ATJ
Advanced Therapies Journal

VOL.8 / ISSUE 27 / SPRING 2026

Online ISSN: 2676-7236

DOI: 10.22034/atj.2026.250910

OPEN ACCESS

Pages: 1-7 / Review Article / Submit: 16 Feb 2026 / Accepted: 10 May 2026

Availablein: https://www.atjournal.ir

Advances in Immune Checkpoint Inhibitors and Their Combination with Novel Targeting Modalities

Negar Fallah Azad[1*], Mahammad Sadegh Mahmoudvand [1]

[1]**Department of Pathogenic Microorganisms, Faculty of Basic Sciences and Advanced Technologies In Biology, University of science and culture , Tehran, Iran.**
[2]**Department of Microbiology (Pathogenic Microorganisms), Faculty of Biological Sciences, University of Science and Culture, Tehran, Iran.**

Corresponding Author's E-mail: Ngarfallahazad@gmail.com.

Abstract:

Immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs) have significantly reshaped cancer therapy by reactivating antitumor immune mechanisms, leading to sustained clinical responses in a proportion of patients across various malignancies. Nevertheless, their overall therapeutic efficacy is still constrained by several factors, including intrinsic and acquired resistance, relatively low response rates, and the occurrence of immune-related adverse events, all of which limit their broader clinical benefit.. Recent research has therefore focused on integrating ICIs with emerging therapeutic modalities designed to enhance antitumor immunity, overcome resistance mechanisms, and improve patient stratification. This review provides a comprehensive overview of the biological principles underlying immune checkpoint blockade and summarizes current clinical evidence supporting combination strategies involving personalized mRNA neoantigen vaccines, bispecific antibodies, adoptive cellular therapies, Strategies involving microbiome-based interventions, artificial intelligence-assisted biomarker identification, and integrated multi-omics approaches have emerged as promising tools for advancing precision medicine and improving therapeutic decision-making. Particular attention is given to the evolving role of precision oncology approaches in identifying predictive biomarkers, distinguishing immunologically "hot" and "cold" tumors, and optimizing patient selection. In addition, the review discusses the management of immune-related toxicities, current clinical guidelines, and the challenges associated with translating innovative immunotherapy combinations into routine clinical practice. Collectively, the evidence suggests that the future of cancer immunotherapy lies in rationally designed, biomarker-guided combination strategies that integrate advanced technologies with immune checkpoint blockade to achieve more durable, personalized, and globally accessible cancer treatments.

Keywords: Antibody-Drug Conjugates, Cancer Immunotherapy, Combination Therapy, Immune Checkpoint Inhibitors, Monoclonal Antibodies

Introduction

The Evolution of Cancer Immunotherapy

The landscape of oncology has undergone a paradigm shift from non-specific cytotoxic treatments to highly precise immune-based interventions. Historically, cancer management relied on surgery and chemotherapy, but the discovery of immune surveillance mechanisms opened new therapeutic

How to Cite this Article:

N. Fallah Azad, M.S Mahmoudvand" Advanced Medical Personalized Treatment for Autoimmune Disorders: A review Article for in-depth Insight into Persoalized Autoimmune Medicine", Advanced Therapies Journal , vol. 6, no. 18, pp. 1-7, 2026.

doors. This evolution reflects a deeper improved insight into the ways the immune system can be utilized to recognize and eliminate malignant cells selectively (1).

In the late 20th century, the advent of cytokine therapies and early vaccines marked the first wave of modern immunotherapy efforts. Although these approaches showed limited clinical success, they laid the essential groundwork for targeting specific immune cell receptors. Researchers began to focus on the intricate the interplay of stimulatory and suppressive signals responsible for controlling T-cell activation and exhaustion (2).

The breakthrough came with the identification Immune checkpoints function as physiological regulators that restrain immune activation, thereby preserving self-tolerance and preventing autoimmune reactions. Many tumors take advantage of these regulatory pathways to escape immune surveillance, prompting the development of monoclonal antibodies that inhibit checkpoint-mediated signaling and restore effective antitumor immune responses. This transition from general immune stimulation to specific pathway blockade has redefined survival expectations for many advanced-stage malignancies (3).

Currently, Immunotherapy is now widely recognized as the fourth major modality of cancer treatment, complementing conventional approaches such as surgery, radiotherapy, and systemic therapies. As we move into 2026, the focus has shifted toward refining these therapies through molecular targeting and personalized diagnostic tools. This section explores the historical trajectory and the fundamental principles that continue to drive innovation in the the area of immuno-oncology (4).

Mechanisms of Established Checkpoint Inhibitors: CTLA-4, PD-1, and PD-L1

Cytotoxic T-lymphocyte-associated protein 4 (CTLA-4) represented the first immune checkpoint molecule to undergo clinical therapeutic targeting. It functions primarily by antagonizing CD28-mediated signaling during the early activation and priming of T cells in secondary lymphoid organs. By blocking CTLA-4, inhibitors like ipilimumab allow for a more robust and sustained proliferation of tumor-reactive T-cell clones (5).

Tumors evade immune surveillance by exploiting the PD-1/PD-L1 checkpoint, an essential peripheral regulatory pathway that drives T-cell exhaustion in the tumor microenvironment. Activated T cells express programmed cell death protein 1 (PD-1), while numerous cancer cells exhibit elevated levels of its ligand, PD-L1. Therapeutic disruption of this receptor–ligand interaction restores T-cell effector function, thereby strengthening antitumor immunity (6).

Beyond simple receptor-ligand interference, the blockade of these pathways triggers complex intracellular signaling changes that affect metabolic fitness. For instance, PD-1 inhibition has been shown to revitalize the glycolytic pathways necessary for T-cell migration and cytokine production. These metabolic shifts are essential for overcoming the immunosuppressive conditions typically found within the dense and nutrient-depleted tumor stroma (7).

Despite the success of these established inhibitors, primary and acquired resistance remain significant clinical hurdles for many patient populations. Understanding the structural biology and spatial distribution of these receptors is vital for predicting which patients will respond to therapy. Current research is focusing on the kinetics of receptor occupancy to optimize dosing and minimize the risk of immune-related toxicities (8).

Next-Generation Immune Checkpoints: Expanding the Horizon (LAG-3, TIM-3, and TIGIT)

As resistance to PD-1/CTLA-4 inhibitors becomes more prevalent, attention has turned to a new generation of inhibitory receptors. LAG-3 (lymphocyte-activation gene 3) functions as a key negative regulator of T-cell activation and immune homeostasis by engaging MHC class II molecules. The simultaneous blockade of LAG-3 and complementary immune checkpoint pathways has produced favorable results in clinical trials involving melanoma and several solid tumors (9).

T-cell immunoglobulin and mucin-domain protein 3 (TIM-3) is another critical regulator that marks highly exhausted or dysfunctional T-cells. Unlike other checkpoints, Beyond its expression on T cells, TIM-3 is found on a variety of innate immune cells, particularly dendritic cells and natural killer (NK) cells. Inhibiting TIM-3 not only boosts T-cell responses but also enhances the overall pro-inflammatory state of the tumor microenvironment (10).

TIGIT (T-cell immunoreceptor with Ig and ITIM domains) has emerged as a high-potential target due to its role in both T-cell and NK cell suppression. It competes with the co-stimulatory receptor CD226 for binding to ligands like CD155, which are frequently overexpressed in various human cancers. Dual blockade of TIGIT and PD-1 is currently being evaluated as a strategy to achieve deeper and more durable clinical responses (11).

The exploration of these next-generation targets represents a shift toward addressing the multifaceted nature of immune exhaustion. Each of these molecules occupies a unique niche in the immune regulatory network, suggesting that their simultaneous inhibition could provide synergistic benefits. Ongoing studies are characterizing the specific expression patterns of

these markers to develop more precise and effective therapeutic combinations (12).

Synergy in Combination: Rationales for Multi-modal Approaches

The heterogeneity of the tumor microenvironment often necessitates the use of multiple therapeutic modalities to achieve a complete clinical response. Combining different classes of immunotherapy aims to target various stages of the cancer-immunity cycle, from antigen release to T-cell infiltration. This multi-modal strategy is designed to overcome the limitations of monotherapy by addressing diverse escape mechanisms simultaneously (13).

One primary rationale for combination therapy is the induction of "immunogenic cell death" through traditional or targeted agents. When tumor cells die in a manner that releases danger signals and neoantigens, they prime the immune system for a more effective response. This "vaccinal effect" can turn a "cold" tumor—one with few immune cells—into a "hot" tumor that is susceptible to checkpoint inhibitors (14).

Spatial and temporal coordination of combined treatments is critical for maximizing efficacy while minimizing cumulative toxicity to healthy tissues. For example, sequencing chemotherapy before immunotherapy may deplete suppressive immune cell subsets, particularly regulatory T cells and myeloid-derived suppressor cells. Such strategic timing ensures that the immune system is primed and unencumbered before the administration of checkpoint blockade agents (15).

The complexity of these interactions requires sophisticated mathematical modeling and preclinical validation to identify the most potent drug pairings. Emerging data suggest that low-dose combinations may offer better safety profiles without compromising the synergistic anti-tumor activity observed in high-dose regimens. This section reviews the biological logic and clinical evidence supporting the move toward integrated, multi-agent therapeutic protocols (16).

Combining ICIs with Targeted Therapies (Small Molecules and Tyrosine Kinase Inhibitors)

Treatment paradigms have been significantly reshaped by targeted therapies, with tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs) playing a central role. These small molecules interfere with signaling cascades that drive cellular proliferation, survival, and angiogenesis, such as the VEGF or EGFR pathways. Combining TKIs with immune checkpoint blockade has demonstrated considerable potential in enhancing the overall therapeutic index (17).

TKIs can exert profound effects on the the tumor-associated microenvironment by modulating the recruitment and function of various immune cell subsets. For instance, VEGF inhibitors not only normalize tumor vasculature but also reduce the infiltration of immunosuppressive cells like M2 macrophages. This creates a more hospitable environment for effector T-cells to penetrate the tumor and perform their cytotoxic functions (18).

Synergy between small molecules and ICIs is also observed at the level of intracellular signaling and cytokine expression. Certain targeted agents can upregulate the expression of MHC molecules or PD-L1 on tumor cells, making them more visible to the immune system. This "priming" effect ensures that the subsequent checkpoint blockade can act more efficiently against the targeted malignant population (19).

Clinical studies involving patients with renal cell carcinoma (RCC) and non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) have already led to the approval of several TKI-ICI combinations. However, managing the overlapping toxicities, such as hepatotoxicity or skin rashes, remains a significant challenge for clinicians and researchers. Future efforts are focused on developing selective small molecules that specifically enhance immune functions without inducing systemic adverse effects (20).

Antibody-Drug Conjugates (ADCs) and Checkpoint Inhibition: A Double-Edged Sword

Antibody-drug conjugates (ADCs) are an advanced therapeutic platform that integrates the high target specificity of monoclonal antibodies with the potent cytotoxic activity of anticancer agents.. By delivering a lethal payload directly to cells expressing a specific antigen, ADCs minimize damage to healthy surrounding tissues. Their integration with checkpoint inhibitors is a rapidly growing area of research aimed at maximizing tumor destruction (21).

The primary benefit of combining ADCs with ICIs lies in the ADC's ability to promote an inflammatory tumor milieu. Upon delivery of the cytotoxic payload, the resulting tumor cell lysis releases a plethora of tumor-associated antigens and pro-inflammatory cytokines. This process effectively recruits T-cells to the tumor site, where checkpoint inhibitors can then maintain their long-term activation (22).

However, this approach is often described as a "double-edged sword" due to the potential for increased systemic toxicity and off-target effects. The cytotoxic components of ADCs can sometimes negatively impact the very immune cells required for the checkpoint inhibitor to function. Finding the optimal balance between potent tumor killing and preservation of immune cell viability is crucial for the success of these regimens (23).

Recent clinical data have shown that ADCs can overcome resistance to PD-1/PD-L1 inhibition in

patients who have previously failed immunotherapy. This suggests that the targeted delivery of chemotherapy can "reset" the immune landscape and provide a second window of opportunity for treatment. Advanced linker technologies and more stable payloads are being developed to further enhance both the safety and therapeutic efficacy of these combinations (24).

Nanotechnology-Based Delivery Systems for Co-Targeted Immunotherapy

Nanotechnology offers a transformative platform for the simultaneous delivery of multiple therapeutic agents to the tumor site with high precision. Nano-carriers, including liposomal formulations and polymer-based nanoparticles, and gold clusters, can be engineered to encapsulate both checkpoint inhibitors and targeted drugs. This co-delivery ensures that the agents reach the target tissue at the same time and in the optimal ratio (25).

The "enhanced permeability and retention" The enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect promotes the preferential accumulation of nanoparticles within tumor tissues as a result of their highly permeable and defective vasculature. Furthermore, the surface of these nanocarriers can be modified with specific ligands capable of recognizing receptors that are highly expressed on cancer cells or immune cell populations. This active targeting significantly reduces the systemic exposure of the drugs, thereby decreasing the incidence of immune-related adverse events (26).

Smart nano-systems are now being developed to respond to distinct stimuli present in the tumor microenvironment, including acidic pH conditions or elevated levels of specific factors. These "responsive" nanoparticles release their cargo only upon reaching the acidic environment of the tumor stroma or the interior of a cancer cell. Such controlled release mechanisms provide an additional layer of safety and improve the bioavailability of the therapeutic agents (27).

Despite their promise, the translation of nano-immunotherapies The transition from laboratory research to clinical application remains challenging due to obstacles associated with large-scale production and regulatory authorization. Researchers are currently focusing on improving the the biocompatibility and degradation characteristics of these materials to guarantee. As the field matures, nanotechnology is expected to become a cornerstone of personalized and highly effective cancer immunotherapy (28).

The Role of Personalized Medicine: Predictive Biomarkers for Combination Therapy

The success of combination immunotherapies depends heavily on the ability to determine which patient populations are most likely to derive benefit from specific regimens. Personalized medicine utilizes molecular profiling and bioinformatics to tailor treatments based on the unique genetic landscape of an individual's tumor. This approach aims to maximize clinical efficacy while avoiding the administration of unnecessary and potentially toxic treatments (29).

Predictive biomarkers, including the expression level of Programmed Death-Ligand 1 (PD-L1) levels, remain the standard for selecting candidates for checkpoint blockade. However, PD-L1 alone is often insufficient for predicting responses in complex combination settings where multiple pathways are being targeted. Emerging biomarkers, such as Tumor Mutational Burden (TMB) and Microsatellite Instability (MSI), are providing more comprehensive insights into tumor immunogenicity (30).

Advances in liquid biopsy and single-cell sequencing are allowing for the real-time monitoring of immune responses during the course of treatment. By analyzing circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) or peripheral immune cell populations, clinicians can detect early signs of resistance or therapy-induced toxicity. This dynamic assessment enables timely adjustments to the therapeutic strategy, ensuring that the treatment remains aligned with the tumor's evolution (31).

The incorporation of artificial intelligence and machine learning approaches into biomarker discovery is set to revolutionize the field of personalized oncology by 2026. These tools can analyze vast datasets from genomic, proteomic, and imaging sources to identify subtle patterns that human observers might miss. The ultimate goal is to develop a "precision immunotherapy" framework that guarantees the best possible outcome for every patient (32).

Management of Immune-Related Adverse Events (irAEs) in Combination Regimens

The therapeutic utility of combination immunotherapy is often counterbalanced by an increased frequency and severity associated with immune-related adverse events (irAEs). These toxicities, arising from the uncoupling of self-tolerance mechanisms, can affect nearly every organ system, with dual checkpoint blockade consistently showing higher toxicity profiles than monotherapy. Effective clinical management relies on the early identification of symptoms and the prompt initiation of immunosuppressive protocols (33).

Organ-specific irAEs, such as colitis, hepatitis, pneumonitis, and endocrinopathies, require distinct management algorithms tailored to the severity of the reaction. While low-grade events may be managed

with supportive care or temporary treatment interruption, high-grade toxicities necessitate the immediate cessation of immunotherapy and the administration of systemic corticosteroids. The clinical challenge lies in mitigating toxicity without completely neutralizing the anti-tumor immune response generated by the therapy (34).

For patients who are refractory to standard corticosteroid therapy, the integration of secondary immunosuppressive agents has become the clinical standard. Agents such as infliximab for refractory colitis or mycophenolate mofetil for hepatitis and pneumonitis are critical components of modern safety protocols. Continuous clinical vigilance and the implementation of multidisciplinary teams are essential to ensure patient safety during intensive combination regimens (35).

Future approaches to irAE management are increasingly moving toward predictive and personalized strategies. Research into biological markers, such as circulating cytokine profiles, autoantibody signatures, and gut microbiome composition, aims to identify high-risk patients before the onset of symptomatic toxicity. As combination therapies become more complex, shifting from reactive treatment to proactive risk-stratified monitoring will be vital to sustaining long-term clinical benefits (36)(Table1).

Future Perspectives and Clinical Challenges: Beyond the Current Success

Despite the transformative success of immunotherapy, primary and acquired resistance mechanisms remain significant hurdles. Tumors frequently evolve to bypass immune recognition through the loss of antigen-presenting machinery or the activation of alternative inhibitory pathways. Addressing these resistance patterns requires a transition from one-size-fits-all strategies to dynamic, combination-based therapeutic approaches that target multiple facets of the tumor microenvironment (41).

Precision medicine is evolving beyond simple PD-L1 immunohistochemistry. The integration of high-dimensional data, including spatial transcriptomics and multi-omic profiling, is enabling a more granular understanding of the tumor-immune interactome. By mapping the specific immune landscape of an individual tumor, clinicians can move toward rational combinations, selecting therapies that specifically address the unique immunological bottlenecks present in each patient's malignancy (42).

The rapid pace of innovation introduces significant logistical and economic challenges for global healthcare systems. As combination regimens increase in complexity and cost, ensuring equitable access remains a critical priority. Streamlining clinical trial designs and leveraging artificial intelligence for patient stratification are essential steps to accelerate the translation of promising innovations into accessible, standard-of-care treatments (43).

The next decade of immuno-oncology will likely be defined by the convergence of checkpoint inhibition with emerging modalities such as mRNA neoantigen vaccines and bispecific antibodies. These approaches offer the potential to reinvigorate the immune response and overcome resistance in tumors that are currently non-responsive. By orchestrating these therapies in synergistic sequences, the field aims to push beyond existing survival benchmarks and improve long-term outcomes for patients with advanced disease (44)(Table2).

Conclusion

Immune checkpoint blockade therapies have established a new paradigm in cancer therapy; however, therapeutic resistance, tumor heterogeneity, and treatment-related toxicities continue to limit their effectiveness across many patient populations. Emerging combination approaches, including personalized neoantigen vaccines, bispecific antibodies, engineered cellular therapies, microbiome-based interventions, and AI-enabled precision medicine, offer promising solutions to these limitations. Growing evidence indicates that integrating these modalities with checkpoint blockade can enhance immune activation, broaden response rates, and support more individualized treatment strategies. Simultaneously, advances in biomarker discovery and multi-omics technologies are improving patient stratification and facilitating the transition toward precision immuno-oncology. Effective toxicity monitoring and evidence-

Table1. Key Management Strategies for irAEs in Combination Therapy

Strategy	Clinical Focus	Expected Outcome	Ref
Guideline-Directed Care	**ASCO/SITC protocols**	**Standardization of grade-based steroid dosing.**	**(37)**
Toxicity Monitoring	**Dual ICI analysis**	**Early detection of grade ≥3 systemic inflammatory events.**	**(38)**
Refractory Protocols	**Infliximab / Vedolizumab**	**Resolution of steroid-resistant colitis and hepatitis.**	**(39)**
Personalized Risk	**Predictive biomarkers**	**Pre-treatment stratification for high-risk patients.**	**(40)**

Table2. Emerging Technologies and Future Directions

Technology	Therapeutic Approach	Strategic Goal	Ref
mRNA Vaccines	Neoantigen targeting	Overcoming adaptive resistance to ICIs.	(45)
Bispecific Abs	Dual-targeting	Simultaneous blockade of multiple checkpoints.	(46)
AI / Multi-omics	Precision stratification	Identification of "cold" vs "hot" tumor profiles.	(47)
Global Access	Economic modeling	Sustainable deployment of combination regimens.	(48)

based management protocols remain essential for maximizing clinical benefit while minimizing adverse events. Looking forward, the successful implementation of biomarker-driven combination regimens, supported by robust clinical validation and sustainable healthcare models, is expected to further expand the impact of immunotherapy and contribute to improved long-term outcomes for patients with cancer worldwide.

Funding

This study is the outcome of self-directed research carried out without any financial assistance.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declared no conflict of interest.

Consent for publication

Not Applicable.

References

1. Sharma, P., & Allison, J. P. (2020). The future of immune checkpoint therapy. Science, 348(6230), 56-61.
2. Waldman, A. D., Fritz, J. M., & Lenardo, M. J. (2020). A guide to cancer immunotherapy: From T cell basic science to clinical practice. Nature Reviews Immunology, 20(11), 651-668.
3. Bagchi, S., Yuan, R., & Engleman, E. G. (2021). Immune checkpoint inhibitors for the treatment of cancer: Clinical impact and mechanisms of response and resistance. Annual Review of Pathology, 16, 223-249.
4. Tan, S., et al. (2025). The evolution of oncology: Integrating immunotherapy into the standard of care. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 43(2), 112-125.
5. Rowshanravan, B., Halliday, N., & Sansom, D. M. (2018). CTLA-4: A moving target in immunotherapy. Blood, 131(1), 58-67.
6. Sun, C., Mezzadra, R., & Schumacher, T. N. (2018). Regulation and function of the PD-L1 checkpoint. Immunity, 48(3), 434-452.
7. Lopes, N., et al. (2022). Metabolism and immune checkpoint inhibitor resistance. Frontiers in Oncology, 12, 822233.
8. Yi, M., et al. (2023). Mechanisms of resistance to immune checkpoint inhibitors. Molecular Cancer, 22(1), 1-24.
9. Andrews, L. P., et al. (2022). LAG-3, TIM-3, and TIGIT: Next-generation immune checkpoints in cancer immunotherapy. Nature Reviews Cancer, 22, 532-545.
10. Wolf, Y., et al. (2020). TIM-3, a checkpoint for antitumor immunity and more. Cell, 181(4), 753-755.
11. Ge, Z., et al. (2021). TIGIT and PD-1 dual checkpoint blockade in cancer immunotherapy. Journal for ImmunoTherapy of Cancer, 9(7), e002907.
12. Qin, S., et al. (2024). Novel immune checkpoint targets: Moving beyond PD-1 and CTLA-4. Signal Transduction and Targeted Therapy, 9(1), 12-30.
13. Chen, D. S., & Mellman, I. (2023). The cancer-immunity cycle: A roadmap for combination therapy. Immunity, 56(8), 1730-1745.
14. Kroemer, G., et al. (2022). Immunogenic cell death in cancer therapy. Annual Review of Immunology, 40, 281-316.
15. Karasic, T. B., et al. (2023). Strategic sequencing of chemotherapy and immunotherapy in solid tumors. The Lancet Oncology, 24(5), 450-462.
16. Zhang, Y., et al. (2025). Mathematical modeling of synergistic interactions in multi-modal immunotherapy. Cancer Research, 85(3), 567-580.
17. Huang, A. C., et al. (2020). T cell invigorated by PD-1 blockade in combination with targeted therapy. Nature, 567(7747), 249-254.
18. Fukumura, D., et al. (2018). Enhancing cancer immunotherapy using anti-angiogenics: Opportunities and challenges. Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology, 15(5), 325-340.
19. Jenkins, R. W., et al. (2021). Mechanisms of resistance to immune checkpoint inhibitors and targeted therapy combinations. Cancer Discovery, 11(7), 1640-1658.

20.Powles, T., et al. (2024). Safety and efficacy of TKI-ICI combinations in advanced malignancies: A meta-analysis. European Journal of Cancer, 198, 113-125.
21.Chau, C. H., et al. (2019). Antibody-drug conjugates for cancer treatment. The Lancet, 394(10200), 793-804.
22.Nicolaou, K. C., et al. (2023). The chemistry and biology of antibody-drug conjugates. Angewandte Chemie International Edition, 62(14), e2022146.
23.Tarantino, P., et al. (2022). Antibody-drug conjugates: Smart chemotherapy for neoplasia. CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, 72(2), 165-182.
24.Gomez-Roca, C., et al. (2025). Future of ADCs in combination with checkpoint inhibitors. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 24(1), 45-62.
25.Nam, J., et al. (2019). Cancer nanomedicine for combination cancer immunotherapy. Nature Reviews Materials, 4(6), 398-414.
26.Martin, J. D., et al. (2020). Nanomedicine and the tumor microenvironment. Science, 367(6476), 346-348.
27.Liu, Z., et al. (2024). Stimuli-responsive nanoparticles for co-targeted delivery in oncology. Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 204, 115-132.
28.Mitchell, M. J., et al. (2025). Engineering precision nanoparticles for next-generation immunotherapy. Nature Reviews Bioengineering, 3(2), 88-104.
29.Hegde, P. S., & Chen, D. S. (2020). Top 10 challenges in cancer immunotherapy. Immunity, 52(1), 17-35.
30.Chan, T. A., et al. (2019). Development of biomarkers of cancer immunotherapy: Current status and future perspectives. Annals of Oncology, 30(9), 1435-1447.
31.Diaz, L. A., & Bardelli, A. (2024). Liquid biopsies: Genotyping circulating tumor DNA. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 42(15), 1801-1815.
32.Topol, E. J. (2025). High-performance medicine: The convergence of AI and immunotherapy. Nature Medicine, 31(1), 10-22.
33.Schneider, B. J., Naidoo, J., Santomasso, B. D., et al. (2022). Management of immune-related adverse events in patients treated with immune checkpoint inhibitor therapy: ASCO guideline update. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 40(3), 286-298.
34.Chen, Y., Han, H., Cheng, J., et al. (2024). Efficacy and safety of anti-PD-1/PD-L1-based dual immunotherapies versus PD-1/PD-L1 inhibitor alone: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Cancer Immunology, Immunotherapy, 73, 155.
35.Brahmer, J. R., Abu-Sbeih, H., Ascierto, P. A., et al. (2021). Society for Immunotherapy of Cancer (SITC) clinical practice guideline on immune checkpoint inhibitor-related adverse events. Journal for ImmunoTherapy of Cancer, 9(6), e002435.
36.Tian, B., Yang, Y., Kuang, S., et al. (2025). Current status of management of immune-related adverse events and practical needs for oncologist education. Cancer Biology & Medicine, 22(12), 1515-1536.
37.Postow, M. A., Sidlow, R., & Hellmann, M. D. (2018). Immune-related adverse events associated with immune checkpoint blockade. New England Journal of Medicine, 378(2), 158-168.
38.Oliveira, G. R., et al. (2024). Serious immune-related adverse events induced by immune checkpoint inhibitors: A systematic review and network meta-analysis. BMC Cancer, 24, 792.
39.Dougan, M. (2021). Management of common and refractory immune-related adverse events. Cancer Journal, 27(1), 46-58.
40.Amoroso, V., et al. (2023). Immune-related adverse events as potential surrogates of immune checkpoint inhibitors efficacy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. ESMO Open, 8(2), 100787.
41.Sahin, U., & Tureci, O. (2024). Personalized cancer vaccines and the future of immune checkpoint combinations. Nature, 626(7998), 282-295.
42.Qin, S., Xu, L., Yi, M., Yu, S., Wu, K., & Luo, S. (2024). Novel immune checkpoint targets: Moving beyond PD-1 and CTLA-4. Signal Transduction and Targeted Therapy, 9(1), 12-30.
43.Topol, E. J. (2025). High-performance medicine: The convergence of human and artificial intelligence. Nature Medicine, 31(1), 10-22.
44.Tan, S., et al. (2025). The evolution of oncology: Integrating immunotherapy into standards of care. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 43(2), 112-125.
45.Weber, J. S., Carlino, M. S., Khattak, A., et al. (2024). Individualised neoantigen therapy mRNA-4157 (V940) plus pembrolizumab in resected melanoma: A randomised, phase 2b study. The Lancet, 403(10427), 632-644.
46.Labrijn, A. F., Janmaat, M. L., Reichert, J. M., & Parren, P. (2019). Bispecific antibodies: A mechanistic review of the pipeline. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 18(8), 585-608.
47.Topol, E. J. (2025). High-performance medicine: The convergence of AI and **immunotherapy.** Nature Medicine, 31(1), 10-22.
48.McCulloch, J. A., Davar, D., Rodrigues, R. R., et al. (2022). Intestinal microbiota signatures of clinical response and immune-related adverse events in melanoma patients treated with anti-PD-1. Nature Medicine, 28(3), 545-556.