



Review Article

Innovative Strategies in Modern Drug Discovery and Development

Sanmay Yadav*, Abhishek Doshi, Sarthak Kole, Mayuri Kore, Sneha Dhekane

Shree Warana Vibhag Shikshan Mandals Tatyasaheb Kore College of Pharmacy Warananagar Panhala, Kolhapur, Maharashtra, India 416113

Pharmaceutical discovery and development continue to be some of the most intricate, financially demanding, and protracted pursuits in the biomedical field, with typical development periods surpassing ten years and failure rates resulting in just a minor percentage of candidates attaining approval. In the last twenty years, a synthesis of computational, biological, and engineering advancements has started to transform this domain. Artificial intelligence and machine learning currently infiltrate almost every phase of the pipeline, from target identification to clinical trial formulation, as deep learning frameworks and generative models facilitate novel molecular design at unparalleled velocity. Structure-oriented and ligand-oriented computer-assisted drug development, molecular docking, molecular dynamics simulations, quantitative structure–activity relationship modelling, pharmacophore analysis, as well as virtual and high-throughput screening are evolving in tandem with fragment-based methodologies and DNA-encoded libraries. Simultaneously, multi-omics profiling, systems biology, and network pharmacology are facilitating a comprehensive comprehension of disease biology, whereas CRISPR-mediated gene editing, gene therapy, RNA therapeutics, and cell-based approaches like CAR-T therapy have broadened the therapeutic landscape beyond small molecules. Progress in organoids, organ-on-chip technologies, 3D bioprinting, and nanomedicine—encompassing lipid and polymeric nanoparticles as well as exosome-mediated transport—is enhancing preclinical predictability and delivery accuracy. Precision medicine, pharmacogenomics, digital twins, and wearable technologies are advancing drug development towards personalised, real-time, data-centric frameworks, whereas drug repurposing, real-world evidence, adaptive clinical trial methodologies, and progressive regulatory science are facilitating clinical translation. The ideas of green chemistry are progressively integrated into process design to enhance the sustainability of pharmaceutical production. This evaluation offers an extensive and critical analysis of these novel tactics, examining their scientific foundations, present utilisations, comparative benefits and drawbacks, as well as the ongoing technological, regulatory, and ethical issues that need resolution. We summarise by identifying research deficiencies and prospective avenues that are poised to shape the forthcoming era of pharmaceutical innovation.

Keywords: Innovative Strategies, Modern Drug Discovery .

INTRODUCTION

The conventional paradigm of drug discovery and development, where a candidate compound advances sequentially through target identification, hit-to-lead optimisation, preclinical safety assessments, and staged clinical trials, has historically been marked by substantial expenses, extended durations, and elevated failure rates [1,2]. Current evaluations suggest that the capitalised expense of introducing a single novel molecular entity to the market exceeds

one billion US dollars, with attrition throughout clinical phases being the primary factor contributing to this expense [1]. These enduring inefficiencies have prompted a surge of methodological advancements across computer science, molecular biology, bioengineering, and data science. Artificial intelligence and machine learning have transitioned from auxiliary instruments to fundamental components inside pharmaceutical research and

development, guiding target identification, chemical formulation, toxicity assessment, and trial structuring [3,4,7]. Concurrently, the landscape of therapeutic modalities has expanded significantly: gene editing, RNA-targeted medications, and tailored cellular therapies now coexist with small molecules and biologics as legitimate clinical offerings [15,16,20,24]. Physiologically pertinent *in vitro* systems—organoids, organ-on-chip technologies, and bioprinted tissues—are bridging the translational divide between preclinical models and human physiology [25–29]. Nanotechnology-facilitated delivery mechanisms have demonstrated their critical role in realising the clinical promise of nucleic acid therapies, as illustrated by mRNA vaccines made with lipid nanoparticles [30–32]. At the systems level, the integration of multi-omics, network pharmacology, and precision medicine frameworks is transforming drug discovery from a universal approach to tailored and personalised therapeutic strategies [17,18,19,35,37]. Regulatory bodies have reacted by implementing flexible frameworks, providing guidance on real-world evidence, and developing creative clinical trial designs aimed at expediting access to groundbreaking medications while maintaining stringent safety protocols [40,44]. The pressing nature of this innovation surge is most comprehended in light of the ongoing decrease in research and development efficiency within the pharmaceutical industry, a trend often referred to as "Eroom's law," which posits that the quantity of new drug approvals per billion dollars invested in research and development has consistently diminished over the years, despite significant advancements in biological understanding [1,2]. This paradox illustrates the cumulative impact of increasing target complexity, heightened regulatory and safety demands, and the declining benefits of thoroughly investigating existing well-defined druggable target categories [2]. In light of this context, the innovations outlined in this review ought to be regarded not as standalone technological anomalies but as interconnected elements of a revamped discovery framework, wherein computational forecasting, physiologically pertinent experimental models, and actual clinical data progressively function as a cohesive, iterative feedback mechanism rather than a succession of isolated, sequential barriers [3,4,43]. Comprehending the various roles and the interplay of different

technologies is crucial for academics and decision-makers aiming to optimise investment and research endeavours. This analysis amalgamates these pioneering methodologies throughout the entirety of the contemporary drug discovery continuum, rigorously assessing their scientific foundations, present implementation, benefits and drawbacks, as well as the existing research voids, aiming to furnish an exhaustive resource for researchers, clinicians, and policymakers involved in pharmaceutical advancement. The evaluation is structured to align with the systematic advancement of contemporary discovery and development initiatives: computational and AI-facilitated strategies for target and candidate identification; traditional and AI-enhanced computer-aided drug design methodologies; broadened therapeutic approaches including gene, RNA, and cellular therapies; sophisticated preclinical and delivery systems; and ultimately, the data-centric, patient-focused, and regulatory advancements that are transforming clinical translation and post-marketing evidence generation.

1. Drug Discovery Pipeline

The traditional drug discovery process consists of a series of stages: target identification and validation, hit identification, lead optimisation, preclinical development, and clinical trials (Phases I–III), concluding with regulatory assessment and post-marketing monitoring [1,2]. Every stage presents unique attrition concerns, with effectiveness failures in Phase II and III studies traditionally representing the largest share of late-stage terminations. Contemporary drug discovery progressively diverges from this rigid linear paradigm, embracing concurrent and cyclical processes where computational forecasts, experimental confirmations, and clinical information inform prior phases. Cycles of design, fabrication, testing, and analysis, now often automated and enhanced by AI-driven decision-making, provide swift iterations on chemical structures based on multifaceted optimisation criteria including efficacy, selectivity, pharmacokinetics, and safety [3,4]. The amalgamation of real-world data and digital biomarkers is increasingly obscuring the distinction between clinical development and post-approval surveillance [38,39,43]. Analysis of attrition throughout the pipeline indicates that insufficient

clinical efficacy and excessive toxicity predominantly contribute to late-stage failures, highlighting the necessity of enhancing the biological and translational validity of preclinical models instead of merely hastening the progression of individual pipeline phases [1,2]. This insight has prompted a reallocation of resources towards earlier and more stringent target validation, as well as preclinical systems—like organoids and organ-on-chip platforms mentioned later in this review—that more accurately replicate

human biology compared to traditional two-dimensional cell cultures or animal models alone [25,26,29]. Decision-making at the portfolio level has progressed, as numerous organisations now utilise quantitative probability-of-success modelling, guided by historical attrition data and AI-generated risk scores, to prioritise candidates and distribute resources throughout a development portfolio instead of addressing each program independently [4,21].

Table 1. Stages of the modern drug discovery and development pipeline and associated innovative technologies

Pipeline Stage	Traditional Approach	Innovative Technologies
Target identification & validation	Literature-based hypothesis, genetic association studies	Multi-omics integration, systems biology, network pharmacology, AI-driven target prioritisation
Hit discovery	High-throughput screening of compound libraries	Virtual screening, DNA-encoded libraries, fragment-based screening, phenotypic screening, generative AI design
Lead optimisation	Iterative medicinal chemistry, in vitro assays	QSAR, molecular docking, molecular dynamics simulation, pharmacophore modelling, deep learning-guided design
Preclinical development	Animal models, 2D cell culture	Organoids, organ-on-chip systems, 3D bioprinting, in silico ADMET prediction
Clinical development	Fixed-protocol randomised controlled trials	Adaptive and master protocol trial designs, biomarker-stratified enrolment, digital twins, wearable monitoring
Regulatory review & post-marketing	Static dossier submission, spontaneous adverse event reporting	Real-world evidence, regulatory science frameworks, AI/ML-based pharmacovigilance

2. Artificial Intelligence

Artificial intelligence (AI) encompasses computing systems that can execute activities usually necessitating human intellect, such as pattern identification, forecasting, and decision-making. In the realm of drug development, artificial intelligence has been utilised in target identification, compound production, property prediction, biomarker discovery, and the optimisation of clinical trials [3,4,6,7,93]. A substantial collection of literature currently illustrates both the potential and the constraints of AI in this field: although AI models can significantly reduce the search space of chemical and biological options, their results are still contingent upon the quality, quantity, and representativeness of the training data [5,7,47]. Expert agreement has underscored significant "grand challenges" for artificial intelligence in small-

molecule drug discovery, such as obtaining high-quality annotated datasets, formulating truly innovative chemical ideas, and conducting thorough experimental validation of model predictions [14]. Interpretability continues to be a significant issue, since numerous high-performing AI models operate as inscrutable predictors, making their decision-making processes challenging to elucidate in regulatory or mechanistic frameworks [10,48]. Notwithstanding these reservations, AI-driven platforms have facilitated numerous clinical-stage candidates, and the adoption across the industry is rapidly increasing, with applications already encompassing real-world data analysis for post-marketing safety signal identification [21]. AI-facilitated forecasting of clinical trial results, predicated on target selection and trial architecture, has further demonstrated the capacity of multi-modal

models to enhance early go/no-go decision-making in development, amalgamating diverse data streams that would be unmanageable through manual analysis [77]. Bibliometric evaluations of the domain reveal a continuous exponential increase in publications and patents pertaining to AI-driven drug discovery over the last ten years, coupled with a parallel escalation in collaborative efforts between industry and academia focused on converting methodological innovations into validated clinical candidates [80]. Nonetheless, a persistent motif in critical evaluations of the domain is the "hype-to-validation gap"—the realisation that computational performance indicators presented *in silico* do not consistently correlate with enhanced clinical success rates, underscoring the necessity for prospective, meticulously controlled assessments of AI-generated candidates instead of depending solely on retrospective comparisons [7,47].

3. Machine Learning

Machine learning (ML), a branch of artificial intelligence, involves algorithms that discern statistical patterns from data autonomously, without explicit programming for particular tasks. In the realm of drug discovery, machine learning techniques such as random forests, support vector machines, gradient boosting, and Gaussian processes are extensively employed for quantitative structure–activity relationship modelling, ADMET (absorption, distribution, metabolism, excretion, toxicity) forecasting, and biomarker categorisation [9,49]. A comprehensive analysis of machine learning applications in drug discovery emphasised notable efficacy in virtual screening enrichment and property prediction tasks, while observing that model performance is significantly influenced by dataset curation and the determination of applicability domains [9]. Models utilising machine learning for human pharmacokinetics have significantly advanced in the last ten years, enhancing early predictions of attrition due to inadequate absorption or fast clearance [4]. ML models developed using chemical and biological data necessitate meticulous validation against prospective, out-of-distribution test sets to prevent an inflated assessment of real-world efficacy, a constraint that has been consistently highlighted in critical evaluations of the discipline [7,49]. Public bioactivity databases, including extensive curated

collections of experimentally determined compound–target interactions, have been instrumental in facilitating reproducible model training and evaluation within the discipline; however, discrepancies in assay conditions and reporting standards among contributing sources persist, introducing noise that may affect subsequent model predictions [81]. Ensemble modelling techniques, which integrate forecasts from various algorithms trained on different data representations, have demonstrated enhanced robustness compared to single-model methods, especially for ADMET endpoints where individual assay noise may otherwise overshadow model inaccuracies [9,49]. Active learning paradigms, wherein models sequentially identify the most enlightening subsequent trials for a certain optimisation goal, are progressively employed to optimise the utilisation of constrained experimental resources throughout lead optimisation initiatives.

4. Deep Learning

Deep learning (DL) enhances machine learning by utilising multi-tiered neural network structures that may autonomously acquire hierarchical feature representations from unprocessed data, such as molecular graphs, protein sequences, and imaging data. Deep learning has demonstrated remarkable efficacy in predicting protein structures, as illustrated by AlphaFold's near-experimental precision in forecasting three-dimensional configurations from amino acid sequences, a breakthrough with significant ramifications for structure-oriented drug discovery [50]. Convolutional and graph neural networks have been utilised to forecast molecular characteristics, binding affinities, and toxicity metrics, while deep learning methodologies have been employed to discover entirely new antibiotic candidates by examining chemical libraries for structurally varied antibacterial properties [51]. A thorough examination of deep learning in drug discovery documented applications including *de novo* molecule generation, synthesis planning, and multi-task property prediction, while warning that model interpretability, limited data for rare targets, and high computational resource requirements pose considerable obstacles to broad clinical implementation [8,74]. Graph neural networks, which represent molecules as nodes and

edges rather than fixed-length descriptor vectors, have proven particularly well suited to capturing the topological and stereochemical information relevant to biological activity, and have progressively displaced earlier fingerprint-based representations across much of the published literature [75]. Transfer learning, which involves refining models that have been pre-trained on extensive general chemical or biological datasets using smaller, specific target datasets, has become a crucial method for tackling data scarcity in specialised therapeutic fields, enabling the effective application of deep learning techniques even when labelled training samples for a particular target are scarce [4,75].

5. Generative AI

Generative AI frameworks—such as variational autoencoders, generative adversarial networks, diffusion models, and large language model-driven chemical generators—facilitate the novel creation of molecules possessing specific physicochemical and biological characteristics, rather than simply evaluating existing libraries [5]. These models can be tailored to specific protein structures, pharmacophoric requirements, or multi-faceted optimisation goals to suggest innovative chemotypes that enhance potency, selectivity, and drug-like properties concurrently. A recent analysis highlighted that generative AI is starting to transform the paradigm from screening to design, hence shortening hit-to-lead timescales in initial-stage programs [5,79]. Nonetheless, the molecules produced often present difficulties in synthetic accessibility, and the rates of experimental validation are relatively low compared to the number of computationally generated candidates, highlighting the ongoing need for robust feedback mechanisms between generative models and laboratory synthesis and testing [5,8]. Reinforcement learning frameworks have been utilised to steer generative design toward multi-objective optimisation, reconciling effectiveness with safety and synthetic feasibility.

6. Structure-Based Drug Design

Structure-based drug design (SBDD) utilises three-dimensional structural data regarding a therapeutic target, generally acquired thru X-ray crystallography, cryo-electron microscopy, or, more frequently, AI-driven structure prediction, to systematically create

ligands that fit the target binding site [11,50]. SBDD procedures often incorporate molecular docking, molecular dynamics simulations, and free-energy perturbation assessments to prioritise and refine candidate molecules. The emergence of precise computational structure prediction has significantly broadened the range of targets suitable for structure-based drug design (SBDD), encompassing formerly "undruggable" proteins without empirically determined structures [50]. Nevertheless, SBDD is limited by protein flexibility, induced-fit binding effects, and the precision constraints of scoring functions employed to evaluate docked conformations, requiring experimental structural confirmation whenever possible [11,13]. The extensive cataloguing of experimentally determined macromolecular structures in centralised public repositories has established the crucial structural basis for decades of structure-based drug design (SBDD) practices and remains the principal benchmark dataset for validating computational structure prediction techniques. The nascent applications of SBDD go beyond targeting the orthosteric active site to include the design of allosteric modulators, disruption of protein-protein interactions, and targeted protein degradation methods like proteolysis-targeting chimerae, each presenting unique structural and computational design challenges compared to traditional enzyme inhibitor development.

7. Ligand-Based Drug Design

Ligand-based drug design (LBDD) is utilised in scenarios where structural data about the target is lacking or inadequately defined, depending on the characteristics of established active ligands to deduce structure–activity connections and inform the creation of novel analogues [11,12]. Fundamental LBDD methodologies encompass quantitative structure–activity relationship (QSAR) modelling, pharmacophore mapping, and molecular similarity analysis. LBDD is especially beneficial for membrane-associated or intrinsically disordered targets that are resistant to crystallographic analysis. Its primary constraint is its reliance on the chemical variety and calibre of the training ligand collection, which may restrict extrapolation to structurally innovative chemotypes [12].

8. Computer-Aided Drug Design

Computer-aided drug design (CADD) involves a comprehensive array of computational techniques, incorporating both structure-based and ligand-based methodologies, aimed at streamlining and enhancing the discovery and refinement of pharmaceutical candidates [11,12]. Modern CADD processes are progressively integrating traditional physics-based techniques with machine learning-generated scoring functions, ADMET predictors, and generative design instruments within cohesive computational frameworks [9,12]. Analyses of CADD applications in oncology and infectious diseases have shown its ability to prioritise both natural and synthetic compounds against clinically validated targets like EGFR, CDK2, and the PI3K/Akt/mTOR pathway, significantly reducing the experimental search space before synthesis [12,76]. The primary obstacle for CADD continues to be the dependable forecasting of binding free energies and off-target liabilities with such precision to alleviate, rather than simply shift, the experimental workload.

9. Molecular Docking

Molecular docking forecasts the optimal orientation and binding strength of a small molecule in a target binding site, generally employing scoring functions that estimate binding free energy [13,52]. Docking is extensively employed for structure-based virtual screening of extensive compound libraries and for elucidating structure–activity connections during lead optimisation [52,53]. Modern docking software can evaluate millions to tens of millions of molecules thru computational methods, significantly broadening the available chemical space compared to traditional high-throughput screening [58]. Notwithstanding its extensive applicability, the precision of docking is constrained by an oversimplified consideration of protein flexibility, solvation impacts, and entropic factors in binding, indicating that docking scores exhibit only a moderate correlation with experimental binding affinities and are more suitable for enrichment purposes than for precise affinity estimation [13,52].

10. Molecular Dynamics Simulation

Molecular dynamics (MD) simulation elucidates the temporal physical motion of atoms and molecules based on classical or, more frequently, machine learning-generated force fields, offering understanding of protein flexibility, ligand binding kinetics, and conformational ensembles that static docking fails to represent [11,13]. Molecular dynamics simulations are employed to enhance docking conformations, calculate binding free energies thru techniques like free-energy perturbation and MM-GBSA, and explore allosteric mechanisms and concealed binding sites. Progress in graphics processing unit acceleration and machine learning-derived force fields has significantly broadened the available simulation timelines, facilitating more authentic modelling of biologically pertinent conformational changes. Nevertheless, molecular dynamics is still computationally costly compared to docking, and the precision of force fields for new chemotypes or metal-containing systems remains a dynamic subject of methodological advancement.

11. QSAR

Quantitative structure–activity relationship (QSAR) modelling formulates mathematical correlations between molecular descriptors and biological efficacy, facilitating the prediction of the activity of unexamined compounds and assisting in the systematic design of analogues with enhanced potency or diminished toxicity [12,54,55]. Contemporary methodologies employ both two-dimensional and three-dimensional QSAR techniques, frequently combined with structural descriptors acquired from docking [52,54]. QSAR models have been widely utilised in the analysis of anticancer, antibacterial, and antimalarial chemical series, among others [55]. A continual constraint is the limited applicability range of QSAR models, which may yield incorrect forecasts when extended beyond the chemical space encompassed in the training dataset, coupled with difficulties in descriptor selection and model interpretability [54,55].

12. Pharmacophore Modeling

Pharmacophore modelling delineates the crucial steric and electronic characteristics of a ligand necessary for ideal engagement with a particular biological target, irrespective of any singular chemical framework

[52,56,57]. Pharmacophore models, obtained from ligand ensembles (ligand-based) or protein binding sites (structure-based), are extensively utilised as filters in virtual screening initiatives, facilitating scaffold-hopping to structurally innovative chemotypes that preserve essential pharmacophoric characteristics [57]. Sequential pharmacophore and docking-based virtual screening methodologies have demonstrated efficacy in discovering new ligands for difficult targets like the sigma-1 receptor, highlighting the synergistic benefits of integrating ligand-centric and structure-centric filters [57]. The quality of pharmacophore models, similar to QSAR, depends on the structural variety and dependability of the training data utilised in their creation.

13. Virtual Screening

Virtual screening (VS) employs computational methods to assess extensive compound libraries, spanning from hundreds of thousands to millions of molecules, against a biological target to select a feasible subset for experimental evaluation, acting as an effective adjunct to physical high-throughput screening [52,53]. VS techniques encompass structure-oriented methodologies (molecular docking) and ligand-centric strategies (pharmacophore and similarity searching), frequently utilised in conjunction within sequential screening processes [53,57]. Extensive virtual libraries, currently including tens of millions of custom compounds, have broadened the available chemical landscape for virtual screening initiatives, enhancing success rates against historically challenging targets [58]. The primary difficulty lies in reconciling computing throughput with scoring precision, especially in extensive campaigns when comprehensive physics-based assessment is computationally unfeasible.

14. High-Throughput Screening

High-throughput screening (HTS) facilitates the automated and simultaneous evaluation of extensive chemical libraries against a biological target or phenotype, traditionally functioning as the main driver of hit identification in drug discovery [53]. Miniaturised assay formats, automated liquid handling, and high-content imaging have steadily enhanced high-throughput screening efficiency while

minimising reagent usage and expense per data point. HTS is sometimes utilised alongside virtual screening, wherein computational pre-filtering enhances the physical screening library with probable actives, hence increasing overall hit rates and minimising false-positive interference from assay chemicals [52,53]. Notwithstanding its efficacy, HTS campaigns may have elevated rates of false positives and false negatives due to compound aggregation, fluorescence interference, and restricted chemical diversity in screening libraries.

15. Fragment-Based Drug Discovery

Fragment-based drug discovery (FBDD) evaluates collections of small, low-molecular-weight chemical fragments (often <300 Da) against a target, pinpointing weakly binding fragments that are later expanded, connected, or combined into higher-affinity lead compounds [53,58]. Fragment libraries explore chemical space more effectively per compound compared to larger drug-like libraries, allowing FBDD to identify binding modes and chemotypes that HTS would miss [53]. Structure-oriented docking of extensive virtual fragment collections, comprising millions of pieces, has recently been employed to discover innovative scaffolds for difficult targets like DNA repair enzymes, with empirically verified binding corroborated by X-ray crystallography [58]. The primary advantage of FBDD—the effective exploration of chemical space—is counterbalanced by the technological challenges associated in identifying weak fragment interactions, which generally necessitate biophysical techniques like surface plasmon resonance, NMR, or X-ray crystallographic fragment soaking.

16. DNA-Encoded Libraries

DNA-encoded library (DEL) technique associates each component of an extensive combinatorial small-molecule library with a distinct DNA barcode, facilitating concurrent affinity-based screening of libraries with billions of compounds against a target in one experiment [59]. Hit identification depends on next-generation sequencing of DNA barcodes that are enriched via affinity selection, then followed by the resynthesis and validation of each individual hit compound. DEL technology has surfaced as a

formidable enhancement to conventional high-throughput screening and virtual screening, providing access to a chemical diversity that significantly surpasses that of physically stored compound libraries. Recent advancements in computation, such as generative and zero-shot design methodologies for DEL construction, seek to enhance the drug-likeness and synthetic feasibility of DEL-derived candidates, responding to a persistent critique that DEL chemistries may prioritise reactive or synthetically advantageous components over superior pharmacological attributes [59].

17. Phenotypic Screening

Phenotypic screening detects substances that elicit a specific biological or disease-associated phenotype in cells, organoids, or entire organisms, without necessitating prior understanding of the exact molecular target [2]. This target-agnostic methodology differs from target-centric screening and has traditionally produced an unequal number of first-in-class therapeutic approvals, demonstrating its ability to encompass polypharmacology and systemic biological impacts that reductionist target-based assays might overlook. Contemporary phenotypic screening progressively utilises high-content imaging, single-cell assessments, and physiologically pertinent 3D models like organoids to enhance translational significance [25,29]. The primary difficulty of phenotypic screening is in the subsequent deconvolution of targets, as elucidating the molecular mechanism behind a detected phenotype can be experimentally arduous and protracted.

18. Multi-Omics

Multi-omics methodologies amalgamate genomic, transcriptomic, proteomic, metabolomic, and epigenomic data to formulate an all-encompassing, systems-oriented perspective of disease biology and treatment efficacy [17,18]. The amalgamation of multi-omics data facilitates target identification and validation, patient classification, and biomarker discovery, and is progressively integrated into AI-driven target prioritisation frameworks [3,17]. Multi-omics profiling has demonstrated significant utility in oncology and intricate polygenic disorders, as single-omics evaluations frequently do not encompass the complete molecular diversity that underpins disease

phenotypes. Principal obstacles encompass the synchronisation of data across many platforms, the computational demands of amalgamating high-dimensional heterogeneous information, and the necessity for resilient statistical frameworks adept at differentiating causal biological signals from technical or confounding variations. Single-cell and spatial omics technologies have enhanced multi-omics analysis by elucidating cellular diversity and tissue structure at resolutions beyond those achievable with bulk profiling techniques, uncovering infrequent cell populations and microenvironmental interactions pertinent to drug responses and resistance mechanisms, especially in cancer and immunology. The utilisation of deep learning-driven transfer learning methods on extensive single-cell transcriptomic atlases has commenced facilitating the forecasting of gene regulatory network reactions to disturbances, presenting a possible avenue for *in silico* modelling of therapeutic strategies before experimental validation.

19. Systems Biology

Systems biology employs computational and mathematical modelling to elucidate how intricate networks of genes, proteins, and metabolites lead to emergent physiological and pathological phenotypes, surpassing the historically prevalent reductionist single-target approach in drug discovery [18,19]. Systems-level models can forecast the propagation of disturbances from a specific node throughout a biological network, guiding target selection and anticipating any off-target or compensatory repercussions. This viewpoint has been codified in initiatives for “P4 medicine”—predictive, preventative, personalised, and participatory—which anticipates systems biology as essential to future healthcare [36]. Systems biology methodologies are computationally intensive and necessitate comprehensive, high-quality interaction data, whereas model predictions ultimately necessitate experimental confirmation to ascertain biological significance.

20. Network Pharmacology

Network pharmacology frames drug action in relation to interlinked biological networks instead of focusing on solitary targets, highlighting that numerous

effective medications, especially for intricate ailments, function by influencing multiple network nodes [19]. This model has significantly impacted the reconfiguration of drug discovery for intricate ailments like cancer and neurodegeneration, where targeting a single entity often falls short. Network medicine methodologies employ extensive interactome mapping to discern illness modules and prioritise combination or multi-target therapy approaches [19,86,87]. Network pharmacology has contributed to the logical development of multitarget ligands and medication combinations; yet, converting network-level forecasts into confirmed treatment approaches is methodologically difficult due to the vastness and incompleteness of existing interactome maps.

21. CRISPR Gene Editing

Clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats (CRISPR) and their corresponding Cas nucleases offer a customisable, RNA-directed framework for accurate genome modification, revolutionising fundamental biomedical research and therapeutic innovation since their first identification [20,60,61]. CRISPR-Cas9 mechanisms induce specific double-strand breaks that are repaired by either error-prone non-homologous end joining or accurate homology-directed repair, facilitating gene deletion, correction, or insertion [20]. The clinical therapeutic potential of this technology was acknowledged with the authorisation of the inaugural CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing therapy for sickle cell disease and transfusion-dependent beta-thalassemia, which operates by inhibiting the erythroid-specific enhancer of BCL11A to restore foetal haemoglobin synthesis [20,62]. Recent editing techniques, such as base editors and prime editors, enhance accuracy beyond mechanisms reliant on double-strand breaks, thereby minimising the likelihood of inadvertent insertions or deletions [20]. Delivery continues to be the primary translational impediment, with in vivo applications predominantly depending on adeno-associated viral vectors and lipid nanoparticles, each exhibiting unique compromises in immunogenicity, payload capacity, and tissue tropism [16,20]. In addition to monogenic haemoglobinopathies, CRISPR methodologies are currently being explored for cancer treatments, which involve the direct

interruption of oncogenic drivers and the modification of immune effector cells, as well as for inherited metabolic and neuromuscular conditions where ex vivo correction is impractical and persistent in vivo editing is necessary [18,20]. Off-target modifications, mosaicism, and the enduring genomic integrity of edited cells continue to be significant subjects of preclinical and post-marketing monitoring, especially as CRISPR-derived products transition from uncommon monogenic conditions to more widespread disease demographics where the overall risk-benefit assessment varies considerably.

22. Gene Therapy

Gene therapy involves the insertion, modification, or suppression of genetic material to address or avert illness, including methods such as viral vector-mediated gene addition, genome editing, and gene silencing techniques [16]. Adeno-associated viruses and lentiviral vectors continue to be the primary delivery systems for both ex vivo and in vivo gene therapy, appreciated for their advantageous safety characteristics and, in the case of lentiviruses, their ability for stable genomic incorporation [16]. The pace of clinical translation has significantly increased in the last ten years, resulting in the approval of gene treatments for inherited retinal disorders, spinal muscular atrophy, and blood disorders. Ongoing difficulties encompass the immunogenicity of viral capsids, restricted re-dosing potential owing to anti-vector immunity, scalability of manufacturing, and the considerable expense of personalised gene therapy items, which presents notable access and health-economic issues [16].

23. RNA Therapeutics

RNA treatments include antisense oligonucleotides, small interfering RNA (siRNA), messenger RNA (mRNA), and guide RNA-based approaches, collectively facilitating the alteration of gene expression or the synthesis of therapeutic proteins at the RNA level [22,24,63]. The clinical development of RNA interference (RNAi) therapeutics, over twenty years post the mechanism's discovery, has been propelled by significant progress in chemical modification techniques that enhance nuclease resistance, diminish immunogenicity, and facilitate effective hepatic delivery thru conjugation or lipid

nanoparticle encapsulation [22,23,64,65]. mRNA treatments gained worldwide recognition via lipid nanoparticle-based vaccinations and are currently being expanded to include enzyme replacement therapy, cancer immunotherapy, and in vivo genome editing and cell reprogramming applications [24,66,67]. Chemical alteration of RNA bases, as demonstrated by nucleoside alterations that inhibit innate immune detection, has been crucial for the clinical application of exogenous mRNA [66]. The distribution of therapeutics beyond the liver presents a significant unresolved issue for both siRNA and mRNA technologies, driving ongoing advancements in targeted lipid nanoparticle and conjugate formulations [23]. Initial clinical trials involving systemically administered nanoparticle-delivered siRNA confirmed the feasibility of RNA interference in humans, showing quantifiable target gene suppression post-intravenous delivery and offering essential preliminary validation for the wider RNA therapeutics domain [92,94]. Antisense oligonucleotide chemistries, such as phosphorothioate backbone modification and 2'-O-methoxyethyl ribose substitution, have advanced to facilitate both systemic and, specifically for intrathecal administration targeting central nervous system conditions, direct delivery methods that completely bypass the blood-brain barrier.

24. Cell Therapy

In cell therapy, living cells, either autologous or allogeneic, are administered to replace, repair, or modify immunological function or damaged tissue. Cell treatment includes mesenchymal stromal cell therapy, haematopoietic stem cell transplantation, and new regenerative techniques utilising differentiated cell products in addition to modified immune effector cells. Scalability and cost reduction are significantly hampered by manufacturing complexity, batch-to-batch variability, and the logistical requirements of autologous cell processing. In addition to new in vivo cell engineering techniques that seek to reprogram target cells directly within the patient using mRNA- or viral vector-delivered constructs, allogeneic "off-the-shelf" cell therapy platforms designed to lower immunogenicity and graft-versus-host risk are actively being developed to address these translational bottlenecks [19,68].

25. CAR-T Therapy

By genetically modifying a patient's own T cells to express a synthetic receptor that targets a tumor-associated antigen, chimeric antigen receptor (CAR) T-cell therapy reroutes cytotoxic immune activity against cancerous cells [68]. Ex vivo-engineered CD19-directed CAR-T products have established a new treatment category for haematological tumours by achieving long-lasting remissions in refractory and recurrent B-cell malignancies [68,69]. Clinical experience has also identified distinctive toxicities that call for specific care procedures, such as neurotoxicity and cytokine release syndrome. The manufacturing complexity, expense, and access constraints of traditional ex vivo CAR-T production are being addressed by in vivo CAR technologies, which use mRNA-loaded lipid nanoparticles or viral vectors to produce CAR-expressing cells directly within the body [19]. Antigen heterogeneity, immunosuppressive tumour microenvironments, and insufficient T-cell trafficking and persistence continue to limit the use of CAR-based strategies to solid tumours. A significant percentage of paediatric and young adult patients treated with CD19-directed CAR-T therapy for relapsed or refractory B-cell acute lymphoblastic leukaemia showed long-lasting remissions during long-term follow-up, which provided crucial evidence supporting the modality's potential for cure and guiding subsequent regulatory approvals across additional haematological indications [69]. In order to increase efficacy and safety margins, next-generation CAR constructs with logic-gated antigen recognition, cytokine co-expression, and switchable or inducible control elements are currently being investigated. This is especially true for solid tumour applications, where the therapeutic window between antitumor activity and on-target, off-tumor toxicity is frequently smaller than in haematological malignancies.

26. Stem Cell-Based Drug Development

Adult and pluripotent stem cells offer sustainable human cell supplies for the development of regenerative therapies, toxicity testing, and disease models. The creation of patient-specific illness models that represent unique genetic backgrounds is made possible by induced pluripotent stem cell

(iPSC)-derived cell types, which assist both mechanistic study and customised treatment response prediction. Drug toxicity and efficacy are increasingly assessed using stem cell-derived models, which are meant to supplement—and in certain regulatory situations, partially replace—traditional animal testing [29]. Important obstacles include insufficient recapitulation of tissue-level architecture, batch variability in differentiation effectiveness between iPSC lines, and the immaturity of several stem cell-derived cell types in comparison to their adult tissue counterparts.

27. Organoids

Organoids are three-dimensional, self-organising structures made from stem cells that mimic important structural and functional characteristics of the corresponding tissue of origin. Compared to traditional two-dimensional cell culture, organoids provide experimental models that are significantly more physiologically representative [25,88,89]. When produced from patient material, organoids facilitate the evaluation of individualised treatment response pertinent to precision oncology and aid in the research of disease causes, drug efficacy, and toxicity [25]. For instance, simulating the genetics of colorectal cancer within an otherwise wild-type human tissue backdrop has been made possible by CRISPR-mediated editing of intestinal organoids [25]. Despite these developments, organoid models frequently lack the vascularization, immunological components, and innervation found in native tissue, and standardising generation techniques across labs continues to be a barrier to cross-study repeatability and regulatory acceptance [25,29]. From high-throughput drug screening in ophthalmology to patient-derived tumour organoid biobanks supporting precision oncology drug sensitivity testing, retinal, intestinal, hepatic, and tumor-derived organoid systems have all demonstrated unique value propositions, demonstrating the range of applications this platform currently supports across therapeutic areas [25,29].

28. Organ-on-Chip Technology

Compared to static cell culture, organ-on-chip (OoC) systems are microfluidic devices designed to replicate the physiological microenvironment of particular human organs, including mechanical, fluidic, and

biochemical cues. This allows for more predictive evaluation of drug efficacy, metabolism, and toxicity [26,28,90]. Over several weeks of culture, multi-organ "physiome-on-a-chip" platforms have shown the ability to simulate interconnected organ systems, including pharmacokinetic drug metabolism [28]. By combining the cellular self-organization of organoids with the environmental control provided by microfluidic engineering, integration of organoids with organ-on-a-chip devices improves structural fidelity, reproducibility, and scalability in comparison to either platform alone [26]. Device standardisation, throughput constraints in comparison to traditional plate-based assays, and the technical know-how needed for production and operation are obstacles to wider adoption.

29. 3D Bioprinting

By depositing cells, biomaterials, and bioactive components in accordance with a predetermined architecture, three-dimensional (3D) bioprinting creates intricate, spatially structured tissue models that allow for the creation of tissue mimetics with more structural complexity than is possible with passive self-organization alone [27]. In order to improve vascularization and mechanical realism and assist applications in disease modelling, high-throughput drug screening, and precision medicine, bioprinted tissue models are increasingly being merged with organoid and organ-on-chip platforms [27,91]. Single-organoid resolution drug screening platforms made possible by bioprinting demonstrate how the technology can combine scalable throughput with high structural fidelity [27]. Regulatory uncertainty surrounding the qualification of bioprinted models for definitive safety and efficacy assessment, limited resolution for capturing microvascular architecture, and a limited selection of bioprintable materials that balance mechanical integrity with cell viability are all persistent challenges.

30. Nanotechnology

The long-standing pharmacokinetic drawbacks of traditional formulations are addressed by nanotechnology-enabled drug delivery systems, which are usually between 10 and 1000 nanometres in size and are designed to enhance the solubility,

stability, targeting, and controlled release of therapeutic payloads [30, 32]. Lipid-based nanoparticles, polymeric nanoparticles, inorganic nanoparticles, and biologically formed vesicles like exosomes are examples of nanocarrier platforms that offer unique benefits in terms of payload compatibility, biodistribution, and manufacturing complexity [30–33]. For nucleic acid therapies, which need protection from nuclease degradation and enhanced cellular absorption to ensure therapeutic efficiency, nanomedicine has proven especially revolutionary [22, 30]. The goal of ongoing development in targeted nanoparticle surface functionalisation is to expand the range of tissue targets for nanomedicine applications beyond the liver, which is the default location of nanoparticle accumulation after systemic injection. In addition to delivering nucleic acids, nanoparticle platforms are frequently used to increase the oral bioavailability of poorly water-soluble small molecules, enable sustained-release depot formulations that lower the frequency of dosing, and accomplish passive or active tumour targeting by utilising surface-conjugated targeting ligands and the enhanced permeability and retention effect, respectively. Agency guidelines now address nanoparticle-specific characterisation requirements, such as particle size distribution, surface charge, and batch-to-batch reproducibility, which are less pertinent to traditional small-molecule formulations. Regulatory experience with nanomedicine products has also developed significantly.

31. Lipid Nanoparticles

The most therapeutically advanced nucleic acid delivery platform is represented by lipid nanoparticles (LNPs), which include phospholipids, cholesterol, ionisable or cationic lipids, and polyethylene-glycolated lipids. LNPs are the basis for both licensed siRNA treatments and widely used mRNA vaccines [30, 32]. To maximise hepatic gene silencing potency while avoiding toxicity, LNP formulation optimisation, including ionisable lipid structure–activity correlations, has been essential [65]. This technology is extended to small-molecule and protein payloads by solid lipid nanoparticles and nanostructured lipid carriers, which provide better biocompatibility than previous colloidal delivery

systems [30, 31]. Microfluidic mixing technologies, which enable repeatable, controllable nanoparticle creation at both laboratory and commercial scale, have significantly increased manufacturing scalability [30]. The primary biodistribution of systemically delivered LNPs to the liver and spleen, which limits extrahepatic applications without further targeting innovation, is one of the main restrictions.

32. Polymeric Nanoparticles

A flexible and adjustable platform for regulated and prolonged drug release is offered by polymeric nanoparticles, which are made from biodegradable and biocompatible polymers such poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA), polyethyleneimine, and chitosan [31, 32]. An intermediary platform between fully lipid-based and entirely polymeric systems is provided by polymer–lipid hybrid nanoparticles, which combine the structural stability of polymeric cores with the biocompatibility and functionalisation potential of lipid shells [31]. Because of their programmable breakdown kinetics, which enable regulated release profiles different from lipid nanoparticles, these carriers have been investigated for peptide and protein delivery, gene delivery, and CRISPR component packing [16, 31]. Compared to lipid-based carriers, polymeric systems often provide better formulation stability and manufacturing reproducibility, but frequently at the expense of reduced encapsulation efficiency for nucleic acid payloads.

33. Exosome-Based Drug Delivery

Proteins, lipids, and nucleic acids are transported between cells via exosomes, which are naturally secreted extracellular vesicles with a diameter of 30 to 150 nanometres [16,70]. Exosomes have a number of potential benefits over manufactured nanoparticles as drug delivery vehicles, such as their inherent biocompatibility, ability to avoid quick immune clearance, and capability to pass thru biological barriers including the blood–brain barrier [16,70,71]. Utilising surface protein modification for cell-specific targeting, engineered exosomes have been investigated for the delivery of small compounds, nucleic acids, and even CRISPR ribonucleoprotein complexes [16]. The lack of established techniques for exosome extraction, characterisation, and potency

evaluation, the restricted internal volume available for packing bigger therapeutic payloads, and the difficulties of obtaining consistent large-scale manufacturing are some of the main translational obstacles [16,70].

34. Biomarkers

In contemporary drug research, biomarkers—objectively detectable indicators of normal biological processes, pathologic processes, or pharmacological responses—are essential for patient classification, confirming target engagement, and choosing surrogate endpoints in clinical trials [34, 35]. The types of biomarkers—diagnostic, prognostic, predictive, pharmacodynamic, and safety biomarkers—are now formally distinguished by regulatory frameworks, each of which plays a unique function throughout the development process. While wearable sensor data-derived digital biomarkers represent an emerging category capturing continuous physiological and behavioural signals outside of traditional clinical settings, multi-omics profiling and AI-driven analytics have significantly expanded the discovery pipeline for novel biomarkers [39]. Since early reliance on poorly validated biomarkers as trial endpoints has historically contributed to expensive late-stage clinical failures, robust analytical and clinical validation of potential biomarkers is still crucial.

35. Precision Medicine

Beyond the conventional one-size-fits-all therapy paradigm, precision medicine adapts illness prevention and treatment techniques to individual diversity in genetics, environment, and lifestyle [37]. In rare monogenic disorders, where genetic identification directly informs targeted or gene-based therapies, and in oncology, where molecular tumour profiling now routinely guides targeted therapy selection, the precision medicine program has been especially revolutionary [37]. Digital twin technologies, systems biology models, and multi-omics integration are coming together to enable more personalised drug response and illness trajectory prediction [36, 42]. The cost and accessibility of thorough molecular profiling, the under-representation of diverse populations in genomic reference datasets, and the difficulty of converting

molecular findings into practical clinical decisions continue to limit the clinical application of precision medicine despite significant advancements [38]. High-performance medicine frameworks have been suggested as a way to close the gap between the creation of precision molecular data and its timely, useful application in routine clinical decision-making. These frameworks use artificial intelligence to help clinicians synthesise complex, multi-modal patient data at the point of care [85]. The reference datasets required to validate genotype–phenotype and genotype–treatment response associations across increasingly diverse populations are being expanded by national and international precision medicine initiatives that connect large-scale genomic biobanking with longitudinal clinical outcome data [36].

36. Pharmacogenomics

Pharmacogenomics studies how genetic diversity affects a person's response to a medication, including variations in effectiveness, dosage needs, and vulnerability to negative drug reactions [38]. The creation of validated medication-gene pairings and clinical decision support guidelines that incorporate pharmacogenomic data into electronic health records, allowing point-of-care drug selection or dose adjustment, has progressed clinical adoption [38]. Pharmacogenomic biomarkers have been added to drug labels by regulatory bodies more frequently, especially for medicines with well-characterized metaboliser characteristics or restricted therapeutic indices [38,72]. However, the practical difficulties of integrating genomic data into time-constrained clinical workflows, incomplete penetration of pharmacogenomic predictions into routine prescribing practice, and inadequate validation of drug–gene associations across diverse ethnic populations continue to limit clinical utility [38].

37. Digital Twins

In order to mimic the course of a disease and forecast a patient's reaction to treatment, digital twins are dynamic, constantly updated virtual representations of specific individuals, organs, or biological systems that are created by combining genetic, physiological, and real-world data [41,42]. Patient-specific digital twins have been proposed in drug development to

facilitate biomarker identification, personalised dose simulation, and virtual clinical trials, potentially lowering the size and cost of prospective clinical studies [41, 42]. Applications in cardiology, cancer, neurology, and complicated disorders like Alzheimer's disease have been investigated; by better recording individual disease trajectories, digital twins may help address high clinical trial failure rates [42]. Digital twin technology is still in the early stages of clinical validation despite significant technological advancements, and there is a significant translational gap between proof-of-concept demonstrations and regulatory-grade, practical clinical decision tools [41].

38. Wearable Technologies

Continuous, real-time, non-invasive monitoring of physiological parameters, such as heart rate, activity, sleep, and increasingly biochemical markers via wearable biosensors, is made possible by wearable sensor technologies. This results in rich longitudinal datasets that are pertinent to post-marketing safety surveillance and clinical trial endpoints. In addition to supporting remote and decentralised trial designs that lessen participant burden, the integration of wearable-derived digital biomarkers into clinical trials offers the potential to capture more precise, ecologically valid measures of treatment response than traditional periodic clinical assessments [39]. Additionally, wearable data streams supply the real-time physiological inputs required for dynamic model update to digital twin models [41]. Difficulties with data standardisation, regulatory qualifying of innovative digital endpoints, and guaranteeing fair access to wearable technologies across various patient populations limit widespread clinical implementation.

39. Drug Repurposing

Given the current safety and pharmacokinetic characteristics of the candidate chemical, drug repurposing, also known as repositioning, finds new therapeutic uses for currently approved or investigational medications, providing a relatively quick and low-risk route to clinical availability [40,82]. Approaches ranging from random clinical observation to systematic computational screening using transcriptome signature matching, network-based studies, and AI-driven prediction of novel

drug–disease relationships have been documented in systematic reviews of drug repurposing strategies [40]. During worldwide infectious illness emergencies, repurposing became especially popular since the urgency of therapeutic need exceeded the timeliness of de novo medication creation. Despite its allure, repurposing encounters unique commercial and regulatory obstacles, such as the ongoing need for sufficiently powered efficacy trials in the new indication and the restricted patent protection incentives for already-approved drugs [40].

40. Real-World Evidence

Clinical evidence obtained from the examination of real-world data, such as insurance claims, patient registries, electronic health records, and increasingly wearable and digital health data, as opposed to conventional randomised controlled trials, is referred to as "real-world evidence" (RWE) [43,44]. In order to support label extensions, inform comparative effectiveness evaluations, and enhance safety surveillance, regulatory bodies have gradually formalised procedures for integrating RWE into pre-approval and post-marketing decision-making [43]. RWE is especially useful for researching treatment efficacy, long-term safety outcomes, and uncommon diseases in groups that are under-represented in controlled trials [43]. Confounding by indication, constraints in data quality and completeness, and the continuous discussion about when real-world data analyses may properly replace rather than just supplement randomised evidence are examples of methodological difficulties [44].

41. Clinical Trial Innovations

In order to increase efficiency and patient access, modern clinical trial design has significantly advanced beyond the conventional fixed-protocol randomised controlled trial by utilising adaptive designs, master protocols, and distributed trial components [41, 45]. More effective evaluation of multiple hypotheses within a single infrastructure is made possible by master protocols, which include basket trials (testing one therapy across multiple diseases sharing a molecular feature), umbrella trials (testing multiple therapies within a single disease stratified by biomarker), and platform trials (evaluating multiple therapies against a shared control

with the ability to add or drop arms over time) [45]. Companion diagnostics provide biomarker-stratified enrolment, which enables trials to be enriched for groups most likely to benefit from a particular intervention. Decentralised and hybrid trial models, which include wearable-derived endpoints, telemedicine visits, and remote monitoring, have increased accessibility and are becoming more and more integrated with simulation-based trial optimisation techniques and digital twins [41]. Compared to fixed-sample frequentist designs, Bayesian adaptive designs offer better statistical efficiency, especially in rare disease populations where recruitment is intrinsically limited. These designs allow pre-specified interim modification of randomisation ratios, sample size, or enrolled patient populations based on accumulating trial data. In settings where randomisation to a placebo or standard-of-care comparator raises ethical concerns, such as paediatric oncology or ultra-rare genetic disease trials, synthetic and external control arms, built from real-world data or historical trial datasets, are increasingly being considered. However, their acceptance necessitates careful methodological scrutiny to control for confounding and temporal changes in standard of care [43,44].

42. Regulatory Science

In parallel with the scientific and technological advancements discussed throughout this study, regulatory science creates and uses new instruments, standards, and approaches to enhance the evaluation of the safety, effectiveness, and quality of medical products. The goal of regulatory agencies' expedited pathways, such as priority review, accelerated approval, and breakthrough therapy designation, is to shorten the time it takes for treatments that address significant unmet medical needs while upholding strict evidentiary standards thru required post-marketing confirmatory studies [73]. As regulatory science keeps up with the rate of scientific advancement, guidance frameworks that particularly address real-world evidence, artificial intelligence and machine learning-based techniques, and novel

advanced therapeutic medical goods (such as gene, cell, and RNA therapies) continue to develop. Making sure regulatory frameworks keep up with quickly developing technology without sacrificing the rigour of safety and efficacy review is a recurring concern, especially for adaptive AI models whose performance characteristics may change after initial approval. Inadequately characterised dose-response relationships or weak efficacy evidence are frequently the scientific and regulatory concerns that underlie delayed or denied approvals, according to historical analysis of regulatory decision-making [95]. These findings continue to influence how sponsors and agencies calibrate the evidentiary standards applied to novel modalities and expedited pathways. Divergent national frameworks can otherwise fragment global development strategies and delay patient access in some regions relative to others, so international harmonisation of regulatory requirements across major jurisdictions is still a top priority, especially for advanced therapy medicinal products and AI-based software as a medical device.

43. Green Chemistry

Green chemistry uses concepts like waste reduction, safer solvent selection, atom economy optimisation, and energy efficiency to limit the environmental impact of chemical synthesis and manufacture [46,84]. Given the historically high solvent-to-product mass ratios (the "E factor") characteristic of active pharmaceutical ingredient synthesis in comparison to other chemical industries, green chemistry principles are becoming more and more integrated into process route design within pharmaceutical manufacturing [46,83]. Stoichiometric reagents and toxic solvents are being replaced by catalytic techniques, flow chemistry, and biocatalysis to lower industrial costs and environmental effect. There is a significant chance to increase the pharmaceutical industry's sustainability at scale by continuing to incorporate green chemistry indicators into early-stage route selection as opposed to retrospective process optimisation following regulatory approval.

Table 2. Comparative advantages and limitations of selected drug discovery technologies

Technology	Key Advantages	Key Limitations
AI/Machine Learning	Rapid large-scale data analysis, pattern recognition beyond human capacity	Dependent on data quality; limited interpretability; risk of overfitting
Generative AI	De novo molecule design optimised for multiple parameters simultaneously	Synthetic accessibility challenges; modest experimental validation rates
Molecular Docking / MD Simulation	Structure-based rationalisation of binding; scalable to large libraries	Limited protein flexibility modelling; moderate correlation with experimental affinity
CRISPR Gene Editing	Precise, programmable genome modification; durable therapeutic effect	Delivery bottlenecks; off-target editing risk; high cost
RNA Therapeutics (siRNA/mRNA)	Rapid design cycle; broad target addressability including “undruggable” targets	Delivery beyond liver remains limited; formulation stability challenges
CAR-T Cell Therapy	Durable remissions in haematological malignancies	Manufacturing complexity; cytokine release syndrome; limited solid tumour efficacy
Organoids / Organ-on-Chip	Improved physiological relevance versus 2D culture	Lack of vascularisation/immune components; limited standardisation
Lipid Nanoparticles	Clinically validated nucleic acid delivery platform	Predominant hepatic/splenic biodistribution; limited extrahepatic targeting
Digital Twins	Individualised simulation of disease trajectory and treatment response	Early-stage clinical validation; substantial data infrastructure requirements

CHALLENGES

The modern drug development enterprise nevertheless faces major, interrelated obstacles despite significant technology advancements throughout the fields described here. First, models trained on biased, incomplete, or non-representative datasets run the danger of propagating systematic mistakes into candidate selection and clinical trial design [7,47,49]. Data quality and standardisation continue to be significant restrictions on AI and machine learning applications. Second, there is a bottleneck in converting *in silico* predictions into verified biological findings since experimental validation still lags behind computational and generative design capabilities [5,8]. Third, individualised cell and gene therapy products are frequently too expensive for many healthcare systems, and modern therapeutic modalities—gene, cell, and RNA therapies—face ongoing delivery, manufacturing scalability, and pricing hurdles that limit equitable patient access [16,20,68]. Fourth, there is residual translational risk that contributes to clinical-stage attrition because preclinical models, even sophisticated organoid and organ-on-chip systems, do not fully replicate human physiology, especially with regard to immune system interactions,

vascularization, and long-term tissue maturation [25,26,29]. Fifth, because many AI/ML-based tools are flexible and constantly updating, regulatory frameworks must constantly adjust to new modalities and computational tools without sacrificing rigorous safety evaluation [43,73]. Sixth, as these technologies grow, ethical and equity concerns—such as the privacy of genomic data, algorithmic bias in AI-driven clinical decision support, and inequalities in access to precision medicine and cutting-edge treatments—need ongoing attention [37, 38]. Lastly, despite increasing awareness of the industry's disproportionate solvent and energy intensity in comparison to other chemical sectors, the environmental sustainability of pharmaceutical manufacture continues to be an underappreciated aspect of drug research [46]. Workforce and organisational readiness is another cross-cutting issue. The successful implementation of AI, multi-omics, and advanced therapeutic platforms necessitates interdisciplinary teams comprising computational science, molecular biology, bioengineering, clinical medicine, and regulatory affairs. However, many research organisations still encounter structural and cultural obstacles when attempting to integrate these historically divided disciplines into coherent, iterative discovery

workflows [3,7]. Additionally, reproducibility is still an underappreciated problem in a number of the domains discussed here; published benchmarks for AI models, organoid protocols, and nanoparticle formulations are not always accompanied by enough methodological detail or standardised reporting to enable independent replication, which makes cross-study comparison more difficult and slows the advancement of the field. Instead of piecemeal technical solutions limited to certain labs or organisations, addressing these interconnected difficulties will probably require coordinated activity across academic, industry, and regulatory parties.

FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

The next stage of drug discovery innovation is probably going to be defined by a number of convergent trajectories. More comprehensive and precise target and candidate prioritisation than single-modality techniques is promised by the growing integration of multimodal AI models, which include structural, omics, imaging, and real-world data inside unified predictive frameworks [3,6]. As long as synthetic accessibility prediction and closed-loop experimental validation continue to advance, generative AI is anticipated to gradually evolve from proof-of-concept molecule generation toward fully integrated design–make–test–analyze cycles with minimum human interaction [5,8]. The cost and manufacturing complexity that now restrict access to cell and gene therapies may be significantly reduced by developments in *in vivo* gene and cell engineering, such as next-generation *in vivo* CAR platforms and enhanced non-viral delivery systems [16,19,68]. It is anticipated that further development of organoid, organ-on-chip, and bioprinted tissue models—especially by adding immunological and vascular components—will gradually lessen the need for animal testing, in line with the growing regulatory acceptance of non-animal approaches [25,26,29]. When combined with wearable-derived real-world data, digital twin technology may allow for more customised virtual trial simulation, which could shorten the duration and scale of confirmatory clinical trials for specific indications [41,42]. In order to ensure that innovation in drug discovery translates into sustainable, accessible, and equitable therapeutic advancements for patients worldwide, it will be

crucial to further integrate green chemistry principles at the earliest stages of route design and to continue evolving adaptive regulatory science frameworks [43,46,73]. In the future, the gradual merging of once separate technological fields is probably going to have just as much of an impact as developments in any one field taken separately. An increasingly closed-loop discovery and development ecosystem where computational hypothesis generation, physiologically relevant experimental validation, and individualised clinical application are closely linked rather than organisationally and temporally separated is indicated by multi-omics-informed digital twins that are updated continuously with wearable-derived real-world data and interrogated using generative AI models trained on organoid and organ-on-chip-derived phenotypic readouts [3,26,41,42]. Sustained investment in individual technologies as well as the interoperable data infrastructure, standardised reporting standards, and cross-sector collaborative models required to connect them will be crucial to realise this ambition. Proactive attention to equitable access will be equally crucial, ensuring that the significant improvements in speed and precision provided by these advances result in therapeutic benefits that are widely accessible rather than exacerbating already-existing gaps in access to healthcare worldwide.

CONCLUSION

The convergence of computational, biological, and engineering innovation discussed throughout this review has radically changed the landscape of drug discovery and development. While computer-aided drug design techniques continue to offer the mechanistic rigour required to convert computational predictions into validated candidates, artificial intelligence, machine learning, and generative design tools are shortening early discovery timelines and increasing accessible chemical space. Supported by concurrent developments in nanomedicine-enabled delivery, the diversity of treatment modalities, including gene editing, RNA therapeutics, and tailored cell therapies, has greatly enlarged the accessible disease area beyond the reach of conventional small drugs. Translational predictivity is being improved by physiologically appropriate preclinical platforms such as organoids and organ-on-

a-chip systems, and more tailored and effective clinical development is being made possible by precision medicine, digital twins, and real-world evidence frameworks. However, for these breakthroughs to reach their full translational and societal potential, enduring issues with data quality, experimental validation capacity, distribution and manufacturing scalability, regulatory adaption, equality, and environmental sustainability must be resolved. To realise a more effective, predictive, and patient-centered future for drug discovery and development, computational scientists, medicinal chemists, biologists, physicians, and regulators must continue their interdisciplinary collaboration.

REFERENCES

1. DiMasi JA, Grabowski HG, Hansen RW. Innovation in the pharmaceutical industry: New estimates of R&D costs. *J Health Econ.* 2016; 47:20-33.
2. Paul SM, Mytelka DS, Dunwiddie CT, Persinger CC, Munos BH, Lindborg SR, et al. How to improve R&D productivity: the pharmaceutical industry's grand challenge. *Nat Rev Drug Discov.* 2010;9(3):203-214.
3. Mullooney MW, Duncan KR, Elsayed SS, Garg N, van der Hooft JJJ, Martin NI, et al. Artificial intelligence for natural product drug discovery. *Nat Rev Drug Discov.* 2023;22(11):895-916.
4. Chen W, Liu X, Zhang S, Chen S. Artificial intelligence for drug discovery: Resources, methods, and applications. *Mol Ther Nucleic Acids.* 2023; 31:691-702.
5. Gangwal A, Lavecchia A. Unleashing the power of generative AI in drug discovery. *Drug Discov Today.* 2024;29(6).
6. Blanco-González A, Cabezón A, Seco-González A, Conde-Torres D, Antelo-Riveiro P, Piñeiro Á, et al. The role of AI in drug discovery: challenges, opportunities, and strategies. *Pharmaceutics.* 2023;16(6):891.
7. Hasselgren C, Oprea TI. Artificial intelligence for drug discovery: are we there yet? *Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol.* 2024; 64:527-550.
8. Askr H, Elgeldawi E, Aboul Ella H, Elshaier YAMM, Gomaa MM, Hassanien AE. Deep learning in drug discovery: an integrative review and future challenges. *Artif Intell Rev.* 2023;56(7):5975-6037.
9. Carracedo-Reboredo P, Liñares-Blanco J, Rodríguez-Fernández N, Cedrón F, Novoa FJ, Carballal A, et al. A review on machine learning approaches and trends in drug discovery. *Comput Struct Biotechnol J.* 2021; 19:4538-4558.
10. Jiménez-Luna J, Grisoni F, Schneider G. Drug discovery with explainable artificial intelligence. *Nat Mach Intell.* 2020;2(10):573-584.
11. Vemula D, Jayasurya P, Sushmitha V, Kumar YN, Bhandari V. CADD, AI and ML in drug discovery: a comprehensive review. *Eur J Pharm Sci.* 2023; 181:106324.
12. Rudrapal M, Khairnar SJ, Jadhav AG. Virtual screening, molecular docking and QSAR studies in drug discovery and development programme. *J Drug Deliv Ther.* 2020;10(4):225-233.
13. Sabe VT, Ntombela T, Jhamba LA, Maguire GEM, Govender T, Naicker T, et al. Current trends in computer aided drug design and a highlight of drugs discovered via computational techniques: a review. *Eur J Med Chem.* 2021; 224:113705.
14. Schneider P, Walters WP, Plowright AT, Sieroka N, Listgarten J, Goodnow RA, et al. Rethinking drug design in the artificial intelligence era. *Nat Rev Drug Discov.* 2020;19(5):353-364.
15. Yang X, Wang Y, Byrne R, Schneider G, Yang S. Concepts of artificial intelligence for computer-assisted drug discovery. *Chem Rev.* 2019;119(18):10520-10594.
16. Advancing gene editing therapeutics: clinical trials and innovative delivery systems across diverse diseases. *Mol Ther.* 2025.
17. Vora LK, Gholap AD, Jetha K, Thakur RRS, Solanki HK, Chavda VP. Artificial intelligence in pharmaceutical technology and drug delivery design. *Pharmaceutics.* 2023;15(7):1916.
18. Hood L, Flores M. A personal view on systems medicine and the emergence of proactive P4 medicine: predictive, preventive, personalized and participatory. *N Biotechnol.* 2012;29(6):613-624.
19. Hopkins AL. Network pharmacology: the next paradigm in drug discovery. *Nat Chem Biol.* 2008;4(11):682-690.

20. Comprehensive review of CRISPR-based gene editing: mechanisms, challenges, and applications in cancer therapy. *Mol Cancer*. 2024;23.
21. Chen Z, Liu X, Hogan W, Shenkman E, Bian J. Applications of artificial intelligence in drug development using real-world data. *Drug Discov Today*. 2021;26(5):1256-1264.
22. DeVincenzo J, Lambkin-Williams R, Wilkinson T, Cehelsky J, Nochur S, Walsh E, et al. A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study of an RNAi-based therapy directed against respiratory syncytial virus. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2010;107(19):8800-8805.
23. RNAi-based drug design: considerations and future directions. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*. 2024.
24. Chien KR, Foo KS. Towards mRNA therapeutics 2.0. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*. 2026.
25. Human organoids as 3D in vitro platforms for drug discovery: opportunities and challenges. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*. 2025.
26. Integrating organoids and organ-on-a-chip devices. *Nat Rev Bioeng*. 2024.
27. Ren Y, et al. 3D bioprinting for engineering organoids and organ-on-a-chip: developments and applications. *Med Res Rev*. 2025.
28. Edington CD, Chen WLK, Geishecker E, Kassis T, Soenksen LR, Bhushan BM, et al. Interconnected microphysiological systems for quantitative biology and pharmacology studies. *Sci Rep*. 2018; 8:4530.
29. Organoids and organs-on-chips: recent advances, applications in drug development, and regulatory challenges. *Drug Discov Today*. 2025.
30. Xu L, Wang X, Liu Y, Yang G, Falconer RJ, Zhao CX. Lipid nanoparticles for drug delivery. *Adv NanoBiomed Res*. 2022;2(2):2100109.
31. Sivadasan D, Sultan MH, Madkhali O, Almoshari Y, Thangavel N. Polymeric lipid hybrid nanoparticles (PLNs) as emerging drug delivery platform—a comprehensive review of their properties, preparation methods, and therapeutic applications. *Pharmaceutics*. 2021;13(8):1291.
32. Lipid nanoparticles in drug delivery: advances, challenges, and clinical prospects. *J Drug Des Med Chem*. 2025.
33. A systematic review of advanced drug delivery systems: engineering strategies, barrier penetration, and clinical progress (2016-2025). *Pharmaceutics*. 2025.
34. FDA-NIH Biomarker Working Group. BEST (Biomarkers, EndpointS, and other Tools) Resource. Silver Spring (MD): Food and Drug Administration; Bethesda (MD): National Institutes of Health; 2016.
35. Winter NR, Blanke J, Leenings R, Ernsting J, Fisch L, Sarink K, et al. A systematic evaluation of machine learning-based biomarkers for major depressive disorder. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2024;81(4):386-395.
36. Collins FS, Varmus H. A new initiative on precision medicine. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;372(9):793-795.
37. Advancing precision medicine: a review of innovative in silico approaches for drug development, clinical pharmacology and personalized healthcare. *Pharmaceutics*. 2024.
38. Relling MV, Evans WE. Pharmacogenomics in the clinic. *Nature*. 2015;526(7573):343-350.
39. Dunn J, Runge R, Snyder M. Wearables and the medical revolution. *Per Med*. 2018;15(5):429-448.
40. Pushpakom S, Iorio F, Eyers PA, Escott KJ, Hopper S, Wells A, et al. Drug repurposing: progress, challenges and recommendations. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*. 2019;18(1):41-58.
41. Björnsson B, Borrebaeck C, Elander N, Gasslander T, Gawel DR, Gustafsson M, et al. Digital twins to personalize medicine. *Genome Med*. 2020; 12:4.
42. Utilization of precision medicine digital twins for drug discovery in Alzheimer's disease. *Front Pharmacol / Alzheimers Dement*. 2025.
43. Sherman RE, Anderson SA, Dal Pan GJ, Gray GW, Gross T, Hunter NL, et al. Real-world evidence - what is it and what can it tell us? *N Engl J Med*. 2016;375(23):2293-2297.
44. Franklin JM, Schneeweiss S. When and how can real world data analyses substitute for randomized controlled trials? *Clin Pharmacol Ther*. 2017;102(6):924-933.
45. Woodcock J, LaVange LM. Master protocols to study multiple therapies, multiple diseases, or both. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;377(1):62-70.
46. Sheldon RA. The E factor 25 years on: the rise of green chemistry and sustainability. *Green Chem*. 2017;19(1):18-43.
47. Vamathevan J, Clark D, Czodrowski P, Dunham I, Ferran E, Lee G, et al. Applications of machine

- learning in drug discovery and development. *Nat Rev Drug Discov.* 2019;18(6):463-477.
48. Basile AO, Yahi A, Tatonetti NP. Artificial intelligence for drug toxicity and safety. *Trends Pharmacol Sci.* 2019;40(9):624-635.
49. Kumar V, Faheem M, Lee KW, et al. A decade of machine learning-based predictive models for human pharmacokinetics: advances and challenges. *Drug Discov Today.* 2022;27(2):529-537.
50. Jumper J, Evans R, Pritzel A, Green T, Figurnov M, Ronneberger O, et al. Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. *Nature.* 2021;596(7873):583-589.
51. Stokes JM, Yang K, Swanson K, Jin W, Cubillos-Ruiz A, Donghia NM, et al. A deep learning approach to antibiotic discovery. *Cell.* 2020;180(4):688-702.
52. Docking, virtual high throughput screening and in silico fragment-based drug design. *J Cell Mol Med.* 2009;13(2):238-248.
53. Fragment-based drug discovery and virtual screening approaches in early hit identification. *Expert Opin Drug Discov.* 2020.
54. Roy K, Kar S, Das RN. Statistical methods in QSAR/QSPR. In: *A Primer on QSAR/QSPR Modeling.* Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2015. p. 37-59.
55. Rudrapal M, Chetia D. QSAR study of trioxane derivatives as antimalarial agents. *Curr Trends Pharm Res.* 2016;3(1):1-17.
56. Ooms F. Molecular modeling and computer aided drug design. Examples of their applications in medicinal chemistry. *Curr Med Chem.* 2000;7(2):141-158.
57. Pharmacophore and docking-based sequential virtual screening for the identification of novel sigma 1 receptor ligands. *Bioorg Med Chem.* 2019.
58. Virtual fragment screening for DNA repair inhibitors in vast chemical space. *Nat Commun.* 2025.
59. Goodnow RA Jr, Dumelin CE, Keefe AD. DNA-encoded chemistry: enabling the deeper sampling of chemical space. *Nat Rev Drug Discov.* 2017;16(2):131-147.
60. Jinek M, Chylinski K, Fonfara I, Hauer M, Doudna JA, Charpentier E. A programmable dual-RNA-guided DNA endonuclease in adaptive bacterial immunity. *Science.* 2012;337(6096):816-821.
61. Doudna JA, Charpentier E. The new frontier of genome engineering with CRISPR-Cas9. *Science.* 2014;346(6213):1258096.
62. Frangoul H, Altshuler D, Cappellini MD, Chen YS, Domm J, Eustace BK, et al. CRISPR-Cas9 gene editing for sickle cell disease and beta-thalassemia. *N Engl J Med.* 2021;384(3):252-260.
63. RNA chemistry and therapeutics. *Nat Rev Drug Discov.* 2025.
64. Khvorova A, Watts JK. The chemical evolution of oligonucleotide therapies of clinical utility. *Nat Biotechnol.* 2017;35(3):238-248.
65. Jayaraman M, Ansell SM, Mui BL, Tam YK, Chen J, Du X, et al. Maximizing the potency of siRNA lipid nanoparticles for hepatic gene silencing in vivo. *Angew Chem Int Ed Engl.* 2012;51(34):8529-8533.
66. Karikó K, Buckstein M, Ni H, Weissman D. Suppression of RNA recognition by Toll-like receptors: the impact of nucleoside modification and the evolutionary origin of RNA. *Immunity.* 2005;23(2):165-175.
67. Pardi N, Hogan MJ, Porter FW, Weissman D. mRNA vaccines - a new era in vaccinology. *Nat Rev Drug Discov.* 2018;17(4):261-279.
68. June CH, Sadelain M. Chimeric antigen receptor therapy. *N Engl J Med.* 2018;379(1):64-73.
69. Maude SL, Laetsch TW, Buechner J, Rives S, Boyer M, Bittencourt H, et al. Tisagenlecleucel in children and young adults with B-cell lymphoblastic leukemia. *N Engl J Med.* 2018;378(5):439-448.
70. Kalluri R, LeBleu VS. The biology, function, and biomedical applications of exosomes. *Science.* 2020;367(6478):eaau6977.
71. Wiklander OPB, Brennan MÁ, Lötvall J, Breakefield XO, El Andaloussi S. Advances in therapeutic applications of extracellular vesicles. *Sci Transl Med.* 2019;11(492):eaav8521.
72. Advancing precision medicine: a review of innovative in silico approaches for drug development, clinical pharmacology and personalized healthcare. *Pharmaceutics.* 2024;12(3).
73. Darrow JJ, Avorn J, Kesselheim AS. New FDA breakthrough-drug category - implications for patients. *N Engl J Med.* 2014;370(13):1252-1258.

74. Askr H, Elgeldawi E, Aboul Ella H, Elshaier YAMM, Gomaa MM, Hassanien AE. Deep learning in drug discovery: an integrative review and future challenges. *Artif Intell Rev.* 2023; 56:5975-6037.
75. McGibbon M, Shave S, Dong J, Somnath S, Vass H, Grant SGN, et al. From intuition to AI: evolution of small molecule representations in drug discovery. *Brief Bioinform.* 2024;25(1):bbad422.
76. Zhu F, Li XX, Yang SY, Chen YZ. Clinical success of drug targets prospectively predicted by in silico study. *Trends Pharmacol Sci.* 2018;39(3):229-231.
77. Aliper A, Kudrin R, Polykovskiy D, Kamya P, Tutubalina E, Chen S, et al. Prediction of clinical trials outcomes based on target choice and clinical trial design with multi-modal artificial intelligence. *Clin Pharmacol Ther.* 2023;114(5):972-980.
78. wwPDB Consortium. Protein Data Bank: the single global archive for 3D macromolecular structure data. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2019;47(D1):D520-D528.
79. Zhavoronkov A, Ivanenkov YA, Aliper A, Veselov MS, Aladinskiy VA, Aladinskaya AV, et al. Deep learning enables rapid identification of potent DDR1 kinase inhibitors. *Nat Biotechnol.* 2019;37(9):1038-1040.
80. Karger E, Kureljusic M. Using artificial intelligence for drug discovery: a bibliometric study and future research agenda. *Pharmaceuticals.* 2022;15(12):1492.
81. Gaulton A, Bellis LJ, Bento AP, Chambers J, Davies M, Hersey A, et al. ChEMBL: a large-scale bioactivity database for drug discovery. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2012;40(D1):D1100-D1107.
82. Ashburn TT, Thor KB. Drug repositioning: identifying and developing new uses for existing drugs. *Nat Rev Drug Discov.* 2004;3(8):673-683.
83. Constable DJC, Jimenez-Gonzalez C, Henderson RK. Perspective on solvent use in the pharmaceutical industry. *Org Process Res Dev.* 2007;11(1):133-137.
84. Anastas PT, Warner JC. *Green Chemistry: Theory and Practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1998.
85. Topol EJ. High-performance medicine: the convergence of human and artificial intelligence. *Nat Med.* 2019;25(1):44-56.
86. Barabási AL, Gulbahce N, Loscalzo J. Network medicine: a network-based approach to human disease. *Nat Rev Genet.* 2011;12(1):56-68.
87. Vatansever S, Schlessinger A, Wacker D, Kaniskan HÜ, Jin J, Zhou MM, et al. Artificial intelligence and machine learning-aided drug discovery in central nervous system diseases: state-of-the-arts and future directions. *Med Res Rev.* 2021;41(3):1427-1473.
88. Rossi G, Manfrin A, Lutolf MP. Progress and potential in organoid research. *Nat Rev Genet.* 2018;19(11):671-687.
89. Takebe T, Enomura M, Yoshizawa E, Kimura M, Koike H, Ueno Y, et al. Vascularized and complex organ buds from diverse tissues via mesenchymal cell-driven condensation. *Cell Stem Cell.* 2015;16(5):556-565.
90. Park SE, Georgescu A, Huh D. Organoids-on-a-chip. *Science.* 2019;364(6444):960-965.
91. Zhang YS, Arneri A, Bersini S, Shin SR, Zhu K, Goli-Malekabadi Z, et al. Bioprinting 3D microfibrillar scaffolds for engineering endothelialized myocardium and heart-on-a-chip. *Biomaterials.* 2016; 110:45-59.
92. Zuckerman JE, Davis ME. Clinical experiences with systemically administered siRNA-based therapeutics in cancer. *Nat Rev Drug Discov.* 2015;14(12):843-856.
93. Paul D, Sanap G, Shenoy S, Kalyane D, Kalia K, Tekade RK. Artificial intelligence in drug discovery and development. *Drug Discov Today.* 2021;26(1):80-93.
94. Davis ME, Zuckerman JE, Choi CH, Seligson D, Tolcher A, Alabi CA, et al. Evidence of RNAi in humans from systemically administered siRNA via targeted nanoparticles. *Nature.* 2010;464(7291):1067-1070.
95. Sacks LV, Shamsuddin HH, Yasinskaya YI, Bouri K, Lanthier ML, Sherman RE. Scientific and regulatory reasons for delay and denial of FDA approval of initial applications for new drugs, 2000-2012. *JAMA.* 2014;311(4):378-384.

Cite: Sanmay Yadav*, Abhishek Doshi, Sarthak Kole, Mayuri Kore, Sneha Dhekane, Innovative Strategies in Modern Drug Discovery and Development, *Int. J. Med. Pharm. Sci.*, 2026, 2 (10), 219-240. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23233627>