©IDOSR PUBLICATIONS International Digital Organization for Scientific Research

IDOSR JOURNAL OF APPLIED SCIENCES 11(2):106-112, 2026 ISSN: 2550-7931

https://doi.org/10.59298/IDOSRJAS/2026/112106112 IDOSRJAS11200

Convergence of Natural Products and Nanomedicine in Diabetes Care: Therapeutic Innovations and Translational Challenges

Mukisa Ian Mugaiga

Department of Pharmacology Kampala International University Uganda
Email:mugaiga.mukisa@studwc.kiu.ac.ug

ABSTRACT

The convergence of natural products and nanomedicine is reshaping diabetes care by enabling multi-target therapeutics with improved pharmacokinetics, tissue distribution, and dosing consistency. Natural antidiabetic compounds polyphenols, alkaloids, terpenoids, and saponins- exert complementary actions on insulin sensitivity, β-cell protection, inflammation, oxidative stress, and gut–metabolic signaling. However, translation is repeatedly constrained by poor solubility, chemical instability, efflux transport, extensive first-pass metabolism, and microbiome-driven variability. Nanomedicine addresses these barriers through lipid and polymer carriers, nanoemulsions, micelles, nanocrystals, and hybrid systems that enhance dissolution, protect labile structures, increase mucosal residence, enable lymphatic uptake, and provide controlled or stimuli-responsive release. Beyond bioavailability, nanoformulations support co-delivery (phytochemical–phytochemical or phytochemical–drug), targeting of liver/adipose/pancreas microenvironments, and gut-focused interventions that modulate incretin biology and inflammatory tone. Yet diabetes is a chronic-use setting, so long-term safety, scalable manufacturing, reproducible characterization, and clear PK–PD linkage are non-negotiable. This review synthesizes therapeutic innovations at the natural product–nanomedicine interface and highlights translational challenges including regulatory expectations, quality control for complex botanicals, microbiome heterogeneity, and clinical trial design. We propose a rational pathway for selecting nano-strategies based on dominant absorption and disposition bottlenecks, emphasizing "minimal-complexity" formulations that deliver measurable clinical value.

Keywords: diabetes; natural products; nanomedicine; bioavailability; translation

INTRODUCTION

Diabetes mellitus especially type 2 diabetes (T2DM) is a systemic metabolic disorder driven by insulin resistance, progressive β-cell dysfunction, chronic inflammation, oxidative stress, dyslipidemia, and altered gut–endocrine signaling[1–3]. Contemporary therapeutics (metformin, GLP-1 receptor agonists, SGLT2 inhibitors, DPP-4 inhibitors, insulin, etc.) have improved outcomes, yet gaps remain: variable response, side effects, polypharmacy burden, access constraints, and incomplete coverage of inflammatory and oxidative components that accelerate vascular, renal, and neural complications[4–6]. These realities sustain interest in adjunctive and integrative approaches that are mechanistically broad, safe for long-term use, and affordable.

Natural products represent a vast pharmacological reservoir. Polyphenols (e.g., curcumin, resveratrol, catechins, quercetin), alkaloids (e.g., berberine), terpenoids (e.g., ginsenosides), and sulfur-containing compounds (e.g., allicin derivatives) influence multiple metabolic pathways[4, 7, 8]. Reported mechanisms include AMPK activation, improved insulin receptor signaling, suppression of hepatic gluconeogenesis, modulation of adipokines, antioxidant and anti-inflammatory effects, improved endothelial function, and protection of pancreatic β-cells. Some compounds also affect carbohydrate digestion and absorption, bile acid signaling, and microbiota composition, linking them to the gut–liver axis and incretin biology. In principle, these pleiotropic actions align with the polygenic, multi-organ nature of T2DM[9].

However, clinical translation of natural antidiabetic compounds has been inconsistent. The most common bottleneck is pharmacokinetic: many phytochemicals exhibit poor oral bioavailability due to low aqueous solubility, chemical instability, rapid metabolism, and efflux transport[10]. Even when clinical signals appear, exposure is often variable across individuals, influenced by diet, formulation, and microbiome heterogeneity. High oral doses may be required to achieve measurable systemic concentrations, increasing pill burden and gastrointestinal intolerance[10]. Additionally, botanical products introduce quality challenges: variable phytochemical profiles, batch-to-batch inconsistency, and complex mixtures in which active constituents and their metabolites are not always well-defined[11].

Nanomedicine provides a bridge between promising natural pharmacology and reliable clinical performance[12–14]. By engineering carriers at the nanoscale, formulators can enhance solubility of hydrophobic compounds, protect labile molecules through the gastrointestinal tract, increase residence time at the intestinal mucosa, and alter absorption pathways (including lymphatic uptake that partially bypasses first-pass metabolism)[15]. Nanocarriers can also enable controlled release, reducing peak–trough fluctuation and improving the temporal alignment between exposure and pharmacodynamic effects. Importantly, nanomedicine is not limited to "making more drug absorbed"; it can reshape biodistribution toward tissues central to insulin resistance and glucose regulation (liver, adipose tissue, skeletal muscle, pancreas), or toward gut targets where local actions may be sufficient to drive systemic benefit[16].

The convergence of natural products and nanomedicine also unlocks combination strategies. Co-encapsulation of synergistic phytochemicals can address multiple pathophysiological nodes with a single dosage form[17, 18]. Co-delivery of phytochemicals with standard drugs may reduce required doses, mitigate side effects, or stabilize glycemic control though this raises interaction and regulatory questions. Beyond therapeutics, nanosystems may support theranostics: co-integrating sensing and delivery concepts (still early for chronic metabolic disease), potentially enabling more adaptive dosing paradigms[19].

Yet the same features that make nanomedicine powerful also create translational friction. Diabetes is a chronic-use indication; any carrier must demonstrate long-term biocompatibility, minimal immunogenicity, and no cumulative disruption of gut barrier integrity or microbiota[20, 21]. Manufacturing must be scalable, reproducible, and cost-effective. Quality control must define particle size distribution, stability, release behavior under biorelevant conditions, and (for botanicals) consistent chemical fingerprints and impurity profiles. Regulatory pathways for nanoformulations of complex natural mixtures remain challenging, particularly when the "active" entity may be a set of constituents plus metabolites[22, 23]. This review evaluates the convergence of natural products and nanomedicine in diabetes care, focusing on (i) therapeutic innovations—bioavailability enhancement, targeting, controlled/stimuli-responsive release, and combination delivery—and (ii) translational challenges safety for chronic dosing, manufacturing and quality control, regulatory considerations for botanicals, microbiome-driven variability, and trial design. We emphasize a rational development philosophy: identify the dominant barrier for each natural compound (solubility-, permeability-, or metabolism-limited; systemic vs gut-local mechanism), then select the simplest nano-strategy that yields consistent exposure and meaningful clinical benefit.

2. Natural Products in Diabetes: Multi-Target Pharmacology Meets PK Limitations

Natural antidiabetic compounds provide breadth of mechanism that is difficult to achieve with single-target agents. Many polyphenols reduce oxidative stress and suppress inflammatory signaling (e.g., NF-κB-linked pathways), which is relevant to insulin resistance and endothelial dysfunction[24, 25]. Alkaloids such as berberine are associated with improved insulin sensitivity and lipid handling via AMPK-related pathways and effects on hepatic glucose production[26, 27]. Terpenoids and saponins can modulate glucose uptake and adipocyte biology, while several compounds influence incretin responses, bile acid signaling, and gut microbiota composition—mechanisms increasingly recognized as central to metabolic health[28].

Yet these benefits often collide with pharmacokinetic constraints. A major fraction of phytochemicals are poorly water-soluble, limiting dissolution in intestinal fluid and making absorption dose-dependent but saturable. Others are chemically unstable or undergo rapid transformation in the gastrointestinal tract[29]. Once absorbed into enterocytes, efflux transporters can reduce net uptake. Extensive first-pass metabolism—particularly glucuronidation and sulfation can convert parent compounds into conjugates with altered potency and tissue distribution. In many cases, circulating levels of the parent compound are low, and biological effects may depend on metabolites or local gut actions, complicating mechanistic interpretation[29].

Variability is amplified by food effects and the microbiome. Dietary fat can improve absorption of hydrophobic compounds, but meal composition varies, producing inconsistent exposure profiles[30]. Meanwhile, microbiota enzymes can activate, inactivate, or diversify metabolites; two individuals taking the same phytochemical may generate different metabolite spectra and thus different therapeutic effects. These issues partly explain why strong preclinical signals do not always translate into robust clinical outcomes[20, 21].

Therefore, the natural-product pipeline in diabetes increasingly requires formulation science to stabilize exposure and clarify PK–PD relationships. Nanomedicine enters here as an enabling layer: it can increase

apparent solubility and dissolution rate, protect labile structures, and reduce the dependency of absorption on variable physiological factors. However, formulation must match the intended mechanism[31]. If a compound's major benefit is via local gut effects (e.g., inhibition of carbohydrate digestion or microbiota modulation), maximizing systemic bioavailability may be unnecessary; instead, targeted intestinal release and mucosal residence may be the priority[31]. Conversely, if β-cell protection or hepatic insulin sensitization is central, systemic exposure and tissue distribution become critical design endpoints.

A rational convergence thus requires early decisions about: (i) the likely active species (parent vs metabolite), (ii) target site (gut-local vs systemic), and (iii) the dominant barrier (solubility, permeability, metabolism, or instability). Nanomedicine can then be tailored to solve the correct problem rather than simply increasing absorption in a non-specific manner.

3. Nanomedicine Platforms Enabling Natural Antidiabetic Therapies

The most mature nano-platforms for diabetes-oriented natural products are lipid- and polymer-based carriers, chosen because of biocompatibility and manufacturability.

Lipid systems (nanoemulsions, self-emulsifying systems, liposomes, solid lipid nanoparticles [SLNs], nanostructured lipid carriers [NLCs]) improve solubilization of hydrophobic phytochemicals and can promote lymphatic uptake[32]. Nanoemulsions disperse compounds rapidly in GI fluids, improving dissolution and reducing precipitation. SLNs and NLCs provide stronger protection and can sustain release; NLCs often improve loading and reduce payload expulsion during lipid crystallization. Oral liposomes can encapsulate diverse compounds but must be engineered to withstand bile salts and digestive enzymes[15, 32].

Polymeric nanoparticles (e.g., PLGA) enable controlled release and protection, while **biopolymeric carriers** (chitosan, alginate, pectin) add functional GI benefits. Chitosan's mucoadhesion can increase intestinal residence and sometimes enhance paracellular transport, useful for permeability-limited compounds[33, 34]. Alginate-based systems can protect payloads in acidic gastric environments and release in the intestine. Pectin and other polysaccharides can support colon targeting, aligning with microbiome-mediated mechanisms.

Polymeric micelles are efficient solubilizers for hydrophobic molecules, with small particle sizes that enhance dispersion and potentially uptake. Nanocrystals offer a carrier-minimal approach: by reducing drug particle size, they increase surface area and dissolution rate with limited excipient burden attractive for chronic use when the compound is stable but dissolution-limited. Hybrid systems (lipid–polymer, polymer–inorganic) seek multi-functionality but add complexity[35]. For diabetes, platform choice must also account for chronic dosing: excipients should be safe long-term, and particle–mucus interactions should not chronically disrupt barrier integrity. Another platform-specific concern is reproducibility: size distribution, surface charge, and stability can strongly influence absorption, making quality control central to translational success[36].

Overall, nanomedicine platforms are not interchangeable. Lipid systems are often first-line for hydrophobic polyphenols; polymeric and biopolymeric systems are favored where stability, permeability enhancement, and controlled release matter; nanocrystals are practical for dissolution-limited yet stable compounds; and hybrids are reserved for problems requiring multi-stage delivery or complex targeting.

4. Therapeutic Innovations: Targeting, Co-Delivery, and Mechanism-Driven Design

Innovation at the natural product–nanomedicine interface goes beyond "higher AUC." Three themes are increasingly prominent.

(1) Tissue and microenvironment targeting. Diabetes is multi-organ; targeting can improve efficacy and reduce dose. Liver targeting aligns with goals of reducing gluconeogenesis and improving lipid metabolism[37]. Adipose targeting addresses inflammatory insulin resistance. Pancreatic targeting aims to protect β-cells from oxidative and inflammatory injury. While true ligand-based targeting is more established in oncology, metabolic targeting may be achieved more pragmatically through carrier physicochemical tuning, macrophage/interstitial interactions in inflamed adipose, or hepatic first-pass capture depending on particle properties[37]. Importantly, "targeting" claims must be supported by biodistribution evidence, not inferred from efficacy alone.

(2) Co-delivery and synergy. Co-encapsulation of phytochemicals can combine antioxidant, anti-inflammatory, and insulin-sensitizing actions in one formulation, potentially reducing the required dose of each component[38]. Co-delivery with conventional drugs could lower drug doses or mitigate side effects conceptually attractive, but it raises drug–drug interaction risks (metabolism and transport), and complicates regulatory classification. Synergy should be quantified using appropriate interaction models rather than assumed[38].

(3) Mechanism-driven gut delivery. A growing proportion of antidiabetic benefit may be mediated locally in the gut: modulation of microbiota composition and metabolites, reinforcement of barrier integrity, regulation of bile acid signaling, and enhancement of incretin responses[39]. For such mechanisms, nanoformulations that increase mucosal residence, protect payload until distal intestinal regions, or enable colon-targeted release may yield strong metabolic effects with limited systemic exposure—potentially improving safety for chronic use.

Stimuli-responsive systems (pH-, enzyme-, redox-responsive) can be aligned with GI transit or intracellular release, but diabetes-specific "glucose-responsive" designs remain comparatively immature for oral phytochemicals[40, 41]. A practical translational stance is to prioritize robust, predictable release over highly engineered responsiveness unless clear added value is demonstrated.

In sum, the most compelling therapeutic innovations are those that explicitly map carrier function to diabetes biology—gut–liver axis modulation, adipose inflammation control, or β-cell preservation and demonstrate improved outcomes with reproducible exposure profiles.

5. Translational Challenges I: Safety for Chronic Use and Microbiome Complexity

Diabetes care implies long-term, often lifelong use; therefore, the safety bar for nanoformulated natural products is high. Key risks include:

Gastrointestinal and barrier safety. Mucoadhesive or permeability-enhancing polymers (e.g., cationic coatings) can be beneficial acutely, but chronic modulation of tight junctions or persistent mucosal interaction could increase permeability in undesirable ways[42]. Subtle inflammation or irritation, negligible in short studies, may become clinically relevant with continuous exposure.

Systemic accumulation and immunogenicity. Biodegradable lipids and polymers generally have an advantage, but degradation products and excipients still require evaluation[43]. Non-biodegradable or slowly cleared inorganic systems raise additional concerns about tissue accumulation.

Microbiome perturbation. Natural products can reshape microbiota; nanocarriers can also alter local exposure gradients and thus microbial responses. While microbiome modulation may be therapeutic, unintended dysbiosis could counteract metabolic benefits or cause GI symptoms. Inter-individual microbiome variability can produce heterogeneous metabolite profiles, complicating both efficacy and safety interpretation[44].

Population heterogeneity and comorbidity. Many patients with T2DM have NAFLD, CKD, cardiovascular disease, or polypharmacy. Nanoformulations must be evaluated for interactions with common drugs and for altered pharmacokinetics in hepatic/renal impairment. Additionally, the risk–benefit calculus differs across populations (newly diagnosed vs advanced disease; older adults; pregnancy)[45].

A translationally robust program must therefore include: repeated-dose toxicology with GI-focused endpoints, immune profiling, microbiome/metabolome tracking, and careful evaluation of excipients at intended chronic doses. Safety should be paired with mechanism: if gut-local action is sufficient, minimizing systemic exposure may improve long-term tolerability[45].

6. Translational Challenges II: Manufacturing, Quality Control, and Regulatory Pathways

Even when a nanoformulation works biologically, many candidates fail at the "engineering–regulatory interface."

Manufacturing and scale-up. Lab-scale processes may rely on solvents, low yields, or fragile conditions that do not translate to industrial production. Diabetes products must be cost-sensitive and stable without demanding cold chains[46]. Continuous or scalable processes (high-pressure homogenization, solvent-free self-emulsifying systems, robust nanoprecipitation with solvent removal) are favored when feasible.

Quality control and reproducibility. Regulators require defined critical quality attributes: particle size distribution, polydispersity, surface charge, encapsulation efficiency, stability across pH/ionic strength, release under biorelevant conditions, and impurity/excipient characterization[47]. For botanicals, QC must also include chemical fingerprinting (and sometimes multi-marker quantification), contamination control, and batch-to-batch consistency. Without this, clinical outcomes cannot be attributed confidently to the product.

Regulatory classification. Natural products exist on a spectrum: dietary supplements, traditional medicines, and drug products. Nanoformulation can shift regulatory expectations toward pharmaceutical standards, especially if therapeutic claims are made. Combination products (phytochemical + drug) further complicate pathways, requiring interaction assessment and robust justification[47].

PK–PD linkage and endpoints. Many studies report improved glycemia without demonstrating that nanoparticle-driven exposure changes explain the effect. Translational success requires aligning exposure with biomarkers of target engagement (inflammatory markers, insulin sensitivity indices, lipid metrics, gut hormone changes) and selecting clinically meaningful endpoints beyond fasting glucose alone (HbA1c, weight, blood pressure, lipid profile, renal markers, patient-reported outcomes)[48].

Ultimately, translation favors "minimal complexity" formulations with well-understood materials and clear, measurable improvements in exposure consistency and clinical outcomes.

7. Roadmap: Rational Development and Clinical Trial Priorities

A practical roadmap for converging natural products and nanomedicine in diabetes care can be framed as a sequence of decision points:

Step 1: Define the active hypothesis. Determine whether efficacy is expected from the parent compound, metabolites, or gut-local mechanisms. Use metabolite profiling and gut-restricted experiments to avoid misdirected formulation goals.

Step 2: Diagnose the dominant barrier.

- Solubility-limited prioritize lipid systems, micelles, or nanocrystals.
- Instability/metabolism-limited → prioritize protective matrices and lymphatic uptake strategies.
- Permeability-limited → consider mucoadhesion and conservative permeability enhancement, with chronic safety testing.

Step 3: Choose the simplest carrier that works. Start with conservative excipients and scalable methods. Avoid over-engineering (complex targeting/triggering) unless biodistribution and efficacy gains are substantial.
Step 4: Build a translational evidence package. Include biorelevant dissolution/release, PK with metabolite mapping, biodistribution where relevant, and repeated-dose safety including GI and microbiome endpoints.
Step 5: Design smarter trials. Control for meal composition where necessary, measure exposure, and stratify for key covariates (baseline HbA1c, BMI, metformin use, microbiome signatures if feasible). Compare against optimized non-nano formulations to justify added complexity. Focus on HbA1c and cardiometabolic risk markers, not only short-term glucose shifts.
If implemented, this pathway can convert natural-product promise into reproducible, clinically meaningful adjuncts or therapies. The highest near-term impact will likely come from scalable lipid and biopolymer systems that stabilize exposure and exploit gut–liver axis mechanisms while maintaining chronic-use safety and affordability.

CONCLUSION

Natural products offer mechanistically broad antidiabetic actions but remain limited by inconsistent exposure, instability, metabolism, and microbiome-driven variability. Nanomedicine can convert this promise into reliable therapeutics by improving solubilization, protecting labile compounds, enhancing mucosal residence, enabling lymphatic uptake, and shaping release and biodistribution. The field is now moving from proof-of-concept "nano-boosting" toward mechanism-driven designs that align delivery with diabetes biology—particularly the gut–liver axis, adipose inflammation, and β-cell preservation—while supporting co-delivery strategies. Translational success, however, hinges on chronic-use safety, scalable manufacturing, rigorous quality control (especially for complex botanicals), and clear PK–PD linkage demonstrated in well-controlled clinical trials. A minimal-complexity, evidence-led development pathway selecting the simplest nano-platform that addresses the dominant pharmacokinetic barrier offers the most credible route to clinically meaningful, accessible innovations in diabetes care.

REFERENCES

1. Adhikari, B.: Roles of Alkaloids from Medicinal Plants in the Management of Diabetes Mellitus. J. Chem. 2021, 2691525 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/2691525
2. Antar, S.A., Ashour, N.A., Sharaky, M., Khattab, M., Ashour, N.A., Zaid, R.T., Roh, E.J., Elkamhawy, A., Al-Karmalawy, A.A.: Diabetes mellitus: Classification, mediators, and complications; A gate to identify potential targets for the development of new effective treatments. Biomed. Pharmacother. 168, 115734 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopha.2023.115734
3. Berbudi, A., Khairani, S., Tjahjadi, A.I.: Interplay Between Insulin Resistance and Immune Dysregulation in Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: Implications for Therapeutic Interventions. ImmunoTargets Ther. 14, 359–382 (2025). https://doi.org/10.2147/ITT.S499605
4. Uti, D.E., Atangwho, I.J., Alum, E.U., Egba, S.I., Ugwu, O.P.-C., Ikechukwu, G.C.: Natural Antidiabetic Agents: Current Evidence and Development Pathways from Medicinal Plants to Clinical use. Nat. Prod. Commun. 20, 1934578X251323393 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1177/1934578X251323393
5. Gustina, F., Amalina, A.N., Nugraha, F., Hany, F.: How Does Metformin as First-Line Therapy Impact Long-Term Cardio- Vascular and Metabolic Outcomes in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus over A 5-Year Period ? : A Systematic Review. Int. J. Med. Sci. Health Res. 13, 39–84 (2025). https://doi.org/10.70070/8c4yz749
6. Alum, E.U.: Optimizing patient education for sustainable self-management in type 2 diabetes. Discov. Public Health. 22, 44 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12982-025-00445-5
7. Godlewska, K., Pacyga, P., Najda, A., Michalak, I.: Investigation of Chemical Constituents and Antioxidant Activity of Biologically Active Plant-Derived Natural Products. Molecules. 28, 5572 (2023). https://doi.org/10.3390/molecules28145572
8. Sanna, V., Siddiqui, I.A., Sechi, M., Mukhtar, H.: Nanoformulation of natural products for prevention and therapy of prostate cancer. Cancer Lett. 334, 142–151 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.canlet.2012.11.037
9. Singh, A.K., Kushwaha, P.P., Singh, A.K., Pandey, A.K.: Overcoming cancer drug resistance: insights into Apoptotic pathway modulation by plant-based nanoparticle and natural products. Front. Oncol. 15, (2025). https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2025.1677380
10. Wen, C., Tang, J., Cao, L., Fan, M., Lin, X., Liu, G., Liang, L., Liu, X., Zhang, J., Li, Y., Xu, X.: Strategic Approaches for Co-Encapsulation of Bioactive Compounds: Technological Advances and Mechanistic Insight. Foods. 14, (2025). https://doi.org/10.3390/foods14122024

11. Xiong, H., Yu, L.X., Qu, H.: Batch-to-Batch Quality Consistency Evaluation of Botanical Drug Products Using Multivariate Statistical Analysis of the Chromatographic Fingerprint. AAPS PharmSciTech. 14, 802–810 (2013). https://doi.org/10.1208/s12249-013-9966-9
12. Uti, D.E., Omang, W.A., Alum, E.U., Bawa, I., Ugwu, O.P.-C., Idowu, A.O., Atangwho, I.J., Egbung, G.E.: Theranostic Nanoparticles in Prostate Cancer: Disrupting Hypoxia-Induced Glycolysis by Targeting Hypoxia-Inducible Factor-1 Alpha and Downstream Metabolites. Cancer Med. 15, e71519 (2026). https://doi.org/10.1002/cam4.71519
13. Ge, X., Shan, S., Lu, H., Wang, W., Gao, C., Fu, S.: Strategies, Challenges and Application Prospects for Exosome Engineering Modifications in Tumor Targeted Therapeutics. Int. J. Nanomedicine. 21, 1–41 (2026). https://doi.org/10.2147/IJN.S572435
14. Gupta, V., Kumar, D., Gupta, S., Tanwar, R., Jaiswal, N.K., Islam, M.M., Singh, S., Choudhary, N., Gowri, S., Webster, T.J., Faiyazuddin, M.: Nanotechnology-Driven Cancer Therapies for Precision Oncology: Advances and Clinical Outlook. Int. J. Nanomedicine. 21, 1–33 (2026). https://doi.org/10.2147/IJN.S568254
15. Alum, E.U., Nwuruku, O.A., Ugwu, O.P.-C., Uti, D.E., Alum, B.N., Edwin, N.: Harnessing nature: plant-derived nanocarriers for targeted drug delivery in cancer therapy. Phytomedicine Plus. 5, 100828 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.phyplu.2025.100828
16. Uti, D.E., Alum, E.U., Atangwho, I.J., Ugwu, O.P.-C., Egbung, G.E., Aja, P.M.: Lipid-based nano-carriers for the delivery of anti-obesity natural compounds: advances in targeted delivery and precision therapeutics. J. Nanobiotechnology. 23, 336 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12951-025-03412-z
17. Gao, D., Guo, X., Zhang, X., Chen, S., Wang, Y., Chen, T., Huang, G., Gao, Y., Tian, Z., Yang, Z.: Multifunctional phototheranostic nanomedicine for cancer imaging and treatment. Mater. Today Bio. 5, 100035 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mtbio.2019.100035
18. Magadani, R., Ndinteh, D.T., Roux, S., Nangah, L.P., Atangwho, I.J., Egba, S.I.: Cytotoxic Effects of Lecaniodiscus Cupanioides (Planch.) Extract and Triterpenoids-derived Gold Nanoparticles On MCF-7 Breast Cancer Cell Lines. Anticancer Agents Med. Chem. 25, 841–850 (2025). https://doi.org/10.2174/0118715206325529241004064307
19. Hertig, J.B., Shah, V.P., Flühmann, B., Mühlebach, S., Stemer, G., Surugue, J., Moss, R., Di Francesco, T.: Tackling the challenges of nanomedicines: are we ready? Am. J. Health. Syst. Pharm. 78, 1047–1056 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1093/ajhp/zxab048
20. Feng, J.: Role of curcumin in altering gut microbiota for anti-obesity and anti-hyperlipidemic effects. Front. Microbiol. 16, (2025). https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2025.1625098
21. Geng, J., Ni, Q., Sun, W., Li, L., Feng, X.: The links between gut microbiota and obesity and obesity related diseases. Biomed. Pharmacother. 147, 112678 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopha.2022.112678
22. Zhao, X., Li, R., Sun, R., Pan, Q., Lu, H., Chai, J.: Targeting the gut microbiota-bile acid axis: Therapeutic strategies for cholestatic liver disease and metabolic dysfunction-associated steatotic liver disease. EngMedicine. 2, 100088 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engmed.2025.100088
23. Zhao, M., Chu, J., Feng, S., Guo, C., Xue, B., He, K., Li, L.: Immunological mechanisms of inflammatory diseases caused by gut microbiota dysbiosis: A review. Biomed. Pharmacother. 164, 114985 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopha.2023.114985
24. Aatif, M.: Current Understanding of Polyphenols to Enhance Bioavailability for Better Therapies. Biomedicines. 11, 2078 (2023). https://doi.org/10.3390/biomedicines11072078
25. Bešlo, D., Golubić, N., Rastija, V., Agić, D., Karnaš, M., Šubarić, D., Lučić, B.: Antioxidant Activity, Metabolism, and Bioavailability of Polyphenols in the Diet of Animals. Antioxidants. 12, 1141 (2023). https://doi.org/10.3390/antiox12061141
26. Li, A., Liu, Q., Li, Q., Liu, B., Yang, Y., Zhang, N.: Berberine Reduces Pyruvate-driven Hepatic Glucose Production by Limiting Mitochondrial Import of Pyruvate through Mitochondrial Pyruvate Carrier 1. EBioMedicine. 34, 243–255 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ebiom.2018.07.039
27. Yin, J., Xing, H., Ye, J.: Efficacy of Berberine in Patients with Type 2 Diabetes. Metabolism. 57, 712–717 (2008). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.metabol.2008.01.013
28. Orchel, A., Skrobek, J., Kaps, A., Paduszyński, P., Chodurek, E.: Current Research on the Control Mechanisms of Cell Survival and Proliferation as Potential Interaction Sites with Pentacyclic Triterpenoids in Ovarian Cancer. Int. J. Mol. Sci. 26, (2025). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms262311622
29. Xie, B., Liu, Y., Li, X., Yang, P., He, W.: Solubilization techniques used for poorly water-soluble drugs. Acta Pharm. Sin. B. 14, 4683–4716 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsb.2024.08.027
30. Kang, S., Jeong, D.-Y., Seo, J., Daily, J.W., Park, S.: Microbiota-Mediated Bile Acid Metabolism as a Mechanistic Framework for Precision Nutrition in Gastrointestinal and Metabolic Diseases. Cells. 15, (2025). https://doi.org/10.3390/cells15010023

31. Vishwakarma, K., Handa, P., Tawfeeq, W.S., Hassan, M.A.: Recent advancements in drug nanocrystals: Innovation in formulation and drug delivery. OpenNano. 27, 100277 (2026). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.onano.2025.100277
32. Nguyen, V.H., Thuy, V.N., Van, T.V., Dao, A.H., Lee, B.-J.: Nanostructured lipid carriers and their potential applications for versatile drug delivery via oral administration. OpenNano. 8, 100064 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.onano.2022.100064
33. Eltaib, L.: Polymeric Nanoparticles in Targeted Drug Delivery: Unveiling the Impact of Polymer Characterization and Fabrication. Polymers. 17, (2025). https://doi.org/10.3390/polym17070833
34. Zhang, H., Chen, H., Hu, X., Muhammad, W., Liu, C., Liu, W.: Inflammation-modulating polymeric nanoparticles: design strategies, mechanisms, and therapeutic applications. eBioMedicine. 118, 105837 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ebiom.2025.105837
35. Gigliobianco, M.R., Casadidio, C., Censi, R., Di Martino, P.: Nanocrystals of Poorly Soluble Drugs: Drug Bioavailability and Physicochemical Stability. Pharmaceutics. 10, 134 (2018). https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics10030134
36. Ji, M., Long, L., Xiong, S., Liu, Z., Luo, J., Liu, D.: Nanocrystalline Drug Delivery Systems for Natural Compounds: Progress, Challenges and Future Opportunities. Int. J. Nanomedicine. 20, 11315–11339 (2025). https://doi.org/10.2147/IJN.S536383
37. Yan, Y., Li, Y., Zou, D., Ma, H., Chen, H.: The role of tissue factor in the tumor microenvironment and targeted therapy. Biochim. Biophys. Acta BBA - Rev. Cancer. 1880, 189409 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbcan.2025.189409
38. Rezagholizade-shirvan, A., Soltani, M., Shokri, S., Radfar, R., Arab, M., Shamloo, E.: Bioactive compound encapsulation: Characteristics, applications in food systems, and implications for human health. Food Chem. X. 24, 101953 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fochx.2024.101953
39. Chen, K., Wang, H., Yang, Y., Tang, C., Sun, X., Zhou, J., Liu, S., Li, Q., Zhao, L., Gao, Z.: Common mechanisms of Gut microbe-based strategies for the treatment of intestine-related diseases: based on multi-target interactions with the intestinal barrier. Cell Commun. Signal. CCS. 23, 288 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12964-025-02299-5
40. Chang, D., Ma, Y., Xu, X., Xie, J., Ju, S.: Stimuli-Responsive Polymeric Nanoplatforms for Cancer Therapy. Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol. 9, 707319 (2021). https://doi.org/10.3389/fbioe.2021.707319
41. Jia, R., Teng, L., Gao, L., Su, T., Fu, L., Qiu, Z., Bi, Y.: Advances in Multiple Stimuli-Responsive Drug-Delivery Systems for Cancer Therapy. Int. J. Nanomedicine. 16, 1525–1551 (2021). https://doi.org/10.2147/IJN.S293427
42. The Role of Mucoadhesion and Mucopenetration in the Immune Response Induced by Polymer-Based Mucosal Adjuvants | MDPI, https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4360/15/7/1615
43. Verma, S.K., Prasad, A., Sonika, Katiyar, V.: State of art review on sustainable biodegradable polymers with a market overview for sustainability packaging. Mater. Today Sustain. 26, 100776 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mtsust.2024.100776
44. Luo, K., Peters, B.A., Moon, J.-Y., Xue, X., Wang, Z., Usyk, M., Hanna, D.B., Landay, A.L., Schneider, M.F., Gustafson, D., Weber, K.M., French, A., Sharma, A., Anastos, K., Wang, T., Brown, T., Clish, C.B., Kaplan, R.C., Knight, R., Burk, R.D., Qi, Q.: Metabolic and inflammatory perturbation of diabetes associated gut dysbiosis in people living with and without HIV infection. Genome Med. 16, 59 (2024). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13073-024-01336-1
45. Assi, R.A., Abdulbaqi, I.M., Yee, C.S.: The Evaluation of Drug Delivery Nanocarrier Development and Pharmacological Briefing for Metabolic-Associated Fatty Liver Disease (MAFLD): An Update. Pharmaceuticals. 14, (2021). https://doi.org/10.3390/ph14030215
46. Zhang, Q.-W., Lin, L.-G., Ye, W.-C.: Techniques for extraction and isolation of natural products: a comprehensive review. Chin. Med. 13, 20 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13020-018-0177-x
47. Kim, K.-S., Cho, H.J., Din, F.U., Cho, J.H., Choi, H.-G.: Surfactant–Particle Engineering Hybrids: Emerging Strategies for Enhancing Solubility and Oral Bioavailability of Poorly Water-Soluble Drugs. Pharmaceutics. 18, (2025). https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmaceutics18010037
48. Dangana, R.S., Okon, M.B., Orire, I.E., Sanusi, I.O., Terkimbi, S.D., Aja, P.M., Abubakar, I.B., Anyim, G.: Systematic review of peptide nanoparticles for improved diabetes outcomes: insights and opportunities. Discov. Nano. 20, 41 (2025). https://doi.org/10.1186/s11671-025-04215-9

CITE AS: Mukisa Ian Mugaiga (2026). Convergence of Natural Products and Nanomedicine in Diabetes Care: Therapeutic Innovations and Translational Challenges. IDOSR JOURNAL OF APPLIED SCIENCES 11(2):106-112. https://doi.org/10.59298/IDOSRJAS/2026/112106112