacy of the therapeutic mechanism itself or the inability to deliver the agent in sufficient concentration to the relevant biological compartment. In this sense, delivery represents not only a biological barrier but also an epistemic one: it limits what can be known about the true potential of many interventions.

The dialogue further highlights the role of questioning as a corrective force in scientific inquiry. Progress in science does not proceed solely through accumulation of data or refinement of existing models; it also depends on identifying hidden assumptions and reconsidering foundational premises. The Socratic method, which advances understanding through disciplined interrogation of apparently settled ideas, provides one mechanism for exposing such blind spots. Historically, shifts in scientific understanding have often occurred when attention moved from secondary phenomena to underlying constraints for example, when the control of infection, the management of pain, or the understanding of microbial causation transformed entire domains of medicine. The suggestion emerging from this dialogue is that delivery may represent a comparable rate-limiting factor in contemporary therapeutics, one whose importance becomes fully visible only when examined from first principles.

The use of Al in this dialogue raises an additional methodological question. Because Hippocrates' arguments are mediated through a large language model, readers must judge the responses critically, as they would any secondary synthesis of scientific knowledge. Al systems are capable of integrating large bodies of literature and reflecting prevailing consensus, but they may also inherit biases, emphasize dominant narratives, or overlook dissenting evidence. At the same time, this exchange suggests a constructive role for such systems. When used interactively and interrogated rigorously, Al can function as a tool for exposing implicit assumptions, mapping the structure of prevailing arguments, and revealing where reasoning converges on unexamined premises. In this sense, Al-mediated dialogue may be viewed not simply as a source of information but as an instrument for reflective inquiry, analogous in some respects to simulation, modeling, or other tools that have reshaped scientific reasoning.

Two general lessons emerge from the dialogue. First, the difficulty of achieving safe, precise, and sufficient delivery to diseased tissues appears to be a pervasive constraint across many therapeutic domains, particularly for diseases located in solid or otherwise inaccessible tissues. While delivery is not the sole determinant of therapeutic success, the dialogue suggests that it may often be a necessary condition for realizing the full potential of otherwise effective agents. Recognizing this limitation may help clarify why advances in molecular biology, genomics, and drug design have not always translated into proportional clinical benefit.

Second, the dialogue illustrates how sustained questioning whether conducted between individuals or mediated through analytical tools such as Al can reveal simplifying principles within problems that initially appear irreducibly complex. Scientific fields sometimes respond to persistent failure by adding layers of explanatory complexity or technological sophistication. Yet progress may also arise from identifying the fundamental constraint that renders many other efforts ineffective. In this respect, Hippocrates and Philosophos embody the Socratic insight that the search for understanding is a dynamic process, in which clarity often emerges not from accumulating answers, but from

refining the questions themselves. The structure of the exchange also reflects, in miniature, a pattern recognizable in the history and philosophy of science: hypotheses are proposed, interrogated, and reshaped through critical examination before giving rise to more coherent explanatory frameworks. In this sense, the Socratic dialogue can be seen as a precursor to the forms of structured inquiry later described by Thomas Kuhn, in which progress occurs not only through the accumulation of data but through the re-examination of underlying assumptions that define a field's prevailing paradigm.

Epilogue

With the exception of the concluding exchange between Philosophos and Hippocrates, the entire dialogue was elicited in one continuous session with ChatGPT Plus. The questions and prompts from Philosophos arose from one of the authors (JES), and have been phrased to conform more closely to the nature of a true Socratic dialogue – stimulating critical thinking, exploring concepts, examining underlying assumptions. The responses from Hippocrates are the contributions from ChatGPT Plus over the course of the dialogue, and remain totally unaltered from the original elicitation. This dialogue is not a unique encounter: Similar dialogues with analogous questioning have occurred in newer ChatGPT versions as well as other AI services including Claude and Gemini. New service accounts were opened independently by each author to ensure initial interactive naiveté by eliminating any track record that could bias the AI output toward sycophancy.

Section / Concept	References
Dialogue 1: Personalized medicine, AI, immunotherapy	Hanahan & Weinberg (2011); Quail & Joyce (2013); Collins & Varmus (2015); Esteva et al. (2019); Topol (2019); Jiang et al. (2017)
Dialogue 2: Foundational biology and quantum insights	Dagogo-Jack & Shaw (2018); Holohan et al. (2013); Ramirez et al. (2016)
Dialogue 3: Drug delivery bottlenecks	Nia et al. (2020); Blanco et al. (2015); Torchilin (2014); Stylianopoulos et al. (2012); Shi J et al. (2017); Tannock et al. (2002); Minchinton & Tannock (2006); Prabhakar et al. (2013); Chauhan et al. (2013); Fang et al. (2011); Cabral et al. (2011); Maeda et al. (2013); Peer et al. (2007); Allen & Cullis (2013); Cabral & Kataoka (2014); Nichols & Bae (2014); Shi Y et al. (2017); Sykes et al. (2016); Barua & Mitragotri (2014); Bertrand et al. (2014); Albanese et al. (2012); Alexis et al. (2008); Danhier (2016); Kalyane et al. (2019); McNeil (2016)
Dialogue 4: Tumor microenvironment & vascular barriers	Quail & Joyce (2013); Baluk et al. (2003); Abbott et al. (2010); Stylianopoulos et al. (2012); Maeda et al. (2013); Fang et al. (2011); Cabral et al. (2011); Chauhan et al. (2013)
Dialogue 5: Immunotherapy & precision oncology	June & Sadelain (2018); Ribas & Wolchok (2018); Collins & Varmus (2015)
Dialogue 6: Adaptive resistance & tumor heterogeneity	Dagogo-Jack & Shaw (2018); Holohan et al. (2013); Ramirez et al. (2016)
Dialogue 7: AI for drug discovery and diagnosis	Esteva et al. (2019); Topol (2019); Jiang et al. (2017)
Dialogue 8: AI bias and risks of group-think	Bender et al. (2021); Bommasani et al. (2021); Birhane & Prabhu (2021); Weidinger et al. (2022)
Dialogue 9: Systemic host interactions and microbiome effects	Alexander et al. (2017); Zitvogel et al. (2018); Jiang et al. (2020)
Dialogue 10: Delivery in non-oncology diseases	Baluk et al. (2003); Shi J et al. (2017); Sun et al. (2022)
Discussion: Delivery bottleneck & engineering advances	Nia et al. (2020); Stylianopoulos et al. (2012); Blanco et al. (2015); Torchilin (2014); Shi J et al. (2017); Cabral & Kataoka (2014); Allen & Cullis (2013); Prabhakar et al. (2013); Chauhan et al. (2013); Nichols & Bae (2014); Shi Y et al. (2017); Sykes et al. (2016); Barua & Mitragotri (2014); Bertrand et al. (2014); Albanese et al. (2012); Alexis et al. (2008); Danhier (2016); Kalyane et al. (2019); McNeil (2016)
Discussion: AI synthesis, bias, and consensus risks	Bender et al. (2021); Bommasani et al. (2021); Birhane & Prabhu (2021); Weidinger et al. (2022); Topol (2019)
Discussion: Delivery as universal solution & Socratic inquiry	Hanahan & Weinberg (2011); Quail & Joyce (2013); Alexander et al. (2017); Zitvogel et al. (2018); Sun et al. (2022); Maeda et al. (2013); Peer et al. (2007); Kuhn (1962)

The above table is meant to be a structured guide to supporting literature: it summarizes key references provided by ChatGPT, mapped to each Dialogue response and the Discussion paragraphs.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported in part by grants R01 HL175948 and P01 CA221775 from the National Institutes of Health.

References

1. Hanahan D, Weinberg RA. Hallmarks of cancer: the next generation. Cell. 2011; 144: 646-674.
2. Quail DF, Joyce JA. Microenvironmental regulation of tumor progression. Nat Med. 2013; 19: 1423-1437.
3. Collins FS, Varmus H. A new initiative on precision medicine. N Engl J Med. 2015; 372: 793-795.
4. Esteva A, Robicquet A, Ramsundar B, et al. A guide to deep learning in healthcare. Nat Med. 2019; 25: 24-29.
5. Topol EJ. High-performance medicine: the convergence of human and artificial intelligence. Nat Med. 2019; 25: 44-56.
6. Jiang F, Jiang Y, Zhi H, et al. Artificial intelligence in healthcare: past, present and future. Stroke Vasc Neurol. 2017; 2: 230-243.

7. Dagogo-Jack I, Shaw AT. Tumour heterogeneity and resistance to cancer therapies. Nat Rev Clin Oncol. 2018; 15: 81-94.
8. Holohan C, Van Schaeybroeck S, Longley DB, et al. Cancer drug resistance: an evolving paradigm. Nat Rev Cancer. 2013; 13: 714-726.
9. Ramirez M, Rajaram S, Steininger RJ, et al. Diverse drug-resistance mechanisms in cancer revealed by single-cell analysis. Nat Commun. 2016; 7: 10690.
10. Nia HT, Munn LL, Jain RK. Physical traits of cancer. Science. 2020; 370: eaaz0868.
11. Blanco E, Shen H, Ferrari M. Principles of nanoparticle design for overcoming biological barriers. Nat Biotechnol. 2015; 33: 941-951.
12. Torchilin VP. Multifunctional, stimuli-sensitive nanoparticulate systems for drug delivery. Nat Rev Drug Discov. 2014; 13: 813-827.
13. Stylianopoulos T, Martin JD, Snuderl M, et al. Causes, consequences, and remedies for growth-induced solid stress in tumors. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2012; 109: 15101-15108.
14. Shi J, Kantoff PW, Wooster R, et al. Cancer nanomedicine: progress, challenges and opportunities. Nat Rev Cancer. 2017; 17: 20-37.
15. Tannock IF, Lee CM, Tunggal JK, et al. Barriers to drug penetration in solid tumours. Nat Rev Cancer. 2002; 2: 83-92.
16. Minchinton AI, Tannock IF. Drug penetration in solid tumours. Nat Rev Cancer. 2006; 6: 583-592.
17. Prabhakar U, Maeda H, Jain RK, et al. Challenges and key considerations in the development of tumor-targeted drug delivery systems. Cancer Res. 2013; 73: 2412-2417.
18. Chauhan VP, Jain RK. Strategies for advancing cancer nanomedicine. Nat Mater. 2013; 12: 958-962.
19. Fang J, Nakamura H, Maeda H. The EPR effect: unique features of tumor blood vessels. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2011; 63: 136-151.
20. Cabral H, Matsumoto Y, Mizuno K, et al. Accumulation of sub-100 nm polymeric micelles in poorly permeable tumours depends on size. Nat Nanotechnol. 2011; 6: 815-823.
21. Maeda H, Tsukioka Y, Kuroda M. Tumor vascular permeability and the EPR effect in macromolecular therapeutics: a review. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2013; 65: 71-79.
22. Peer D, Karp JM, Hong S, et al. Nanocarriers as an emerging platform for cancer therapy. Nat Nanotechnol. 2007; 2: 751-760.
23. Allen TM, Cullis PR. Liposomal drug delivery systems: from concept to clinical applications. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2013; 65: 36-48.
24. Cabral H, Kataoka K. Progress of drug-loaded polymeric micelles into clinical studies. J Control Release. 2014; 190: 465-476.
25. Nichols JW, Bae YH. EPR: Evidence and fallacy. J Control Release. 2014; 190: 451-464.
26. Shi Y, van der Meel R, Chen X, et al. Overcoming the biological barriers in cancer nanomedicine: toward clinical translation. Sci Transl Med. 2017; 9: eaal1649.
27. Sykes EA, Dai Q, Sarsons CD, et al. Tailoring nanoparticle designs to target cancer based on tumor pathophysiology. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 2016; 113: E1142-E1151.
28. Barua S, Mitragotri S. Challenges associated with penetration of nanoparticles across cell and tissue barriers: a review of current status and future prospects. Nano Today. 2014; 9: 223-243.
29. Bertrand N, Wu J, Xu X, et al. Cancer nanotechnology: the impact of passive and active targeting in the era of modern cancer biology. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2014; 66: 2-25.
30. Albanese A, Tang PS, Chan WCW. The effect of nanoparticle size, shape, and surface chemistry on biological systems. Annu Rev Biomed Eng. 2012; 14: 1-16.
31. Alexis F, Pridgen E, Molnar LK, et al. Factors affecting the clearance and biodistribution of polymeric nanoparticles. Mol Pharm. 2008; 5: 505-515.
32. Danhier F. To exploit the tumor microenvironment: passive and active tumor targeting of nanocarriers for anti-cancer drug delivery. J Control Release. 2016; 244: 108-121.
33. Kalyane D, Raval N, Maheshwari R, et al. Recent advances in nano-architectures for cancer drug delivery. Adv Drug Deliv Rev. 2019; 138: 3-22.
34. McNeil SE. Evaluation of nanomedicines: stick to the basics. Nat Rev Mater. 2016; 1: 16073.
35. Baluk P, Morikawa S, Haskell A, et al. Abnormalities of basement membrane on blood vessels and endothelial sprouts in tumors. Am J Pathol. 2003; 163: 1801-1815.
36. Abbott NJ, Rönnbäck L, Hansson E. Structure and function of the blood–brain barrier. Neurobiol Dis. 2010; 37: 13-25.
37. June CH, Sadelain M. Chimeric antigen receptor therapy. N Engl J Med. 2018; 379: 64-73.
38. Ribas A, Wolchok JD. Cancer immunotherapy using checkpoint blockade. Science. 2018; 359: 1350-1355.
39. Bender EM, Gebru T, McMillan-Major A, et al. On the dangers of stochastic parrots: can language models be too big? Proc ACM Conf Fairness Accountability Transpar. 2021; 610-623.
40. Bommasani R, Hudson DA, Adeli E, et al. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. arXiv. 2021.
41. Birhane A, Prabhu VU. Large image datasets: a pyrrhic win for computer vision? arxiv. 2021: 152-160.
42. Weidinger L, Mellor J, Rauh M, et al. Ethical and social risks of harm from language models. arXiv. 2021.
43. Alexander JL, Wilson ID, Teare J, et al. Gut microbiota modulation of chemotherapy efficacy and toxicity. Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2017; 14: 356-365.
44. Zitvogel L, Ma Y, Raoult D, et al. The microbiome in cancer immunotherapy: diagnostic biomarker, mediator, or confounder? Science. 2018; 359: 1366-1370.

45. Jiang X, Wang J, Deng X, et al. The role of microenvironment in tumor angiogenesis. J Exp Clin Cancer Res. 2020; 39: 204.
46. Chauhan VP, Stylianopoulos T, Boucher Y, et al. Angiotensin inhibition enhances drug delivery and potentiates chemotherapy. Nat Commun. 2013; 4: 2516.
47. Sun Q, Barz M, De Geest BG, et al. Nanomedicine and precision oncology. Adv Mater. 2022; 34: 2107788.
48. Kuhn TS. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1962.