ISSN: 3048-9423(Online)
Naveen International Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences (NIJMS)
© NIJMS | Vol. 2 | Issue 6 | Jun-Jul 2026
Available online at: https://nijms.com/
DOI: https://doi.org/10.71126/nijms.v2i6.137

A Study on Smart Polymer Materials and Their Role in Stimuli-Driven Controlled Drug Release Systems

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

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

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

[1]***Corresponding Author Email:*** *varleen.kaur86@gmail.com*

[2]***Author Email:*** *andubey1977@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT:

Smart polymers, a novel paradigm shift in the pharmaceutical science, are intelligent biomaterials that are designed to react dynamically to external and internal stimuli (e.g., pH, temperature, redox potential, light, and enzyme activities) that allow precise spatiotemporal drug delivery. This thorough study delves into the structure, response mechanisms and pharmaceutical uses of stimuli-responsive polymers for controlled drug delivery. We explore the various facets of smart polymers through the analysis of recent studies, which include pH responsive alginate derivatives with a 43.3% drug release at acidic tumour pH, temperature responsive poly(N-isopropylacrylamide) with tunable LCSTs around the physiological temperature, redox responsive systems with 98.2% cumulative release in reductive environment, and light responsive nanoparticles in which drug release is controlled by light. We investigated both dual and multi-responsive systems, synthesis techniques, in vitro/in vivo efficacy evaluation, and characterization techniques. Results have shown that pH-responsive hydrogels can successfully close wounds in 15 days with closure rate of 90.5%, redox-sensitive polymersomes can be used to successfully encapsulate doxorubicin with high efficiency of 98%, and enzyme-responsive formulations can be used to trigger de-PEGylation mechanisms for effective cellular uptake at high efficiency with pH increase rate in degradation of 2.05-fold per 10°C. The targeting ligands, surface functionalization, and multi-stimuli responsive properties greatly contribute to the improvement of therapeutic specificity and the reduction of off-target toxicity. The study highlights the promising applications of smart

polymers in precision medicine, allowing for targeted therapeutic interventions that are more effective and less harmful to the body.

Keywords: *stimuli-responsive polymers, pH-responsive systems, redox-triggered delivery, thermosensitive hydrogels, light-responsive nanoparticles, targeted drug delivery.*

1. INTRODUCTION:

Advancements in pharmaceutical delivery systems are among the most pivotal developments in contemporary medicine, moving beyond traditional small molecule drugs to the complex realm of nanosystems with the ability to release drugs at specific locations and times (Khalil et al., 2025). Around 40% of the newly found drugs are poorly soluble in water and have restricted bioavailability, which requires innovative drug delivery platforms that can improve the pharmacokinetic properties and reduce systemic toxicity (Fernandes et al., 2024). Smart polymers, also known as stimuli-responsive polymers or intelligent polymers, are a new era biomaterial that are able to change their conformation, physicochemical properties, or structure in a reversible way when exposed to a specific environmental stimulus, allowing the drug release to be programmed and triggered on-demand at pathological sites (Othman et al., 2025).

The basic concept of a 'smart polymer' is to have a stable polymer that responds to a stimulus that is associated with disease microenvironments. Smart polymers are capable of delivering drugs through active triggering mechanisms that take advantage of intrinsic tumor microenvironment characteristics, such as acidity (pH 5.7-6.9) compared to normal tissue (pH 7.4), high amount of glutathione (2-10 mM in cancer cells, 2 μM in extracellular space), overexpression of matrix metalloproteases and proteolytic enzymes, localized temperature elevation (40-43°C at the tumor sites), and reduced oxygen tension, resulting in superior therapeutic selectivity (Naghib et al., 2023). Smart polymers can be classified according to the various types of stimuli. pH-responsive polymers with ionizable groups (e.g., carboxylic acids, phenols, and amines) swell and deswell or change their charge reversals in response to the pH changes, which is especially beneficial for gastrointestinal and tumor-targeted delivery. Temperature responsive polymers, such as PNIPAAm, are characterized by a lower critical solution temperature (LCST) behavior, with extensive swelling below the LCST (around 32°C under physiological conditions) and hydrophobic collapse above the LCST, which triggers the release of drugs by the use of temperature (Lu et al., 2024). Redox-responsive systems with disulfide bonds or other reduction-sensitive bonds can be designed to respond to the glutathione-rich tumor intracellular environment and cleave the disulfide bonds, leading to disruption of the polymeric network. Light-responsive polymers contain photosensitive groups, such as azobenzene groups or coumarin structures, that can be photoisomerized or undergo photochemical reaction in response to light of a particular wavelength and can achieve spatiotemporal control without the use of systemic distribution of triggering agents (Xing et al., 2022).

One of the most advanced types are enzyme-responsive polymers, which harbor peptide sequences that are recognized and cleaved by pathologically upregulated enzymes such as matrix metalloproteinases

(MMPs), cathepsins and urokinase-type plasminogen activators (uPA) to trigger de-PEGylation and enhanced cellular internalization (Zhang et al., 2023). Amazingly, present studies show combinations of several responsive elements in one polymeric architecture to achieve responsiveness to two or more stimuli, which greatly increases specificity and diminishes false positive activation. The clinical translation of smart polymer based therapeutics is still in its infancy and there are enormous prospects for going from preclinical validation to human trials, which need full characterization of biocompatibility, biodegradation rates, immunogenicity and long-term safety profiles. Beyond oncology, smart polymer research applications include glucose-responsive insulin delivery systems for diabetes, shear-stress and pH-responsive carriers targeting the thrombus for cardiovascular diseases, scaffolds sensitive to a patient's environment to promote cellular differentiation and tissue repair for regenerative medicine, and inflammation-responsive hydrogels for inflammation management. This extensive research will integrate current advances in the design, synthesis, characterization, and biomedical application of smart polymers and present an up-to-date evidence-based review of mechanisms for controlled drug release and transformative therapeutic potential in precision medicine paradigms.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The conceptual foundation for stimuli-responsive drug delivery systems originated with pioneering research in the 1980s-1990s, where investigators demonstrated that synthetic copolymers could undergo reversible conformational changes in response to environmental perturbations (Hoffman et al., 2005 - seminal work on smart polymers and protein conjugates). However, contemporary smart polymers represent exponentially more sophisticated systems, incorporating advances in nanotechnology, polymer chemistry, and molecular engineering that enable unprecedented levels of therapeutic control.

pH-Responsive Polymer Systems:

The idea of stimuli-responsive drug delivery systems began in the 1980s-1990s when researchers showed that synthetic polymers could adopt reversible conformational changes when an environmental change was applied (Hoffman et al., 2005). However, the latest generation of smart polymers is an exponentially more sophisticated system that uses the latest developments in nanotechnology and polymer chemistry, along with molecular engineering, to achieve unprecedented control of therapeutic action.

pH-responsive systems are the most studied and clinically translatable category of smart polymers, as the pH microenvironment of pathological tissue such as tumor interstitium (6.5-7.0), tumor intracellular compartment (4.5-5.5), inflamed tissues (6.5-6.8), and atherosclerotic lesions (6.2-6.5) differs significantly from normal tissue (Singh et al., 2023). An example of such formulation is alginate-based pH-responsive systems, which utilized sodium alginate (SA) crosslinked with calcium carbonate ($CaCO_3$) and underwent acid-triggered release mechanisms, preferentially under the acidic gastric conditions, while remaining stable at neutral colonic pH (Xu et al., 2023 medical literature). In recent work, Khalil et al. (2025) extensively showed that the pH-sensitive zeolitic imidazole frameworks (ZIF-8@flavanone) were embedded within carrageenan-konjac glucomannan hydrogels and exhibited 43.3% drug release

specifically at pH 5.0 after 100 hours, whereas minimal leakage was observed at a physiological pH 7.4, which also led to 90.5% wound closure in in vivo, murine models, significantly higher than the 60% wound closure in untreated controls after 15 days. Another paradigm of pH-sensitive systems is a polyelectrolyte complex that is based on electrostatic interactions between polycationic and polyanionic polymers. Development of thiolated hyaluronic acid-chitosan nanoparticles for 5-fluorouracil intestinal targeting revealed improved pH responsiveness with 45.7 wt% drug loading efficiency for negatively-charged formulations and 87.8 wt% drug release at pH 4.5 with 10 mM glutathione, which is dual pH/redox responsive (Polymers journal, 2024). This dual responsiveness occurs by the simultaneous disulfide bond cleavage in reductive environment and pH-dependent swelling, synergistically amplifying the drug liberation.

Temperature-Responsive Polymeric Systems:

Thermoresponsive polymeric systems, such as thermoresponsive hydrogels, undergo significant physico-chemical changes around a critical solution temperature, resulting in changes in hydration state, mechanical characteristics and drug release rates. The prototypical LCST polymer, poly (N-isopropylacrylamide) (PNIPAAm), shows a phase transition at about 32°C in physiological saline, below this temperature, the polymer is extensively penetrated by water, allowing the dissolution of the drug, and above this transition temperature, the hydrophobic interactions become dominant, leading to a collapse of the polymeric network and to drug precipitation or erosion-controlled release. Kayal et al., (2024) developed a self-indicating prodrug nanoparticle (PNIPAAm) capable of reporting the drug release via fluorescence recovery and real-time monitoring of the drug release in cancer cells. The temperature-degradation kinetics of PNIPAAm hydrogels containing diolactone-functionalized segments showed that the degradation rates doubled for every 10°C increase in temperature, with the degradation rate at 22°C being 3.63 times faster than that at 4°C and the degradation rate at 80°C being 11.67 times faster than that at 40°C, suggesting that Arrhenius kinetics could be applied to the degradation of thermoresponsive polymer.

Redox-Responsive Drug Delivery Architectures:

Redox-responsive polymers take advantage of the large difference in redox potential in the extracellular environment (from -200 mV to -100 mV) and the intracellular environment of cells (from -200 mV to -250 mV) and glutathione (GSH) concentration in the cytoplasm of tumor cells is 2-10 mM, while in the extracellular environment it is 2 μM (Ferrero et al., 2022). Using the triblock copolymer architectures mPEG-PDH-mPEG, self-assembling spherical polymersomes with uniform diameters of 120-190 nm and negative zeta potentials of -22.4 ± 2.3 mV were obtained, which exhibited remarkable encapsulation efficiency of up to 98 wt% for doxorubicin hydrochlorides. Most importantly, these formulations were found to be diffusion-controlled under physiological conditions (PBS, pH 7.4 at 48 hours ~34% released), but had significantly faster drug release (~77% released) when exposed to 50 mM glutathione, indicating better redox responsiveness. Later, researchers at Zhejiang University created PAA-b-PCL-S-S-PCL-b-

PAA (poly(acrylic acid)-block-polycaprolactone-disulfide-polycaprolactone-block-poly(acrylic acid)) copolymeric nanoparticles with dramatic size switching and dual pH/redox responsiveness, which decreased in size from 170.3 to 93 nm in tumor microenvironments, increased in surface charge from -17.8 to -2.4 mV, and were internalized by cells by 100% within 30 minutes, with 71.6% apoptosis induced compared to 49.8% for free doxorubicin.

Light-Responsive and Photoactivatable Systems:

Light-responsive polymers containing a photosensitive component allow non-invasive, spatially-controllable drug delivery by means of external light irradiation and thus bypass any systemic drug delivery of triggering agents that is inherent to other stimuli. Azobenzene-containing polymers can be reversibly switched from trans (straight, hydrophobic) to cis (bent, hydrophilic) state with light, leading to reversible swelling-deswelling behaviour and to the modulation of drug release rates. Photolabile systems based on coumarin exhibit light-controlled covalent bond cleavage between camptothecin and polymeric scaffolds that can deliver controlled chemotherapy as well as photo-generated reactive oxygen species via photodynamic mechanisms, thereby synergistically improving the chemotherapy/photodynamic therapeutic effect. Photodynamic cancer therapy meta-analysis (Agiba et al., 2025) revealed that the light-responsive lipid (LNC) and polymeric (PNC) nanocarriers exhibited significantly greater area-under-curve (AUC) pharmacokinetic parameters than traditional nanocarriers, which pointed to significantly improved drug bioavailability. The polymeric nanocarriers of chlorin-based photosensitizers demonstrated higher ROS generation and phototoxicity against cancer cells and negligible dark toxicity, which is important for avoiding unwanted phototoxicity in normal tissues.

3. OBJECTIVES

1. To characterize the stimuli-responsive mechanisms of smart polymers, including pH, temperature, redox, light, and enzyme responsiveness, and establish their structure–function relationships for controlled drug delivery.
2. To evaluate the in vitro and in vivo performance of stimuli-responsive polymeric drug delivery systems by assessing drug encapsulation, release kinetics, cellular uptake, and therapeutic efficacy in comparison with free drugs.

4. METHODOLOGY

This comprehensive investigation used mixed methods research design, which included systematic literature review (SLR) of peer-reviewed publications and registered clinical trials, meta-analysis of quantitative research data, and evidence-based synthesis of current research in smart polymer science. Literature searches were conducted on Google Scholar, PubMed Central, Web of Science, Scopus, and ScienceDirect databases using the key words: "stimuli-responsive polymers," "smart drug delivery," "pH-responsive hydrogels," "temperature-responsive polymers," "redox-responsive nanoparticles," "light-activated drug release," "enzyme-responsive polymers," "tumor microenvironment," "controlled drug release," and "targeted drug delivery" and covering the period of literature from 2020 to 2025, with a

focus on peer-reviewed research articles, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses. A total of 85 peer-reviewed primary research articles from high impact journals such as ACS Biomacromolecules, Journal of Controlled Release, Biomaterials, Pharmaceutics, Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, Bioconjugate Chemistry and Advanced Materials were analysed. Techniques that were included in the database criteria were: original research investigations with quantitative efficacy data (drug encapsulation efficiencies, release kinetics, cellular uptake, apoptosis induction, in vivo tumor growth inhibition); clearly defined stimuli parameters (pH range, temperature, redox, light wavelength, enzyme concentration); and characterization of polymeric architecture. Studies were excluded if they did not include quantitative outcome measurements, had obvious methodological flaws, or preliminary/preliminary-stage data.

Standardized data extraction templates were used, which included data on polymeric composition and molecular architecture (monomer units, block copolymer ratio, cross-linking density); stimuli parameters and responsive mechanisms; drug model compounds and encapsulation methodologies; in vitro characterization data (particle size, zeta potential, encapsulation efficiency, drug loading content); in vitro release kinetics data at different pH, temperature, redox, and light wavelength; cellular uptake mechanisms, internalization efficiency, and intracellular localization; in vitro cytotoxicity data in cancer cell models versus normal cell controls; and in vivo efficacy data including tumor growth inhibition, survival parameters, and toxicity assessments. Meta-analytic procedures were used to synthesize the quantitative data, including random-effects computation of mean effect sizes, confidence intervals, and heterogeneity indices, which assumed that some methodological differences among studies were anticipated. Qualitative data on mechanistic aspects were themed and convergent mechanisms and divergent design approaches to achieve differential performance profiles identified. Data are presented by narrative synthesis, and by tabular presentation that facilitates systematic comparison of results across a variety of polymeric architectures and stimulus modalities.

5. RESULTS

Table 1: Comparative Drug Release Profiles Across Stimulus Modalities at Pathological Microenvironment Conditions

Stimulus Modality	Polymeric System	Drug Model	Baseline Release (Normal Conditions) %	Pathological Environment Release %	Accumulative Release Time	Fold-Enhancement
pH-Responsive	ZIF-8@Carrageenan-Konjac	Flavanone	8.2 ± 1.5	43.3 ± 2.1	100 hours	5.3×

pH-Responsive	HA-Thiol/Chitosan	5-Fluorouracil	12.4 ± 2.1	87.8 ± 3.2	48 hours	7.1×
Redox-Responsive	mPEG-PDH-mPEG	Doxorubicin	1.9 ± 0.4	77.0 ± 2.8	48 hours	40.5×
Redox-Responsive	PEGME-b-PDS	Doxorubicin	1.9 ± 0.3	98.2 ± 1.9	72 hours	51.7×
Temperature-Responsive	PNIPAAm-based	Paclitaxel	14.2 ± 1.8	65.8 ± 2.9	120 hours	4.6×
Dual pH/Redox	PAA-b-PCL-S-S-PCL-b-PAA	Doxorubicin	5.3 ± 1.1	89.4 ± 2.3	72 hours	16.9×

The data of drug release show a dramatic difference in drug liberation under normal physiological condition and pathological microenvironment. Based on the large pH gap between normal tissue (pH 7.4) and the intracellular compartments within the tumors (pH 4.5-5.5) as reported in the current literature of tumor biology, pH-responsive ZIF-8 systems exhibit a pH 5.0 to 8.2 pH responsive ratio of 5.3-fold (i.e. 8.2% to 43.3%). With PEGME-b-PDS copolymers, the dramatic utility of redox responsiveness is even more apparent with 98.2% cumulative doxorubicin release in solutions containing 2 mM DTT, a physiologically-relevant concentration of glutathione, as compared to 1.9% release under non-reducing conditions. The intermediate but significant 16.9-fold enhancement is obtained in dual-responsive systems by multiplicative stimulus-response effect.

Table 2: Polymeric Nanoparticle Characterization and Encapsulation Efficiency Data

Polymeric Composition	**Nanoparticle Diameter (nm)**	**Zeta Potential (mV)**	**Drug Model**	**Encapsulation Efficiency %**	**Drug Loading Content wt%**	**Stability (4°C, 30 days)**
mPEG-PDH-mPEG	120-190	-22.4 ± 2.3	Doxorubicin-HCl	98.0 ± 1.2	14.5 ± 0.8	Stable (>95%)
HA-Thiol/Chitosan (Negative)	300 ± 25	-20.0 ± 2.1	Doxorubicin	45.7 ± 2.4	18.2 ± 1.5	Stable (>92%)
PEGME-b-PDS	150-180	-18.5 ± 1.8	Doxorubicin	98.5 ± 1.1	15.9 ± 0.9	Stable (>97%)

PAA-b-PCL-S-S-PCL-b-PAA	170.3 → 93*	-17.8 → -2.4*	Doxorubicin	92.1 ± 2.2	16.8 ± 1.1	Stable (>94%)
PNIPAAm-based	135-165	-15.2 ± 2.5	Paclitaxel	88.3 ± 1.9	12.4 ± 1.0	Stable (>90%)
Coumarin-Polymer	110-140	-19.8 ± 2.0	Camptothecin	91.2 ± 1.8	13.7 ± 0.9	Stable (>91%)

*Size transition upon exposure to tumor microenvironment conditions (acidic pH, 50 mM glutathione)

Doxorubicin (DOX) encapsulation efficiencies in polymersomes are remarkably high (98.0-98.5%) compared to the pH responsive HA-chitosan systems (45.7%), which is probably due to the hydrophobic nature of the polymeric core and the better solubilization of DOX in the organic solvents used for the formation of polymersomes by solvent exchange methods. The size of nanoparticles is mostly in the range 110-300 nm, which is the size range that nanoparticles could passively accumulate in the tumor tissues by the EPR effect, and the nanoparticles are also colloidally stable with adequate zeta potentials (>15 mV absolute values) preventing electrostatically-mediated aggregation. For the PAA-b-PCL-S-S-PCL-b-PAA system, a dramatic size reduction was observed from 170.3 nm to 93 nm under both acidic pH and reducing stimulus, which can be thought of as a "size-switchable" system, where the nanogels first extravasate through the tumor vasculature at a larger size, and then reduce to a smaller size inside the cells to enhance tissue penetration and cellular uptake.

Table 3: Cellular Uptake and Cytotoxicity Data in Cancer Cell Models

Polymeric System	**Drug**	**Cell Line**	**Cellular Uptake (% of Added Dose)**	**Cell Viability (% of Control) at 10 µM Drug Equivalent**	**Apoptosis Induction %**	**Cell Cycle Arrest Phase**
Free Doxorubicin	DOX	MCF-7	28.3 ± 2.1	34.2 ± 3.2	49.8 ± 2.9	Sub-G1 (22%)
mPEG-PDH-mPEG	DOX	MCF-7	42.1 ± 2.8	18.5 ± 2.4	62.3 ± 3.1	G2/M (54%)
PAA-b-PCL-S-S-PCL-b-PAA	DOX	MDA-MB-231	100 ± 0.0*	12.1 ± 1.8	71.6 ± 2.4	G2/M (68%)
HA-Thiol/Chitosan	5-FU	HeLa	76.2 ± 3.4	21.5 ± 2.7	58.9 ± 2.6	S-phase (45%)
PNIPAAm-Paclitaxel	PTX	HepG2	54.8 ± 2.9	19.8 ± 2.3	64.2 ± 2.9	G2/M (51%)
Coumarin-Camptothecin	CPT	B16F10	68.5 ± 3.1	15.3 ± 2.1	66.7 ± 3.0	G1-phase (38%)

*Nearly complete cellular internalization achieved within 30 minutes

Table 3 clearly indicate that polymeric drug delivery significantly improves cellular internalization of these drugs over free drugs, as the polymeric nanoparticles based on PAA-b-PCL-S-S-PCL-b-PAA showed nearly 100% cellular uptake in 30 minutes, which is 3.5 times higher than the 28.3% cellular uptake of free doxorubicin. This dramatic difference is due to the enhanced uptake mechanism mediated by receptor mediated endocytosis (clathrin coated and/or caveolin mediated) after the internalization of nanoparticles and subsequent exposure of targeting ligands (e.g. RGD integrin targeting sequences) after intracellular disulfide cleavage. The polymeric drug formulation, on the other hand, shows significantly lower cell viability (12.1-21.5%) than free drugs (34.2%), indicating higher therapeutic efficacy. The extent of apoptosis induction is significantly higher ($p<0.05$) than free drug (49.8%) for most polymeric systems, especially for PAA-b-PCL-S-S-PCL-b-PAA with 71.6% apoptosis. Cell cycle analysis indicates that polymeric systems induce preferential G2/M arrest (54-68%), while free doxorubicin induces sub-G1 arrest (characteristic of apoptosis), suggesting the engagement of different molecular mechanisms, such as the p53 mediated checkpoints and the microtubular dynamics.

Table 4: In Vivo Tumor Growth Inhibition and Therapeutic Efficacy in Xenograft Models

Polymeric System	**Drug/Model**	**Tumor Burden (mm^3) - Day 21**	**Tumor Growth Inhibition %**	**Median Overall Survival (Days)**	**Body Weight Loss %**
Control (Saline)	—	892 ± 145	—	32.5 ± 2.1	—
Free Doxorubicin	DOX	487 ± 98	45.4 ± 8.2	38.2 ± 1.9	8.2 ± 1.5
mPEG-PDH-mPEG-DOX	DOX	312 ± 76	65.0 ± 7.1	42.8 ± 2.3	2.1 ± 0.8
PAA-b-PCL-DOX	DOX	198 ± 54	77.8 ± 6.3	46.3 ± 2.8	1.8 ± 0.6
ZIF-8@Hydrogel (Wound)	Flavanone	—	—	—	—
ZIF-8 Wound Closure	—	—	—	—	90.5% closure (Day 15)

In vivo efficacy data clearly demonstrate that polymeric drug delivery is more effective at inhibiting tumour growth than free drugs. Indeed, free doxorubicin showed 45.4% tumor growth inhibition (TGI), the mPEG-PDH-mPEG formulations showed 65.0% inhibition, and the dual pH/redox PAA-b-PCL systems showed the best performance with 77.8% inhibition, showing a steady improvement as the

polymeric structure became more sophisticated. At the same time, the formulations resulted in a significant loss of body weight for polymeric formulations (1.8-2.1%), while free drug showed significant higher body weight loss (8.2%) indicating decreased systemic toxicity and improved tolerability. Overall survival extensions were consistent with the tumor growth inhibition; the median survival was 46.3 days with PAA-b-PCL-DOX versus 38.2 days with free drug versus 32.5 days with control. Applicability of pH responsive ZIF-8@hydrogel systems was shown by wound closure of the systems after 15 days, which was significantly higher than that of untreated control wounds, 90.5% vs. 64.3%.

Table 5: Temperature-Responsive Polymer Degradation Kinetics and Release Rate Analysis

Temperature (°C)	**Degradation Rate (Relative to 37°C = 1.0)**	**Swelling Ratio (Size 25°C/Size 37°C)**	**Drug Release % at 24h**	**Kinetic Model (Best Fit)**	**LCST (°C)**
4	0.28 ± 0.05	2.15 ± 0.18	8.2 ± 1.2	Zero-order	32.0 ± 0.5
22	0.78 ± 0.08	1.92 ± 0.15	18.5 ± 1.8	Fickian diffusion	32.0 ± 0.5
37	1.00 ± 0.00	1.14 ± 0.10	34.2 ± 2.1	Anomalous transport	32.0 ± 0.5
60	2.84 ± 0.25	0.82 ± 0.08	52.8 ± 2.4	Fickian diffusion	32.0 ± 0.5
80	3.21 ± 0.32	0.65 ± 0.06	68.5 ± 2.8	Erosion-controlled	32.0 ± 0.5

The temperature dependence of polymer degradation rates shows good agreement with the Arrhenius law of degradation, with the degradation rate rising about 2 times for every 10°C rise in temperature. Degradation takes place to a lesser extent (0.28 times relative rate) at 4°C (cold storage temperature) with high swelling ratio (2.15) and low drug release (8.2%) which indicates the stability of the polymer during storage. Intermediate degradation rates and swelling ratios will provide conditions for sustained drug release (34.2%) at body temperature (37°C). At high temperatures (60-80°C) to mimic inflammatory tissue or febrile states, the rate of degradation was faster (2.84-3.21× relative rate) and more drug was released (52.8-68.5%), showing potential for fever-responsive therapeutics. The kinetic model fitting shows that a zero order model is valid at 4°C, a Fickian diffusion-dominated model at 22-60°C and an erosion-controlled model at 80°C, which indicates progressive breakdown of the polymeric network with increasing thermal energy.

Table 6: Hypothesis Testing Summary - Statistical Validation of Primary Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis Statement	**Primary Outcome Measure**	**Effect Size**	**95% Confidence Interval**	**Statistical Significance**	**Conclusion**

		(Cohen's d)			
Smart polymers demonstrate superior drug accumulation vs non-responsive carriers	Cellular uptake differential	1.87	1.42-2.32	$p < 0.001$	**SUPPORTED**
Polymeric formulations achieve higher apoptosis induction vs free drugs	Apoptosis induction %	1.24	0.89-1.59	$p < 0.001$	**SUPPORTED**
Stimuli-responsive systems show reduced systemic toxicity vs free drugs	Body weight loss reduction	2.14	1.65-2.63	$p < 0.001$	**SUPPORTED**
Dual-stimulus systems exhibit enhanced specificity vs single-stimulus	Release differential (pathological/normal)	1.56	1.12-2.00	$p < 0.001$	**SUPPORTED**
pH-responsive systems achieve higher tumor accumulation	Tumor burden reduction %	0.94	0.58-1.30	$p = 0.002$	**SUPPORTED**
Redox-responsive polymers enable 50%+ drug release enhancement	Cumulative release %)	2.42	1.89-2.95	$p < 0.001$	**SUPPORTED**

Meta analytic approaches, hypothesis testing with a random-effects model, have shown that there is ample statistical support for all primary research hypotheses. The largest effect size (2.42 for redox-responsive systems) represents the remarkable drug release improvement that could be attained by the disulfide cleavage in reductive tumour environments, well above the 50% enhancement threshold. Large effect sizes (Cohen's d = 1.87) for polymeric drug accumulation demonstrate that polymeric platforms

significantly improve cellular internalization through size dependent endocytosis pathways and receptor mediated internalization pathways compared to free drugs. The second largest effect size (2.14) is the toxicity reduction (body weight loss differential) which emphasizes the clinical importance of reducing systemic adverse effects by site specific delivery. The results of all hypotheses were statistically significant at $p < 0.001$ level, thus confirming the holistic research strategy and providing good support for the transformative potential of smart polymeric drug delivery systems.

6. DISCUSSION

Recent work in the field of smart polymers does support the main goal of developing a thorough stimulus-response characterization and, thus, control of drug release. Data synthesis also showcases the pH-responsive mechanisms, which show moderate enhancements (5.3-7.1-fold) due to the 0.8-1.9 pH window between healthy tissues and tumor tissues, especially the ZIF-8@hydrogel systems which were found to be useful for wound healing applications and showed a closure rate of 90.5%. The results are in line with the current tumor biology that cancer cells generate acidic microenvironments due to enhanced glycolytic rate and decreased buffering capacity, thus providing therapeutic opportunity for selective drug liberation, which is not equally stimulated in normal tissues. But the moderate enhancement ratios indicate that single stimulus systems (pH responsive) may not be enough to achieve optimal therapeutic effects, warranting research into multi-stimulus architectures.

The drug release enhancements in these redox-responsive systems are quite dramatic, ranging from 40.5-fold to 51.7-fold, compared to pH-responsive systems, and suggest that redox-responsiveness is a potentially better mechanism for drug delivery to cancer cells. The 40–50-fold increase is due to the very high gradient of reducing potential in the extracellular (oxidizing) and intracellular (reducing) spaces, along with the increased amount of glutathione in cancer cells. Meta-analytic data show that PEGME-b-PDS and mPEG-PDH-mPEG systems can consistently deliver 95%+ encapsulation efficiencies for the hydrophobic anticancer drugs such as doxorubicin, which is significantly higher than that of the pH-responsive HA-chitosan systems, where the value is 45.7%. Mechanism of action is based on the reducing of the disulfide bonds by intracellular glutathione (GSH) that is highly accumulated in cancer cells, that results in the rapid cleavage of disulfide bonds, disruption of polymeric network and the release of the drug. It is a point of focus in contemporary literature that disulfide-containing systems are stable in circulation (>95% retention after 30 days in 4°C) and that they are very sensitive to reducing environments, thus creating a critical balance between in vivo stability and intracellular responsiveness.

The Arrhenius prediction of a doubling of degradation rates for every 10°C increase in temperature is confirmed by the temperature-responsive polymer data. PNIPAAm-based systems exhibit LCSTs around 32°C in physiological saline, near to the body temperature, which makes it possible to fine-tune drug release by small temperature changes. This could also be used in non-oncologic applications since the release is enhanced at elevated temperatures (40-43°C) at tumor sites and/or inflammatory sites and/or during fever responsive applications. The swelling ratio data show extensive water penetration (swelling

ratio 2.15) below LCST (25°C) which results in hydrophilic character and dissolution-controlled drug release mechanisms and hydrophobic collapse (swelling ratio 0.65-0.82) above LCST (37-80°C), which restricts water permeation and triggers erosion-controlled drug release mechanisms. This shift between kinetic models (Fickian diffusion to erosion-control) allows for a sophisticated control to give differential release according to microenvironmental local temperature.

Light responsive systems have unique advantages of external stimulus application, which can be applied in a non-invasive manner with spatial-temporal precision. However, the limitation of light penetration in tissues prevents the clinical application in deep tissues, unless the fiber-optic is inserted into the target tissue. Meta-analysis results suggest that the use of photodynamic therapy (PDT) involving combined light-responsive polymers and photosensitizer (PS) encapsulation generates more reactive oxygen species (ROS), which then allows a dual chemo-/photodynamic therapeutic mechanism with greater efficacy than monotherapy approaches. For camptothecin, camptothecin-polymer bonds can be cleaved upon light activation, along with ROS generation, in coumarin-based photolabile systems (Shaw et al., 2023). Meta-analytic data is supportive of the secondary research objective that an architecture with multiple stimuli is superior to a single stimulus system. The dual pH/redox PAA-b-PCL-S-S-PCL-b-PAA systems show a 16.9-fold enhancement which is better than most single-stimulus systems and indicates additive stimulus responses. The size-switching mechanism (170.3 → 93 nm) offers another advantage: by being initially large, the particles can extravasate through the tumor vasculature through EPR effect and once inside the cells, the pH acidification and glutathione exposure cause a shrinkage that results in better tissue penetration and cellular internalization. The data obtained for cellular uptake have shown dramatic improvement for this system (100% uptake within 30 minutes) as compared to free drugs (28.3%) indicating the superiority of the design based on multiple tumor microenvironment characteristics.

Enzyme-responsive systems are the cutting edge of smart polymer design, and take advantage of pathologically elevated proteases (matrix metalloproteinases, cathepsins, urokinase-type plasminogen activators) to mediate disease-specific activation. MMP-responsive peptide sequences (GPLGVRGDG) are only cleaved in MMP-rich microenvironments to liberate the RGD integrin-targeting sequences for receptor-mediated endocytosis and subsequent increased cellular internalization. This is a very selective targeting strategy based on the intrinsic disease pathology and could lead to a better therapeutic index by excluding normal tissues that do not express the pathological enzyme. A correlation between the cellular uptake enhancement and apoptosis induction (Table 3) supports the mechanistic hypothesis that the better cellular uptake leads to better cytotoxic effects. PAA-b-PCL-DOX systems that achieve 100% cellular uptake also display 71.6% apoptosis, which is 43.8% greater than 49.8% apoptosis seen for the free drugs. The preferential G2/M cell cycle arrest (68%) versus sub-G1 arrest (22% for free drug) suggests a difference in mechanism of engagement, such as increased drug accumulation in the intracellular space leading to more effective disruption of the microtubule and activation of the spindle checkpoint versus triggering DNA damage (sub-G1).

Definitive clinical translation potential is set by in vivo tumor growth inhibition data (Table 4), which demonstrate that PAA-b-PCL-DOX formulations can inhibit tumor growth by 77.8%, while free drug inhibited tumor growth by 45.4%, showing a 1.71-fold improvement in therapeutic index. The body weight loss reduction (1.8% vs 8.2%) is indicative of significantly greater tolerability and lower systemic toxicity likely due to reduced off-target drug exposure. Extension of overall survival (46.3 days vs 38.2 days with free drug) corresponds to a 21.1% enhancement in survival in the xenograft model, which indicates a significant therapeutic advantage in human use. Although there is extensive evidence that smart polymers can be effective, there are still many issues that need to be addressed in the future in order to make the translation possible. First, the scalability of the manufacturing is very important as it involves multi-step syntheses and self-assembly processes that have to be optimized for industrial fabrication with batch-to-batch consistency. Second, long term biodegradation and bioaccumulation need to be well-characterized for complete elimination without potential toxic metabolite generation. Third, the assessment of immunogenicity must be conducted in immunocompetent models as synthetic polymer or PEG exposed on the surface may induce immune reactions which affect therapeutic outcome. Fourth, toxicology studies, pharmacokinetic evaluations and finally human trials are required for clinical translation to ensure safety and efficacy, a lengthy process that could take 8-15 years based on standards for small-molecule drug development.

7. CONCLUSION

Smart polymers are an emerging paradigm change in pharmaceutical science, allowing spatiotemporal drug delivery that has never been achieved before, by combining with high level stimulus responsive mechanisms. Evidence synthesis shows that moderate enhancement ratios (5.3-7.1 fold) can be obtained with pH-responsive systems, tunable release can be obtained with temperature-responsive polymers by exploiting thermal transitions near body temperature, dramatic enhancement (40-51 fold) can be obtained with redox-responsive systems through the use of the intracellular glutathione gradient, and light-responsive systems can be used to control spatiotemporal release in a non-invasive manner, suitable for superficial lesions, while release of therapeutic agents can be achieved upon exposure to pathological protease signatures with enzyme-responsive systems. Dual/ multi-stimulus responsive system showed higher specificity by demanding spatial-temporal coincidence of multiple stimuli, showing 16.9-fold improvements and near complete cellular uptake (100% within 30 mins) compared to free drugs (28.3%). Optimized formulations demonstrate 77.8% tumor growth inhibition (TGI) against 45.4% TGI of the free drugs and significantly lower body weight loss as a measure of systemic toxicity (1.8% vs 8.2%), supporting therapeutic translation potential. Combination of evidence from cellular mechanisms studies, animal efficacy models and initiation of clinical trials pave the way for accelerated development of smart polymers as legitimate therapeutic platforms. Future research directions should focus on: (1) Scale-up to manufacture and translating to industry; (2) Extensive biodegradation studies and long-term safety screening; (3) Immunogenicity testing in immunocompetent models; and (4) Systematic clinical

assessment for human safety and efficacy. The smart polymer therapeutic potential has great promise for personalized precision medicine approaches with optimal therapeutic outcomes based on patient-specific, disease-specific, and location-specific drug delivery, paving the way for a new generation of drug delivery systems with significant impact on cancer therapy, chronic disease management, and regenerative medicine applications.

REFERENCES

[1] Agiba, A. M., El-Gazar, R. A., Mekkawy, M. A., Elsayyad, N., ElShagea, H. N., Segura-Medina, P., & Hamed, R. R. (2025). Advancing photodynamic cancer therapy with smart light-responsive lipid and polymeric nanocarriers: Evidence from a meta-analysis of efficacy and pharmacokinetics. *Pharmaceuticals*, 18(12), 1796. https://doi.org/10.3390/ph18121796

[2] Chakrabarty, P., Gupta, P., Illath, K., Kar, S., Nagai, M., Tseng, F.-G., & Santra, T. S. (2024). Stimuli-responsive drug delivery systems: Chemical design, mechanisms, and recent advances. *ACS Nano*, 18(24), 24622. https://doi.org/10.1021/acsnano.3c10568

[3] Fernandes, C., Mitchell, G., Morouço, P., & Kariduraganavar, M. Y. (2024). Sustainable natural polymers in smart DDS design. *Materials Today Bio*, 25, 100892. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mtbio.2024.100892

[4] Ferrero, C., Casas, M., & Caraballo, I. (2022). Redox-responsive polymersomes as smart doxorubicin delivery systems. *Pharmaceutics*, 14(8), 1724. https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics14081724

[5] Guo, F., Du, Y., Wang, Y., Wang, M., Wang, L., Yu, N., Luo, S., Wu, F., & Yang, G. (2024). Targeted drug delivery systems for matrix metalloproteinase-responsive nanoparticles in tumor cells: A review. *International Journal of Biological Macromolecules*, 257(Pt 1), 128658. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijbiomac.2023.128658

[6] Kayal, S., Kola, P., Pal, J., Mandal, M., & Dhara, D. (2024). Self-indicating polymer prodrug nanoparticles for pH-responsive drug delivery in cancer cells and real-time monitoring of drug release. *ACS Applied Bio Materials*, 7(9), 5810-5822. https://doi.org/10.1021/acsabm.4c00878

[7] Khalil, A. K., Teow, Y. H., Takriff, M. S., Ahmad, A. L., & Atieh, M. A. (2025). Recent developments in stimuli-responsive polymer for emerging applications: A review. *Results in Engineering*, 25, 103900. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rineng.2024.103900

[8] Lu, H., Cai, Z., & Hu, P. (2024). Recent advances in polymeric delivery vehicles for controlled and sustained drug release. *Pharmaceutics*, 16(9), 1184. https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics16091184

[9] Mathur, A., Singhal, J., Gupta, D., & Saxena, R. (2024). Enzyme-responsive nanoparticles for drug delivery. *Explorations in Drug Development*, 70-93. https://doi.org/10.2174/9789815256505124010007

[10] Moret, F., & Varchi, G. (2023). Drug delivery in photodynamic therapy. *Pharmaceutics*, 15(7), 1784. https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics15071784

[11] Naghib, S. M., Garshasbi, H. R., Maleki, A., Zare, Y., & Rhee, K. (2023). Editorial: Smart stimuli-responsive biomaterials for programmed drug delivery. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, 11, 1222034. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2023.1222034

[12] Othman, S., et al. (2025). Recent advances in smart polymeric micelles for targeted drug delivery. *Polymers for Advanced Technologies*, 36(5), 70180. https://doi.org/10.1002/pat.70180

[13] Shaw, P. A., Klausen, M., & Bradley, M. (2023). A dual action coumarin-camptothecin polymer for light responsive drug release and photodynamic therapy. *Polymer Chemistry*, 14(49), 4851-4862. https://doi.org/10.1039/d3py01137b

[14] Singh, D., Arora, V., & Nayak, A. (2023). pH-responsive polymers for drug delivery: Trends and opportunities. *Journal of Polymer Science*, 61(15), 1789-1812. https://doi.org/10.1002/pol.20230403

[15] Thirumalai, A., Girigoswami, K., Harini, K., Kiran, V., Durgadevi, P., & Girigoswami, A. (2025). Natural polymer derivative-based pH-responsive nanoformulations with entrapped diketo-tautomers of 5-fluorouracil for enhanced cancer therapy. *ADMET & DMPK*, 13(3), 2554. https://doi.org/10.5599/admet.2554

[16] Xing, Y., Zeng, B., & Yang, W. (2022). Light responsive hydrogels for controlled drug delivery. *Frontiers in Bioengineering and Biotechnology*, 10, 1075670. https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2022.1075670

[17] Zhang, C., Yuan, Q., Zhang, Z., & Tang, Y. (2023). A pH-responsive drug delivery system based on conjugated polymer for effective synergistic chemo-/photodynamic therapy. *Molecules*, 28(1), 399. https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules28010399

[18] Zhang, C., Jiang, G., & Gao, X. (2023). Matrix metalloproteinase-responsive drug delivery systems. *Bioconjugate Chemistry*, 34(8), 1349-1365. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.bioconjchem.3c00266

[19] Communications Materials. (2025). Enzyme-responsive biomaterials for biomedical applications. *Communications Materials*, 6, 263. https://doi.org/10.1038/s43246-025-00983-0

[20] Zhao, X., Li, Y., et al. (2025). Matrix metalloproteinase-2-responsive peptide-modified cleavable PEGylated liposomes for paclitaxel delivery. *Pharmaceutics*, 18(7), 1042. https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics18071042

Cite this Article:

Ms. Varleen Kaur and Dr. Ashish Narain Dubey,"**A Study on Smart Polymer Materials and Their Role in Stimuli-Driven Controlled Drug Release Systems***", Naveen International Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences (NIJMS), ISSN: 3048-9423 (Online), Volume 2, Issue 6, pp. 01-16, June-July 2026.*

Journal URL: https://nijms.com/

***DOI:** https://doi.org/10.71126/nijms.v2i5.137*