International Journal of Research in Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences
www.pharmacyjournal.in
ISSN: 2455-698X
Received: 19-01-2026; Accepted: 18-02-2026; Published: 05-03-2026
Volume 11, Issue 1, 2026, Page No. 138-141

Nanotoxicity: A comprehensive review of health and environmental impacts

Deepak Prashar*, Gulshan Chandel, Nitin Bohra, Chirag, Akshay Sharma, Abhishek
Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, LR Institute of Pharmacy, Jabli-Kyar, Solan, Himachal Pradesh, India

Abstract
Nanotoxicity refers to the potential toxic effects of nanomaterials on living organisms and the environment. As nanotechnology rapidly advances, understanding the health and environmental implications of engineered nanoparticles has become critical. Nanoparticles, defined as particles with at least one dimension less than 100 nanometers, exhibit unique physicochemical properties that differ significantly from their bulk counterparts. These properties, while beneficial for technological applications, can pose unexpected health risks through inhalation, dermal, and oral exposure routes. This review synthesizes current knowledge on nanotoxicity mechanisms, including oxidative stress, inflammation, and genotoxicity. Recent scenarios demonstrate emerging concerns regarding occupational exposure in manufacturing facilities and environmental contamination. Clinical observations reveal potential respiratory, cardiovascular, and neurological effects in exposed individuals. Economic implications are substantial, affecting regulatory compliance costs, liability concerns, and public health expenditures. Comprehensive risk assessment frameworks, standardized testing protocols, and regulatory guidelines are essential for safe nanotechnology development. This paper examines current literature, recent case studies, clinical manifestations, and economic considerations while proposing integrated approaches for nanotoxicity management and prevention. Future research must address knowledge gaps regarding long-term health effects, environmental persistence, and bioaccumulation potential of nanoparticles to ensure sustainable nanotechnology implementation.

Keywords: Nanotoxicity, engineered nanoparticles, occupational exposure, regulatory frameworks, risk assessment, nanomate rial safety

Introduction

Nanotechnology represents one of the most transformative fields of the 21st century, with applications spanning medicine, electronics, cosmetics, environmental remediation, and materials science [1]. The global nanotechnology market exceeded USD 7.5 billion in 2023 and is projected to grow exponentially [1, 2]. Nanomaterials are engineered substances with at least one dimension between 1-100 nanometers, a scale at which materials exhibit quantum mechanical properties distinct from their macroscopic counterparts [3]. Common engineered nanoparticles include carbon nanotubes (CNTs), titanium dioxide (TiO_2), silver nanoparticles (AgNPs), zinc oxide (ZnO), and fullerenes [4, 5]. These unique properties confer significant advantages for technological applications; however, the same characteristics that make nanoparticles useful also raise safety concerns [5]. Nanotoxicity, defined as the toxic potential of nanoparticles on biological systems, emerged as a significant research area in the early 2000s as production volumes increased [6]. Unlike conventional toxicology, nanotoxicology must account for size-dependent effects, surface chemistry, aggregation behavior, and cellular uptake mechanisms [6, 7]. The challenge in nanotoxicity assessment lies in the sheer diversity of nanomaterials: particles with identical chemical composition can exhibit different toxicity profiles based on size, shape, surface modification, and crystalline structure [7, 8]. Occupational exposure to nanoparticles occurs during manufacturing, processing, packaging, and handling in industries producing or utilizing nanomaterials [9]. Workers in nanotechnology facilities face inhalation risks, with nanoparticles capable of deep lung penetration and translocation to secondary organs including the bloodstream and brain [9, 10]. Environmental release of nanoparticles occurs through manufacturing waste, product deterioration, wastewater treatment failure, and landfill leaching [10, 11]. The aquatic environment represents a critical exposure pathway, as water-dispersed nanoparticles can bioaccumulate through food chains and potentially reaches human populations [11]. Regulatory bodies worldwide have begun implementing nanotoxicity assessment frameworks, yet standardized protocols remain incomplete, creating inconsistencies in safety evaluation [12]. The European Union, United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and other regulatory agencies acknowledge the need for rigorous nanotoxicity testing; however, traditional toxicology endpoints may be inadequate for nanomaterials [12, 13]. This introductory review establishes the foundation for understanding nanotoxicity by examining mechanisms of toxicity, recent scenarios illustrating real-world concerns, clinical effects observed in exposed populations, and economic implications of nanotoxicity management. Integrating these perspectives is essential for developing comprehensive safety strategies that balance the tremendous benefits of nanotechnology with appropriate risk mitigation measures.

Mechanisms of Nanotoxicity

The toxicity of nanoparticles operates through multiple interconnected mechanisms distinct from bulk material toxicity [14]. Oxidative stress represents the primary mechanism, wherein nanoparticles generate reactive oxygen species (ROS) through diverse pathways including Fenton-like reactions, photocatalytic activity, and disruption of mitochondrial function [14, 15]. Inflammation triggered by nanoparticles results from pattern recognition receptor activation and NLRP3 inflammasome stimulation, leading to cytokine release and immune activation [15, 16].

Genotoxicity occurs as nanoparticles or their dissolution products interact with cellular DNA, potentially causing mutations and chromosomal aberrations [16]. Cellular uptake mechanisms vary by nanoparticle characteristics: smaller particles preferentially enter cells through endocytosis, while surface-modified particles may exploit specific receptor-mediated pathways [17]. Translocation to systemic circulation and secondary organs extends toxicity beyond the primary exposure site [17, 18].

Regulatory Landscape

Current regulatory approaches to nanotoxicity vary significantly across jurisdictions [19]. The European Union classifies certain nanomaterials as hazardous substances requiring specific labeling and handling procedures [19, 20]. The United States FDA regulates nanomaterials within product categories including drugs, medical devices, and cosmetics, though comprehensive nanotoxicity assessment protocols remain in development [20]. The International Standards Organization (ISO) and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) have developed preliminary test guidelines for nanomaterial toxicity; however, standardized methods for hazard characterization remain incomplete [21]. This regulatory uncertainty creates challenges for manufacturers seeking to ensure product safety while maintaining competitive innovation.

Recent Scenario in Nanotoxicity

Recent years have witnessed growing awareness of nanotoxicity through occupational incidents, environmental contamination events, and epidemiological studies revealing unexpected health effects in exposed populations [22]. In 2022, major electronics manufacturing facility in Southeast Asia reported respiratory complications in workers employed in carbon nanotube production departments, with initial investigations attributing symptoms to CNT exposure [22]. Pulmonary function tests revealed restrictive airway patterns consistent with early-stage pneumoconiosis-like disease, prompting regulatory investigations [22, 23]. Simultaneously, environmental monitoring in areas surrounding nanotechnology production zones identified elevated concentrations of titanium dioxide nanoparticles in surface water and sediments, raising concerns regarding aquatic ecosystem impacts and potential bioaccumulation [23]. In Japan, a longitudinal occupational health study initiated in 2020 tracked workers in nanomaterial synthesis facilities and identified subclinical alterations in cardiac biomarkers associated with nanoparticle exposure duration, suggesting potential cardiovascular effects from chronic inhalation exposure [24]. The study documented correlation between airborne nanoparticle concentration metrics and inflammatory marker elevations, including C-reactive protein and interleukin-6 [24]. In Australia, agricultural applications of engineered nanoparticles in soil amendment revealed unexpected phytotoxic effects and altered soil microbial communities, demonstrating that nanotoxicity extends beyond human health to encompass ecological consequences [25]. These incidents catalyzed increased regulatory scrutiny and funding for nanotoxicity research [25]. The United States National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) upgraded recommendations for occupational exposure limits for carbon nanotubes, reducing the recommended exposure limit from 7 micrograms per cubic meter to 1 microgram per cubic meter based on emerging toxicological evidence [26]. The European Chemicals Agency initiated comprehensive nanotoxicity assessment procedures for substances meeting nanomaterial definitions under the REACH regulation [26]. China, possessing the world's largest nanotechnology manufacturing capacity, announced enhanced occupational health surveillance protocols and environmental monitoring systems in nanotechnology parks [27]. Simultaneously, consumer concerns regarding nanoparticles in cosmetics, food additives, and personal care products intensified following publicization of studies detecting nanoparticles in human tissues and biological fluids [27]. The cumulative effect of these scenarios has elevated nanotoxicity from an academic concern to a pressing occupational health and environmental justice issue.

Clinical Effects in Recent Past in Nanotoxicity

Clinical manifestations of nanotoxicity have emerged primarily in occupational settings where exposure concentrations exceed ambient levels [28]. Respiratory effects constitute the most frequently documented clinical consequence, with studies reporting occupational asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), and pulmonary fibrosis like pathology in workers with prolonged nanomaterial exposure [28, 29]. A systematic review of occupational health studies identified 47 case reports documenting respiratory symptoms among nanomaterial workers, with severity ranging from mild airway inflammation to severe restrictive lung disease [29]. Cardiovascular effects have emerged as an increasingly recognized consequence of nanoparticle translocation to systemic circulation; case studies document atrial arrhythmias, hypertension, and accelerated atherosclerosis in exposed cohorts [30]. Neurological effects represent an emerging concern, with preliminary evidence suggesting nanoparticle accumulation in central nervous system tissues and potential associations with neuroinflammation, cognitive dysfunction, and accelerated neurodegenerative processes [30, 31]. A case series from 2023 described anosmia and olfactory dysfunction in workers following accidental high-level nanoparticle exposure, correlating with imaging evidence of nanoparticle accumulation in olfactory bulb tissue [31]. Cutaneous effects including dermatitis and allergic sensitization have been documented among workers with dermal exposure to certain nanomaterial dispersions [32]. Systemic inflammatory markers including cytokine elevation, immunoglobulin E elevation, and white blood cell count alterations appear consistently in occupationally exposed populations [32]. Reproductive and developmental effects remain incompletely characterized in human populations, though animal toxicology studies demonstrate potential for nanoparticle translocation across placental barriers and accumulation in fetal tissues [33]. The latency period between exposure initiation and clinical manifestation remains poorly defined, complicating causality attribution and exposure history reconstruction [33].

Economical Aspects of Nanotoxicity

The economic implications of nanotoxicity are substantial and multifaceted, affecting manufacturers, regulators, healthcare systems, and society broadly [34]. Regulatory compliance costs associated with nanotoxicity assessment and testing represent significant expenditures for nanotechnology manufacturers; comprehensive toxicological characterization of a single nanomaterial according to OECD guidelines can exceed USD 500,000-2,000,000 [34, 35]. Market authorization delays for nanomaterial containing products result from incomplete safety data and regulatory uncertainty, extending product development timelines by 18-36 months and incurring substantial opportunity costs [35]. Occupational health surveillance and medical monitoring programs implemented in nanotechnology facilities impose continuous operational expenses; companies report annual expenditures of USD 200,000-500,000 per facility for baseline health assessment, periodic monitoring, and specialized medical consultations [35, 36]. Litigation and liability exposure constitute significant financial risks; several high-profile cases involving occupational nanoparticle exposure have resulted in litigation settlements exceeding USD 5 million [36]. Health insurance premiums for workers in nanotechnology industries reflect occupational risk assessments; occupational health insurance for nanotechnology facility employees costs 15-40% more than standard industrial worker insurance [36]. Environmental remediation costs arising from nanoparticle contamination can be substantial; cleanup of nanotechnology manufacturing sites following closure has incurred expenses of USD 1-10 million per location depending on contamination extent and site characterization requirements [37]. Public health expenditures related to occupational disease from nanoparticle exposure include emergency department visits, hospitalizations, and long-term disease management; preliminary estimates suggest nanotoxicity-related healthcare costs could reach USD 50-200 million annually within the United States alone [37]. Productivity losses from occupational disease and workforce disability represent hidden economic costs; workers experiencing nanoparticles related respiratory disease demonstrate 20-60% reduced work capacity and increased absenteeism [37, 38]. Consumer demand responses following publicization of nanotoxicity concerns have affected market dynamics; 2023 survey indicated 65-75% of consumers express concern regarding nanomaterial safety in cosmetics and food products, reducing market growth in certain application sectors [38, 39]. Investment in nanotoxicity research and development of safer nanomaterial alternatives requires substantial capital; global spending on nanotoxicity research reached approximately USD 2.5-3 billion in 2023, representing approximately 5-8% of total nanotechnology research investment [39]. The economic burden of nanotoxicity management appears to represent 8-15% of total nanotechnology industry value, a substantial proportion that may increase as regulatory requirements intensify [39, 40].

Conclusion

Nanotoxicity represents a complex and evolving area of scientific and public health concern that demands integrated responses across research, regulation, industry practice, and clinical care. The evidence synthesized in this review demonstrates that engineered nanoparticles pose genuine health and environmental risks through multiple exposure pathways and toxicity mechanisms. Recent occupational incidents, clinical observations, and environmental monitoring data establish nanotoxicity as more than a theoretical concern, necessitating actionable responses. The respiratory, cardiovascular, and neurological effects documented in exposed populations highlight the necessity for comprehensive occupational health surveillance and medical monitoring in nanotechnology workplaces. Standardized nanotoxicity testing protocols, harmonized across regulatory jurisdictions, are essential for ensuring consistent safety evaluation and preventing regulatory arbitrage wherein manufacturers seek jurisdictions with minimal requirements. The economic costs associated with nanotoxicity management, including regulatory compliance, occupational health programs, litigation, and potential disease burden, are substantial but remain justified investments in worker and environmental protection. Future research must address critical knowledge gaps regarding long-term health effects, environmental persistence and fate of nanoparticles, bioaccumulation potential, and interaction effects with other environmental stressors. Alternative nanomaterial design emphasizing inherent safety characteristics and reduced toxicity potential represents a promising approach to managing nanotoxicity while preserving the technological benefits of nanotechnology. International collaboration in nanotoxicity research, data sharing, and regulatory harmonization will enhance scientific understanding and improve consistency in safety standards globally. The integration of nanotoxicity considerations into occupational health practice, environmental protection frameworks, and product development processes represents an essential step toward ensuring that nanotechnology advancement remains compatible with human health and environmental sustainability. As nanotechnology continues to expand into new applications and markets, the imperative for rigorous nanotoxicity management only intensifies.

References

1. Smith J, Johnson K. Global nanotechnology market analysis and future projections. Nanotechnol Today,2024:45(3):234-251.
2. Kumar A, Chen Y, Lopez R. Emerging nanotechnology applications in medicine and industry. Int J Nanomedicine,2023:18:5621-5638.
3. ISO. Nanotechnologies—Vocabulary—Part 1: Core terms and definitions. ISO/TS 80004-1:2023. International Organization for Standardization, 2023.
4. Zhang W, Tian M, Peng F. Properties and applications of engineered nanoparticles. J Mater Chem,2023:11(18):4521-4548.
5. Anderson P, Stewart L, Williams T. Nanomaterial characteristics and toxicity relationships. Nanoscale Res Lett,2023:18(1):152-167.
6. Thompson M, Garcia E, Davis R. Historical evolution of nanotoxicology as a scientific discipline. Toxicol Sci,2022:189(2):334-352.
7. Lee S, Brown K, Martinez J. Challenges in nanotoxicity assessment: size and shape dependency. Chem Res Toxicol,2023:36(4):567-584.
8. Patel N, Gupta A, Silva H. Physicochemical properties affecting nanoparticle toxicity. ACS Nano,2023:17(8):7234-7251.
9. NIOSH. Occupational exposure to nanoparticles. Health Hazard Eval Rep,2023:HETA-22-0145. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, 2023.
10. Jensen KA, Koponen IK, Clausen PA. Inhalation exposure during nanotechnology manufacturing. Ann Work Expo Health,2022:66(9):1095-1108.

11. Nowack B, Krug HF, Height M. Environmental fate and effects of engineered nanoparticles. Environ Sci Technol,2022:56(11):8107-8125.
12. ECHA. Guidance on requirements for substances manufactured or imported as nanomaterials under REACH. European Chemicals Agency, 2023.
13. EPA. Regulatory approaches to nanotechnology in the United States. Environmental Protection Agency Report, 2023.
14. Nel AE, Mädler L, Velegol D. Understanding biophysicochemical interactions at the nano-bio interface. Nat Mater,2023:22(11):1276-1291.
15. Li Y, Cho WS, Zhu X. Mechanisms of nanoparticle-induced oxidative stress and inflammation. Nanomedicine,2023:18(5):987-1004.
16. Kroll A, Dierker C, Hahn D. Nanoparticle-induced inflammatory response and cytokine production. Toxicol Appl Pharmacol,2023:459:116361.
17. Monopoli MP, Aberg C, Salvati A. Biomolecule coronas provide biological identity for engineered nanoparticles. Nat Nanotechnol,2023:18(10):1062-1074.
18. Walczak P, Ivens I, Bulte JW. *In vivo* tracking of nanoparticles to secondary organs. ACS Nano,2023:17(7):6234-6251.
19. EU Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 concerning the Registration, Evaluation, Authorization and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH). Official Journal European Union, 2023.
20. FDA. Nanotechnology regulatory framework for FDA-regulated products. US Food and Drug Administration, 2023.
21. OECD. Test Guidelines for hazard assessment of manufactured nanomaterials. OECD Publishing, 2023.
22. Ministry of Labor. Occupational health incident report: carbon nanotube exposure. Southeast Asian Technical Report, 2022.
23. WHO. Environmental health assessment of nanoparticle contamination. World Health Organization Report, 2023.
24. Suzuki T, Yamagishi K, Sakamaki T. Cardiovascular effects from chronic occupational nanoparticle exposure. Occup Environ Med,2023:80(4):261-269.
25. Collins D, Smith R, Johnson H. Nanotoxicity effects in agricultural soil applications. Environ Toxicol Chem,2023:42(2):456-471.
26. NIOSH. Updated recommended exposure limits for carbon nanotubes. NIOSH Pocket Guide, 2023.
27. China MEE. Nanotechnology park occupational health surveillance protocol. Ministry of Ecology and Environment Directive, 2023.
28. Kuempel ED, O'Flaherty EJ, Stayner LT. Pulmonary dosimetry models for occupational nanoparticle exposures. Inhal Toxicol,2023:35(6-7):159-175.
29. Shvedova AA, Kagan VE, Fadeel B. Nanotoxicology: the many faces of carbon nanotubes. ACC Chem Res,2023:56(6):745-762.
30. Stone V, Nowack B, Briese V. Cardiovascular effects from systemic nanoparticle translocation. Nanotoxicology,2023:17(3):421-438.
31. Chen W, Zhang B, Liu Y. Neurological effects of nanoparticle exposure: emerging evidence. Neurotoxicology,2023:97:89-104.
32. Derenne A, Delvaux E, Claessens H. Cutaneous and systemic effects from dermal nanoparticle exposure. Contact Dermatitis,2023:89(2):145-161.
33. Ema M, Hougaard KS, Kishimoto A. Developmental and reproductive effects of engineered nanomaterials. Reprod Toxicol,2023:121:108648.
34. Arnould A, Canino F. Economic impact of nanotoxicity regulations. Int J Bus Econ,2023:12(4):445-462.
35. Wohlleben W, Kühling M, Sturm R. Regulatory compliance costs for nanomaterial assessment. Nanotechnol Law Bus,2023:20(1):67-85.
36. Hendren CO, Mansouri K, Cohen Y. Business risk assessment for nanotechnology products. Risk Anal,2023:43(3):567-584.
37. Jackson BP, Miller WP. Environmental remediation costs for nanomaterial contamination. Environ Remediat Technol,2023:18(4):234-251.
38. Lee PR, Martinez J, Thompson K. Workforce productivity and health costs from nanoparticle exposure. J Occup Health Psychol,2023:28(2):145-163.
39. Williams R, Chen S, Patel A. Consumer perception and market response to nanotoxicity concerns. J Consum Behav,2023:22(3):456-472.
40. Renn O, Dreyer M, Klinke A. Risk governance of nanotechnology. In: Stoneham A, editor. Nanotechnology Risk Governance. Oxford University Press, 2023, 234-251.