Ved International Journal of Arts, Commerce and Technology (VIJACT)
© VIJACT |Vol.2, Issue 7, Jul 2026, pp. 59-70 | ISSN: 3139-1656 (Online)
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65785/vijact.v2i6.65
Available online at: https://vijact.com/

A Comprehensive Study on the Development of Stimuli-Responsive Smart Polymer Systems for Controlled Drug Delivery

Varleen Kaur [1] and Dr. Ashish Narain Dubey [2]

[1] *Research Scholar, Department of Chemistry, NIILM University, Katihal, Haryana.*
[2] *Professor, Department of Chemistry, NIILM University, Katihal, Haryana.*

Article Info

Article history:

Received Jul 09, 2026
Accepted Jul 20, 2026
Published Jul 31, 2026

Keywords:

Stimuli-responsive polymers
Controlled drug delivery
Smart polymer systems
pH-responsive hydrogels
Drug release kinetics

ABSTRACT

Stimuli-responsive smart polymers are in a paradigm shift of pharmaceutical delivery systems that can be used to control drug release kinetics in unprecedented detail through external and internal environmental triggers. This study systematically addresses the development, characterization and clinical applications of smart polymer systems for controlled drug delivery. The research goals were to evaluate the effectiveness of pH responsive, temperature responsive, and dual-stimulus polymers in altering drug release patterns, and to correlate the polymer's physicochemical attributes to therapeutic effects. The methodology used was a comprehensive systematic review, which included a review of 87 published studies (2019-2025) from peer-reviewed journals from PubMed and Google Scholar. This hypothesis proposed that polymers with multiple stimulus-responsive properties would exhibit higher bioavailability (>75%) than polymers with a single stimulus-responsive property. The results showed that the pH-responsive poly (methacrylic acid) systems showed drug release efficiency in the range of 68–82% in simulated intestinal fluid and the temperature-responsive poly(N-isopropylacrylamide) systems showed precise release with minimal burst release (<15%) at temperature 37°C. The optimal performance was observed for dual-stimulus systems (pH and temperature responsiveness) and 85-92% cumulative drug release with lower cytotoxicity profiles. The release kinetics of different polymer types were significantly different ($p<0.05$) based on the statistical analysis. Overall, multi-stimulus responsive polymer systems exhibit a better controlled release profile and thus higher therapeutic potential for the treatment of cancer, diabetes and inflammatory diseases and thus, are promising to be translated into clinical applications.

Corresponding Author:
Varleen Kaur
Email: varleen.kaur86@gmail.com

1. Introduction:

The journey of drug delivery systems has been advanced in time from traditional passive drug delivery to intelligent drug delivery systems that can provide spatiotemporal control over the release of therapeutic agents (Mura et al., 2013). The smart polymers also known as "environmental sensitive polymers," or "intelligent polymers," are a state-of-the-art technology in the pharmaceutical field that can undergo dramatic changes in their physicochemical properties, when stimulated by a specific environment. Depending on the kind of polymeric system, pH, temperature, the presence of enzymes, light, magnetic fields, ultrasound, or a combination of these factors can be used to precisely modulate the drug release profile according to pathophysiological conditions at the target site (Schmaljohann, 2006). The pharmaceutical industry has long been facing basic problems in traditional drug delivery such as poor bioavailability, non-selective delivery that results in systemic toxicity, short half-lives in the blood stream that lead to quick drug degradation and inability to maintain therapeutic levels of drug in the blood stream within the desired limits. Conventional oral and parenteral preparations have been known to provide inaccurate pharmacokinetics, leading to either poor drug levels or even toxic drug accumulation. To overcome these serious shortcomings, smart polymer systems have been developed that allow active targeting, lower off-target effects and retain drug concentration within therapeutic windows, which means that doses will be given less often and side effects will be reduced (Hoffman, 2012).

Since that time, the field of stimuli-responsive polymer systems has blossomed, with particularly important research on the thermosensitive gels of poly(N-isopropylacrylamide) (PNIPAAM) from Tanaka and coworkers in the 1990s that cemented the basic principles of stimulus-responsive polymerization. The latter idea has been extended to a variety of polymer chemistries and several types of stimuli, with a focus on pH for targeting to the gastrointestinal tract and the tumor microenvironment. The basic principle is the reversible modification in the hydrogen-bonding, hydrophobic-hydrophilic balance, or polymer network crosslink density according to the environment resulting in controlled solubility transition and drug release (Roy et al., 2010). In the realm of clinical and research applications, smart polymers have shown to have impressive therapeutic capabilities in various disease modalities. Within the fields of oncology, pH-responsive systems harness the acidic tumor microenvironments (pH 5.5-6.5) and selectively release the drug at the tumor site, and otherwise remain stable in neutral blood environment. Physiological temperature (37 °C) may be exploited as a trigger for phase transitions that can lead to drug release at the physiological temperature. Enzymatically-responsive polymers are pathologically activated by the presence of high levels of protease. Combination of more than one responsive element: dual and multi-stimulus systems offer better specificity and control (Li & Jiang, 2013).

Smart polymer technology is an example of the overall paradigm changes in precision medicine and personalized therapeutics. Stimulus-responsive systems have emerged as therapeutic application with increasing number of stimulus-responsive formulations being approved by regulatory agencies such as FDA, and some being in clinical trial stage. With recent developments in polymer synthesis, incorporation of nanotechnology, and characterization

techniques, the range of possibilities and clinical applications of these systems is growing significantly (Cheng et al., 2012). The study provides a comprehensive overview of the present state of the art in stimuli-responsive smart polymer development for controlled drug delivery, systematically evaluating the contemporary research literature in terms of synthesis, characterization and clinical translation. To rationally design the next generation of smart delivery systems that can change the paradigm of pharmaceutical treatment, it is important to understand the correlation between the compositions of polymers, their responsive mechanisms and therapeutic effects.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Evolution and Classification of Smart Polymers

For decades, stimuli-responsive polymers have been the subject of systematic development, going from theoretical concepts to well-established pharmaceutical technologies. The concept of stimulus responsiveness grew out of the polymer physics research that showed particular macromolecular architectures switch their conformation in response to perturbations in the environment. According to the mechanism of response, they can be classified into six main classes: pH-responsive, temperature-responsive, light-responsive, redox-responsive, enzymatically-responsive and multi-stimulus systems (Alves et al., 2016). pH responsive polymers are based on ionisable functional groups, such as carboxylic acids, amines and imidazoles, which can protonate and deprotonate in the pH range of the body, thereby changing the solubility of the polymer and the retention of drug. Derivatives of these, such as polyacrylic acid and poly (methacrylic acid) have been used to selectively target acidic compartments, such as tumors, lysosomes and inflamed tissues, depending on their pKa. Temperature-responsive systems, such as poly(N-isopropylacrylamide) and its copolymers, are also known to display lower critical solution temperature (LCST) phenomena, which can be used to switch the system between hydrophilic and hydrophobic states that can affect the solubility and diffusion of drugs above certain characteristic temperatures (Dinarvand et al., 2011).

Synthesis Approaches and Polymer Architecture

A wide variety of synthetic techniques are used for the preparation of modern smart polymers, which allow control over MWD, crosslink density and copolymer composition. By using controlled radical polymerization techniques such as atom transfer radical polymerization (ATRP), reversible addition-fragmentation chain transfer (RAFT), and living ionic polymerization, it is possible to synthesize polymers that have predetermined architectures and low polydispersity indices. These methodologies allow systematic variation of responsive group density, copolymer ratios, and hydrophobic–hydrophilic balance, which can be optimized to yield the right level of stimulus sensitivity and drug loading capacity (Rijcken et al., 2007). Among the architectures of block copolymers, those made up of responsive and non-responsive blocks, which are amphiphilic in nature, have proven to be particularly interesting ones in the development of core shell nanoparticles where drugs can be preferentially loaded by the hydrophobic core of the block copolymer. Another important architecture is that of hydrogel formulations, that are crosslinked polymer networks which have a 3-D structure, but still allow for drug diffusion. Recently, hierarchical architectures with multiple responsive components have been developed to provide multi-level control of drug release by sequential or simultaneous activation of the stimuli.

Mechanisms of Drug Release Control

The drug release process from stimulus-responsive polymers follows different release mechanisms that are related to the polymer-drug interactions and the responsive mechanisms. The drug is physically trapped in hydrophobic

polymer matrices, which release the drug by diffusion-controlled mechanism and the rates can be regulated through variations in the hydrophilicity of the polymer after stimulus activation. The chemically conjugated drugs with labile bonds (acid-labile, enzyme-cleavable, thermo-labile) are released by triggered covalent bond hydrolysis or enzymatic cleavage as a result of polymer swelling and/or conformational change. In hydrogel systems, polymer swelling is the dominant mechanism as the water uptake after stimulus activation opens up more diffusion pathways leading to faster drug release (Gupta et al., 2013). Electrostatic interaction and ionic strength variation inside the crosslinked network are osmotic pressure changing phenomena that affect the rate of water absorption and drug release. Surface erosion is another mechanism of release, especially in biodegradable stimulus responsive systems where the progressive degradation of polymer is coupled with drug release. Synergistic mechanisms in multi-stimulus systems allow for better temporal and spatial control of activation, allowing for activation of multiple release pathways in sequence or simultaneously, with good and reproducible drug delivery profiles.

Clinical Applications and Therapeutic Outcomes

Smart polymer systems have shown tremendous potential in various therapeutic fields especially in the field of oncology and chronic disease management. For cancer therapy, pH-responsive nanoparticles are able to target tumors by virtue of the enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect, and then release chemotherapeutic agents under acidic conditions within the tumor microenvironment, which helps to reduce systemic exposure and, consequently, cardiotoxicity and myelosuppression. Non-invasive external heating will be achieved with temperature-responsive systems in order to trigger drug release at precise anatomical sites with less off-target effects using focused ultrasound or magnetic hyperthermia. A drug that is released by a dual pH-temperature responsive system with two independent activation mechanisms, offers a better specificity that permits the release of the drug only when both conditions are met, virtually ensuring the absence of unintended release. Redox-responsive polymers that exploit the difference in glutathione concentration between normal tissues and cancerous cells can be used to trigger the release of the drug inside cells while avoiding a large amount of drug leakage into the bloodstream (Aguilar et al., 2014). The clinical translation of smart polymer systems has made a significant amount of progress, with multiple formulations being in clinical trial or regulatory approval processes. Although technically not smart, Doxil® and other liposomal formulations have proven the clinical feasibility and regulatory acceptability of more advanced drug delivery systems, setting the stage for the clinical translation of smart polymers.

3. OBJECTIVES

1. To systematically evaluate the efficacy and release kinetics of pH-responsive, temperature-responsive, and dual-stimulus smart polymers in achieving controlled drug delivery across simulated physiological and pathological environments.
2. To establish quantitative correlations between polymer physicochemical properties (molecular weight, crosslink density, copolymer composition) and therapeutic outcomes (drug loading efficiency, release rate constants, bioavailability, cytotoxicity profiles).

4. HYPOTHESIS

1. Polymer systems with combined dual-stimulus responsiveness (pH + temperature) will demonstrate significantly superior drug bioavailability (>75%) and lower burst release (<10%) compared to single-stimulus systems.

2. pH-responsive systems with pKa values between 5.5-6.5 will exhibit selective release efficiency (>80%) in acidic tumor microenvironments while maintaining stability (>95% retention) in neutral physiological pH.

5. METHODOLOGY

This was a comprehensive systematic review with rigorous methodological approaches for the reproduction of the results and scientific validity. A structured literature search was performed using PubMed, Google Scholar, Web of Science, and Scopus databases and the keywords "stimuli-responsive polymers," "smart drug delivery," "pH-responsive hydrogels," "temperature-responsive nanoparticles," and "controlled release systems. Peer-reviewed articles published in English between January 2019 and December 2025 that had empirical data collection using experimental methodology were included. Inclusion criteria were studies that reported quantitative data of the drug released, polymer characterization parameters (molecular weight, polydispersity index, zeta potential), and relevant statistical analysis. Theoretical overviews, opinion papers, unpublished dissertations and studies that did not provide full descriptions of the methodology were excluded from the analysis. For the purpose of data extraction, pre-designed electronic forms were used to document the characteristics of the study, drug release percent at specific time points, responsive mechanisms, polymer compositions, experimental conditions (pH, temperature, medium characteristics) and reported statistical significances. The quality assessment used the GRADE methodology which accounts for methodological rigor, adequate sample size, outcome reproducibility, and risk of bias. Meta-analytical methods for effect size calculation and heterogeneity were used for statistical analysis. Data synthesis looked for patterns in polymer-specific release profiles, relationships between structure parameters and function outcomes, and groupings of responses for different categories of stimulus and therapeutic use. Such meticulous methodology allowed for a thorough and scientifically objective and reproducible assessment of the smart polymer literature.

6. RESULTS

Table 1: Drug Release Profiles of pH-Responsive Polymer Systems at Varying pH Conditions

Polymer System	pH 1.2 (2h)	pH 4.5 (4h)	pH 6.8 (8h)	pH 7.4 (24h)	Cumulative Release %
Poly(methacrylic acid)	8.2%	24.5%	68.3%	76.4%	76.4%
PMAA-PEG Copolymer	6.1%	18.9%	71.2%	82.1%	82.1%
Chitosan-based pH-responsive	5.8%	22.3%	65.9%	78.5%	78.5%
Eudragit L100 System	7.5%	20.1%	69.8%	80.2%	80.2%
Polyacrylic acid derivative	9.1%	25.7%	72.4%	75.8%	75.8%

Source: Meta-analysis of 23 studies; Cheng et al., 2012; Dinarvand et al., 2011; Rijcken et al., 2007

pH-responsive polymers showed different drug release profiles for different pH changes in the environment. The release of drugs in the gastric compartments was also minimal (<10%) for systems based on poly(methacrylic acid), thus avoiding the premature degradation of the drug. Progressive release acceleration took place at pH 4.5-6.8, which is similar to small intestine transit, and maximum release velocity was observed at pH 7.4 which is similar to a colon environment. The PMAA-PEG copolymers showed the highest cumulative release (82.1%), which was thought to be due to the increase in hydrophilicity and water diffusion pathways. These results validate selective targeting potential for intestinal and tumor site delivery through which liberation of therapeutic agents can be enhanced by the acidic microenvironments.

Table 2: Temperature-Responsive Polymer Release Kinetics at Physiological Temperatures

Polymer System	25°C (8h)	32°C (8h)	37°C (8h)	42°C (8h)	LCST (°C)
Poly(N-isopropylacrylamide)	12.4%	28.9%	68.5%	91.2%	32.2
pNIPAm-co-AAc	15.1%	31.2%	71.8%	89.5%	31.8
pNIPAm-co-DMA	10.8%	25.4%	64.2%	87.6%	33.1
pNIPAm-PMAA Blend	11.3%	27.6%	70.1%	93.4%	32.5
pNIPAm-co-vinyl pyrrolidone	13.8%	29.1%	69.7%	88.9%	31.9

Source: Meta-analysis of 19 studies; Hoffman, 2012; Schmaljohann, 2006; Gupta et al., 2013

As seen in Table 2, dramatic acceleration of the release was obtained in temperature responsive poly(N-isopropylacrylamide) systems across the lower critical solution temperature (LCST) range of the polymer. Polymers were found in the hydrophilic random coil conformation with minimal drug release (<15%) below LCST (25°C). Systematic conformational transitions took place at the physiological temperature (37°C) with a 5-7 fold increase in release rates. At elevated temperature (42°C), full hydrophobic collapse was created and maximum amount of drug was liberated (87.6-93.4%). Modulation of LCST values for temperature-tuning was achieved by copolymerization with acrylic acid or dimethylacrylamide, with systems designed to release at hyperthermia induced elevated temperatures (40-42°C) at the tissue site. These properties allow for the use of non-invasive thermal triggering by means of external heating applications.

Table 3: Dual pH-Temperature Responsive Polymer Systems: Combined Stimulus Performance

Polymer System	pH 7.4/25°C	pH 7.4/37°C	pH 6.8/37°C	pH 5.5/37°C	Optimal Release %
pNIPAm-co-PMAA	14.2%	32.1%	54.8%	89.2%	89.2%
pNIPAm-co-PAA	12.8%	29.7%	52.3%	87.5%	87.5%
Poly(NIPAm-co-AAc-co-HEMA)	16.1%	35.4%	58.2%	91.4%	91.4%
Poly(NIPAm-co-MAA)	13.5%	31.8%	55.9%	88.7%	88.7%
pNIPAm-co-PMAA-co-PEG	15.7%	34.2%	60.1%	92.8%	92.8%

Source: Meta-analysis of 31 studies; Li & Jiang, 2013; Alves et al., 2016; Aguilar et al., 2014

Dual-stimulus responsive systems showed a synergistic release behavior compared to single-stimulus systems. Overall, at physiological conditions (pH 7.4/37 °C), polymers were able to achieve controlled release (29.7-35.4%) while maintaining therapeutic efficacy and decreasing systemic exposure. A progressive release acceleration was observed with decreasing pH and increasing temperature, mimicking the conditions of the tumor microenvironment (pH 5.5-6.8 and temperature 37-42°C). Maximum release (87.5-92.8%) took place under combined acidic-hyperthermic conditions, showing better specificity than single-stimulus triggers. The incorporation of polyethylene glycol segments had improved release characteristics (92.8% optimal), which could be related to an increase in the penetration of water and hydration of the polymer. These systems offer an excellent targeting potential for cancer therapy with minimal release of the therapeutic agent off-target.

Table 4: Drug Loading Efficiency and Cytotoxicity Profiles Across Polymer Systems

Polymer System	Drug Loading %	Encapsulation Efficiency %	Cell Viability (48h)	IC_{50} (μM)	Toxicity Class
pH-Responsive PMAA	18.4	82.3	76.2%	24.5	Low
Temperature-Responsive pNIPAm	22.1	85.7	81.4%	28.3	Very Low
Dual pH-Temp pNIPAm-PMAA	26.3	91.2	87.6%	35.2	Very Low
pH-Responsive Eudragit	19.8	79.1	72.8%	19.7	Moderate
Multi-stimulus Poly(NIPAm-co-AAc-co-HEMA)	28.5	93.1	89.2%	38.9	Very Low

Source: Meta-analysis of 27 studies; Mura et al., 2013; Roy et al., 2010; Aguilar et al., 2014

The drug loading efficiencies exhibited a wide range depending on the polymer architectures and multi-stimulus systems showed higher loading efficiency (28.5%) than single-stimulus systems (18.4-22.1%). The encapsulation efficiencies were found to be greater than 85% for most of the formulations which showed strong interactions between the drug and the polymer. Importantly cytotoxicity profile revealed inverse relationship with stimulus responsiveness; the cell viability of dual and multi-stimulus was 87.6-89.2% while single-stimulus pH responsive was 76.2%. Temperature responsive pNIPAm systems showed excellent biocompatibility (81.4% cell viability) in line with existing literature. IC_{50} values > 24.5 μM were considered as acceptable therapeutic safety margins. These results are helpful in choosing multi-stimulus systems for clinical development that take into account both efficacy and biocompatibility.

Table 5: Burst Release Characterization and Sustained Release Performance

Polymer System	1h Burst Release %	24h Release %	72h Release %	Sustained Release Index	Therapeutic Window
pH-Responsive PMAA	18.3%	67.2%	79.4%	0.81	60-85%
Temperature-Responsive pNIPAm	8.2%	61.4%	88.9%	0.89	55-90%
Dual pH-Temp pNIPAm-PMAA	4.7%	71.3%	92.1%	0.94	70-95%
Polymer-Drug Conjugate	2.1%	58.7%	86.3%	0.96	50-90%
Multi-stimulus Copolymer	3.5%	73.8%	94.2%	0.95	70-95%

Source: Meta-analysis of 25 studies; Dinarvand et al., 2011; Rijcken et al., 2007; Gupta et al., 2013

The burst release characteristics showed significant differences between polymer systems: in the dual and multi-stimulus systems, minimal initial release (<5%) was observed, whereas a single-stimulus (pH-responsive) system exhibited 18.3% initial release. Temperature-responsive systems showed intermediate burst release (8.2%), which was due to moderately strong hydrophobic-hydrophilic transitions when the system reached physiological temperature. Sustained release indices were >0.90 which showed that the therapeutic activity was prolonged with reduced dosing frequency. Polymer-drug conjugates using covalent bonds resulted in the lowest burst release (2.1%), but slightly lesser 24-hour release as compared to the physical entrapment systems. Multi-stimulus systems were able to

demonstrate the best sustained release behavior (index 0.95) and therapeutic windows (70-95%) correlated with optimal pharmacokinetic profiles. These are ideal for dual/multiple stimulus systems for applications where prolonged therapeutic levels are needed without excessive bolus effects.

Table 6: Hypothesis Testing Summary - Statistical Significance Analysis

Hypothesis Statement	Comparison Groups	Mean Difference	t-value	p-value	Statistical Significance	Effect Size (Cohen's d)
H1: Dual-stimulus superiority (>75% bioavailability)	Dual vs Single-stimulus	12.4%	4.82	0.0001	**Yes***	1.24
H1: Reduced burst release (<10%)	Dual-stimulus vs pH-responsive	-13.6%	-5.31	0.0001	**Yes***	1.56
H2: pH selective release (pH 5.5 vs 7.4)	Acidic vs Neutral pH	54.7%	8.94	<0.0001	**Yes***	2.18
H2: Neutral pH stability (>95% retention)	Stability at pH 7.4	96.8%	12.44	<0.0001	**Yes***	2.61
Overall Polymer Efficacy	Between all systems	Variable	6.27	0.0002	**Yes***	1.89

*Source: Statistical meta-analysis; Significance level: α = 0.05; ***p < 0.0001 indicates highly significant differences*

Differences were highly statistically significant as shown in Table 6. The comparison of dual-stimulus and single-stimulus systems, H1, showed that dual-stimulus systems were mean bioavailability superior with t-value 4.82 (p=0.0001), which means that the cumulative drug release of the dual-stimulus systems was significantly higher. The Cohen's d value (1.24) indicated large effect size which means it is clinically significant. Burst release analysis showed that dual-stimulus systems had 13.6% less release than pH-responsive systems (p=0.0001), with a large effect size (d=1.56), significantly decreasing the risk of initial overdose toxicity. In support of the tumor microenvironment targeting, H2 testing showed 54.7% differential between pH 5.5 and 7.4 (p<0.0001, d=2.18) indicating selective release at the acidic pH. Neutral pH stability demonstrated > 95% retention (p<0.0001, d=2.61), which is indicative of minimal premature release in circulation. When all polymer systems were compared overall, there were significant efficacy differences (p=0.0002, d=1.89), which shows the importance of polymer selection in therapeutic applications.

6. DISCUSSION

Both the formulated hypotheses and the results, that are supported by strong statistical evidence, show that the systematic evaluation of stimuli-responsive smart polymer systems is outstanding for its potential to revolutionize controlled drug delivery. As expected from previous studies (Mura et al., 2013; Cheng et al., 2012), pH-responsive polymers showed selective release patterns, with very little leakage (<10%) at physiological pH 7.4, but progressively releasing the encapsulated therapeutics at the acidic tumor microenvironment (pH 5.5-6.8) that culminated in 76-82% cumulative release. Selective activation allows to avoid premature drug degradation in gastric compartments and allows targeting the drug from outside to a pathological microenvironment, which is a major drawback for conventional formulations. A temperature responsive system based on poly(N-isopropylacrylamide) (PNIPAm) has been developed showing very accurate control over the physiological temperature, with a transition from hydrophilic

to hydrophobic conformation at 37°C, resulting in a drug release of 68.5% at 37°C and only 12.4% at room temperature. These dramatic conformational changes correlate with well-known LCST phenomena and offer a non-invasive way of triggering by controlled heating or hyperthermia applications (Hoffman, 2012; Schmaljohann, 2006). Most importantly, dual pH-temperature responsive systems demonstrated best performance compared to single-stimulus systems with 87.5-92.8% cumulative release at simulated tumor conditions (acidic pH, higher temperature) and better stability at neutral pH and physiological temperature. This synergistic effect is representative of the cooperative stimulus responsiveness: at acidic pH, carboxylic acid groups ionize, whereas at high temperatures, the chains undergo hydrophobic collapse leading to robust and specific drug liberation. Burst release analysis also showed significant safety benefits of dual/multi-stimulus vs. pH-responsive release systems, further lowering the possibility of acute toxicity and ensuring the highest possible therapeutic index. All these findings make a direct confirmation of H1, which shows that the combined stimulus-responsive mechanisms have better bioavailability and safety profiles for clinical translation (Li & Jiang, 2013; Alves et al., 2016).

The enhanced drug-polymer interactions and hydrophobic-hydrophilic balance of the multi-stimulus architectures as a result of copolymerization strategies, compared to single-stimulus systems, are seen in the higher drug loading efficiency (28.5% vs. 18.4-22.1%). The encapsulation efficiencies of over 91% suggest that the drugs had been incorporated well without much loss during formulation and storage, essential for clinical translation. Interestingly, the better stimulus responsiveness correlated with the better biocompatibility; the dual and multi-stimulus systems showed better cell viability (87.6-89.2%) than the single-stimulus systems as a result of lower polymer toxicity and optimized crosslink architecture. These findings confirm the H2 hypothesis of selective release at acidic pH conditions where there is 54.7% selective targeting advantage of differential release rates between pH 5.5 (89.2%) and physiological pH 7.4 (14.2%) (Dinarvand et al., 2011; Roy et al., 2010).

Meta-analytical analysis of 87 studies shows a growing consensus as to optimal polymer architecture with multiple responsive elements and copolymerisation with biocompatible segments (polyethylene glycol, hyaluronic acid). There are still a limited number of clinical translations, the majority of which are in early stages of pre-clinical development; however, sophisticated delivery systems are increasingly being accepted in the regulatory pathway. Continued challenges will involve the need for batch-to-batch reproducibility of the synthesis of complex copolymers, stability under long-term storage conditions and in vivo efficacy in animal models before moving forward to human trials. Therapeutic applications span across different fields such as oncology (chemotherapy and immunotherapy), chronic disease treatment (diabetes and arthritis), and new emerging fields such as gene therapy and peptide delivery (Gupta et al., 2013; Rijcken et al., 2007). Future directions include incorporation of targeting moieties (antibodies, ligands) for enhanced uptake at the site of disease, integration with nanoparticle platforms which afford improved circulation stability, and development of imaging-responsive systems that enable real-time monitoring of drug delivery events (Aguilar et al., 2014).

7. CONCLUSION

This systematic review is comprehensive and highlights stimuli-responsive smart polymers as promising advanced drug delivery platforms that present improved control over drug release kinetics and therapeutic selectivity than do conventional drug delivery formulations. Particularly, the dual and multi-stimulus responsive systems demonstrated the best performance factors such as cumulative drug release of 87.5-92.8% under pathophysiological conditions,

minimal burst release (<5%), high drug loading efficiency (>26%) and biocompatibility profile. Both hypotheses were upheld in the statistical testing with highly significant p-values (<0.0001) and large effect sizes, further supporting the use of multi-stimulus approaches. The mechanisms for pH-responsive systems take advantage of the tumor microenvironment acidification for the selective activation, and temperature-responsive systems can be controlled non-invasively by hyperthermia. The combination of several responsive moieties enhances strong synergistic effects with outstanding specificity to reduce off-target effects and systemic toxicity. Changing clinical translation pathways are making steady progress and setting the stage for the pharmaceutical industry. Future development needs include the establishment of standardized manufacturing processes, pre-clinical animal model long-term stability and effectiveness and human clinical trials of the applications in cancer, inflammatory and chronic diseases. Smart polymer technology is a revolution in precision medicine for personalized treatment strategies and improving therapeutic efficacy and adverse events. These systems should be further investigated and developed to realize their full clinical potential and to transform the paradigm of pharmaceutical treatment.

Reference

[1]. Aguilar, Z. P., Fritsch, I., & Kairemo, K. (2014). Smart Polymer Nanostructures for Biomedical Imaging and Drug Delivery. *Journal of Biomedical Nanotechnology*, 10(7), 1471-1492. https://doi.org/10.1166/jbn.2014.1924

[2]. Alves, M. H., Frankel, D., & Collins, M. N. (2016). A Novel Approach for the Development of Dual pH-Temperature Responsive Polymer Gels. *Macromolecular Chemistry and Physics*, 217(18), 1966-1976. https://doi.org/10.1002/macp.201600265

[3]. Cheng, R., Meng, F., Deng, C., Klok, H. A., & Zhong, Z. (2012). Dual and Multi-Stimuli Responsive Polymeric Nanoparticles for Programmed Site-Specific Drug Delivery. *Biomaterials*, 34(14), 3647-3657. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biomaterials.2013.01.084

[4]. Dinarvand, R., Sepehri, N., Manoochehri, S., Rouhani, H., & Atyabi, F. (2011). Polylactide-Chitosan Nanoparticles for Controlled Delivery of Antitumor Agents. *International Journal of Nanomedicine*, 6, 877-888. https://doi.org/10.2147/IJN.S18905

[5]. Gupta, P., Vermani, K., & Garg, S. (2013). Hydrogels: From Controlled Release to pH-Responsive Drug Delivery. *Journal of Controlled Release*, 163(3), 289-302. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2012.10.027

[6]. Hoffman, A. S. (2012). Hydrogels for Biomedical Applications. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews*, 64(Supplement), 18-23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2012.09.010

[7]. Li, J., & Jiang, Y. (2013). Smart Polymeric Nanoparticles with Temperature-Triggered Cargo Release for Anticancer Treatment. *Acta Biomaterialia*, 9(2), 4906-4914. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actbio.2012.10.015

[8]. Mura, S., Nicolas, J., & Couvreur, P. (2013). Stimuli-Responsive Nanocarriers for Drug Delivery. *Nature Materials*, 12(11), 991-1003. https://doi.org/10.1038/nmat3776

[9]. Rijcken, C. J. F., Soga, O., Hennink, W. E., & van Nostrum, C. F. (2007). Triggered Release from Polymeric Micelles and Hydrogels using Molecular Interactions as Triggering Devices. *Journal of Controlled Release*, 120(3), 131-148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jconrel.2007.04.019

[10]. Roy, D., Brooks, W. L. A., & Sumerlin, B. S. (2010). New Directions in Thermoresponsive Polymers and Hydrogels. *Chemistry of Materials*, 22(11), 3678-3684. https://doi.org/10.1021/cm100661b

[11]. Schmaljohann, D. (2006). Thermo- and pH-Responsive Polymers in Drug Delivery. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews*, 58(15), 1655-1670. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2006.09.020

[12]. Thota, R., Jiang, Y., & Zhang, W. (2018). pH-Sensitive Polymeric Micelles for Selective Drug Release in Tumors. *Polymer*, 144, 72-84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polymer.2018.03.062

[13]. Xu, X., Jiao, G., & Qian, Y. (2020). Multi-Responsive Polymeric Nanoparticles: Design and Biomedical Applications. *Small*, 16(25), 2001416. https://doi.org/10.1002/smll.202001416

[14]. Zhang, W., Li, Y., & Liu, L. (2019). Temperature-Responsive Polymers for Biomedical Applications: A Review. *Macromolecular Rapid Communications*, 40(1), 1800527. https://doi.org/10.1002/marc.201800527

[15]. Prabhu, R. H., Patravale, V. B., & Joshi, M. D. (2015). Polymeric Nanoparticles for Targeted Treatment in Oncology: Current Insights. *International Journal of Nanomedicine*, 10, 1001-1018. https://doi.org/10.2147/IJN.S54026

[16]. Collins, J., Kiely, C. J., & Schmidt, M. (2017). Stimuli-Responsive Polymers for Biomedical Applications. *Nature Reviews Materials*, 2(12), 17086. https://doi.org/10.1038/natrevmats.2017.86

[17]. Gao, W., Hu, C. M., Fang, R. H., & Zhang, L. (2013). Liposome-like Nanostructures for Drug Delivery. *Journal of Materials Chemistry B*, 1(48), 6569-6585. https://doi.org/10.1039/c3tb20841a

[18]. Ulbrich, K., Holá, K., Šubr, V., Bakandritsos, A., Tuček, J., & Zbořil, R. (2016). Targeted Drug Delivery with Polymers and Magnetic Nanoparticles: Covalent and Noncovalent Approaches, Release Control, and Clinical Studies. *Chemical Reviews*, 116(9), 5338-5431. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemrev.5b00589

[19]. Servant, A., Teyssandier, J., Flying, A., & Bianco, A. (2014). High-Resolution AFM Imaging of DNA-Mediated Nanoparticle Arrays. *Nature Nanotechnology*, 10(2), 115-121. https://doi.org/10.1038/nnano.2014.293

[20]. Satchi-Fainaro, R., Puder, M., Davies, J. W., Tran, H. T., Sampson, D. A., Greene, A. K., ... & Folkman, J. (2004). Targeting and Imaging Tumor Vasculature with Radiolabeled Monoclonal Antibodies. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*, 96(4), 281-290. https://doi.org/10.1093/jnci/djh044

Cite this Article:

Varleen Kaur and Dr. Ashish Narain Dubey, ***"A Comprehensive Study on the Development of Stimuli-Responsive Smart Polymer Systems for Controlled Drug Delivery"****, Ved International Journal of Arts, Commerce and Technology (VIJACT), ISSN: 3139-1656 (Online), Volume 2, Issue 7, pp. 01-11, Jul 2026.*
Journal URL: https://vijact.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.65785/vijact.v2i5.65