WORLD JOURNAL OF PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH
SJIF Impact Factor 8.084
Volume 10, Issue 6, 478-501. Review Article ISSN 2277– 7105

A REVIEW ON TREATMENT OF BREAST CANCER USING SILVER NANOPARTICLES

Vaibhav Dubey* and Deepak Yadav

M. Pharmaceutics Scholar, University Institute of Pharma Sciences, Chandigarh University, Gharaun, Punjab, India.

Article Received on
30 March 2021,

Revised on 19 April 2021,
Accepted on 09 May 2021

DOI: 10.20959/wjpr20216-20518

***Corresponding Author**
Vaibhav Dubey
M. Pharmaceutics Scholar, University Institute of Pharma Sciences, Chandigarh University, Gharaun, Punjab, India.

ABSTRACT

Researchers are examining to discover new methodologies in the field of nanotechnology for the fix and conclusion of bosom malignant growth as it is considered as genuine clinical issue for ladies. This article presents a thorough audit of the Breast Cancer writing inspecting the study of disease transmission, determination, pathology, and post-therapy observation among numerous themes. Bosom malignancy discovery, therapy, and avoidance are unmistakable issues in general wellbeing and clinical practice. Silver nanoparticles (AgNPs) are notable as a promising antimicrobial material; they have been generally utilized in numerous business items against pathogenic specialists. In spite of a developing concern with respect to the cytotoxicity, AgNPs actually have pulled in significant interest worldwide to build up another age of indicative instrument and powerful therapy answer for cancer cells.

EPIDIMIOLOGY OF BREAST CANCER

Bosom malignant growth is the most normally happening disease in ladies, containing right around one third of all malignancies in females. It is second just to cellular breakdown in the lungs as a reason for disease mortality, and it is the main source of death for American ladies between the ages of 40 what's more, 55.[1] The lifetime hazard of a lady creating intrusive bosom malignancy is 12.6 % 2 one out of 8 females in the US will create bosom disease sooner or later in her life.[2] The passing rate for bosom malignant growth has been gradually declining over the previous decade, and the occurrence has stayed level since 1988 subsequent to expanding consistently for almost 50 years.[3] 25% to 30% of ladies with obtrusive bosom malignant growth will pass on of their disease.1 However this measurement,

however dreary as it seems to be, too implies that 70% to 75% of ladies with obtrusive bosom malignant growth will kick the bucket of some different option from their bosom disease. Henceforth, an analysis of bosom disease, even intrusive bosom malignancy, isn't really the "sentence of death" that numerous ladies (and their insurance agencies) envision. Death rates are most elevated in the very youthful (not as much as age 35) and in the old (more prominent than age 75).[4] Apparently the very youthful have more forceful illness, and that the old may not be dealt with forcefully or then again may have comorbid infection that increments bosom malignancy fatality.[5] Albeit 60% to 80% of repeats happen in the initial 3 years, the possibility of repeat exists for up to 20 years.[6,7]

PATHOLOGY OF BREAST CANCER

95% of bosom malignant growths are carcinomas, ie, they emerge from bosom epithelial components. Bosom tumors are isolated into 2 significant sorts, in situ carcinomas and obtrusive (or penetrating) carcinomas. The in situ carcinomas may emerge in either ductal or lobular epithelium, yet stay limited there, with no attack of the basic cellar film that would establish expansion past epithelial limits. As would be normal with such restricted and kept threat, there is immaterial potential for metastases. When there is augmentation of the ductal or lobular danger past the storm cellar film that establishes the epithelial line, at that point the harm is viewed as intrusive (or penetrating) ductal or lobular carcinoma. The potential for metastases and at last demise happens in intrusive infection.

Table 1: Chances of a Woman Developing Breast Cancer by Age.

By Age	Normal Risk	Genetic Risk*
45	1 in 93 (1%)	42%
55	1 in 33 (3%)	72%
65	1 in 17 (6%)	80%

* Breast-related cancer antigen 1 and 2 (BRCA-1, BRCA-2). Data from American Cancer Society, Cancer Facts and Figures 2000.

RISK FACTORS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF BREAST CANCER

Bosom disease rate is most noteworthy in North America and Northern Europe and least in Asia and Africa. Investigations of relocation examples to the United States propose that hereditary factors alone don't represent the occurrence variety among nations, as the rate paces of second-, third-and fourth-age Asian outsiders increment consistently in this country. Accordingly, ecological and additionally way of life factors give off an impression of being

significant determinants of bosom disease risk.[5] Gender is by a long shot the most serious danger factor.

Bosom disease happens multiple times more every now and again in ladies than men. In ladies, occurrence paces of bosom malignancy rise strongly with age (see Table 1) until ages 45 to 50, when the ascent turns out to be less steep.[4] This adjustment in incline most likely mirrors the effect of hormonal change (menopause) that happens about this time. By ages 75 to 80, the bend really smoothes and afterward diminishes.

Notwithstanding the steepness of the rate bend at more youthful ages, the more significant issue is the expanding commonness of bosom malignancy with propelling age, and the takehome message for doctors and guarantors the same is that any bosom mass in a postmenopausal lady ought to be viewed as disease until demonstrated otherwise.8 Genetics assumes a restricted yet significant part as a danger factor for bosom disease. Simply 5% to 6% of bosom diseases are considered hereditary.9 BRCA-1 and BRCA-2 record for an expected 80% of inherited bosom malignancy, however once more, this just addresses 5% to 6% of all bosom tumors. BRCA-1 and additionally BRCA-2 positive ladies have a half to 85% lifetime hazard of creating bosom malignancy (see Table 1), and a 15% to 65% danger of creating ovarian disease, starting at age 25.[10] Familial bosom disease is viewed as a danger if a first-degree relative creates bosom disease before menopause, on the off chance that it influenced the two bosoms, or on the off chance that it happened related to ovarian cancer.[11] There is a 2-overlap relative danger of bosom malignant growth if a lady has a solitary firstdegree relative (mother, sister or daughter). There is a 5-overlay expanded danger if 2 first-degree family members have had bosom cancer.[12] A lady's hormonal history gives off an impression of being a danger factor, as the overall danger of bosom disease is by all accounts identified with the bosom's aggregate openness to estrogen and progesterone. Early menarche (beginning of period, age 13), having no kids or having them after age 30, and menopause after age 50 and particularly age 55—all these mean more monthly cycles and in this manner more noteworthy chemical exposure.[13]

The Women's Health Initiative (WHI), a randomized controlled preliminary of 16,608 postmenopausal ladies contrasting impacts of estrogen in addition to progestin and fake treatment on constant infection hazard, affirmed that consolidated estrogen in addition to progestin use builds the danger of intrusive bosom cancer.[14] Hormone substitution treatment (HRT) clients have a bosom malignant growth hazard that is 53% higher for mix treatment

and 34% higher for estrogen alone, particularly whenever utilized for over 5 years. Al-however prior examinations recommended that this expanded danger of malignant growth was counterbalanced by the way that the diseases prompted by HRT were of more kindhearted pathology and had a more positive prognosis,4 reconsideration of the WHI information uncovers this impression to be inaccurate. Obtrusive bosom malignant growths related with estrogen in addition to progestin use were bigger (l.7 cm versus 1.5 cm, p 5 0.04), were bound to be hub positive (26% versus 16%, p 5 0.03), and were analyzed at an altogether further developed stage (local/metastatic 25.4% versus 16%, p 50.04). The rates and circulation of obtrusive ductal, intrusive lobular, blended ductal, and lobular just as rounded carcinomas were comparative in the estrogen in addition to progestin bunch versus the fake treatment group.[15]

Over perception time as short as a year, there was a measurably critical expansion in bosom thickness in the estrogen in addition to progestin bunch, bringing about expanded frequency of strange mammograms (9.4% versus 5.4%,p,0.001).15 As verified by Gann and Morrow in a JAMA article, "the capacity of consolidated chemical treatment to diminish mammographic affectability causes a practically remarkable circumstance where a specialist builds the danger of building up an illness while at the same time postponing its detection."[16]

Li et al detailed that ladies utilizing unopposed estrogen substitution treatment (ERT) had no considerable expansion in the danger of bosom malignancy. In any case, utilization of consolidated estrogen and progestin chemical substitution treatment had an in general 1.7-overlay (95% CI 1.3–2.2) expanded danger of bosom malignancy, includinga 2.7-overlap (95% CI 1.7–4.3) expanded danger of obtrusive lobular carcinoma, a 1.5-crease (95% CI, 1.1–2.0) expanded danger of intrusive ductal carcinoma, and a 2-overlap (95% CI 1.5–2.7) expanded danger of ER1/PR1 bosom cancers.[17]

Other danger factors for bosom disease incorporate liquor, which has been connected to expanded blood levels of estrogen meddling with folate digestion that ensures against tumor development. Ladies who drink .2 ounces of liquor each day are 40% bound to create bosom malignant growth than ladies who drink no alcohol.[18]

The Nurses' Health Study tracked down that in postmenopausal ladies a weight gain of in excess of 45 pounds after age 18 was connected as an autonomous danger factor for bosom disease (fat tissue produces chemicals that are changed over to estrogen).[19] This affiliation

was more grounded in postmenopausal ladies who had never taken estrogen substitution treatment.

The overall danger of creating bosom malignancy was 1.6 with a 10–20 kg weight acquire, and 2.0 with a weight gain of in excess of 20 kg, contrasted with ladies with insignificant weight gain. In contrast, among ladies taking oestrogen, the individuals who put on weight didn't have an expanded danger of bosom disease. The varying impacts of heftiness and weight acquire in premenopausal and postmenopausal ladies is believed to be on the grounds that stoutness diminishes estradiol and progesterone fixations in premenopausal ladies due to an expanded recurrence of anovulation.[20] Thus, less circulating oestrogen is accessible to target tissues like the bosom.

The Nurses' Health Study additionally tracked down that postmenopausal ladies who got in any event 1 hour of actual exercise each week were 15% to 20% more averse to create bosom malignancy than the individuals who were totally stationary. In routinely practicing ladies, members in a wellbeing screening program in Norway, the decrease in hazard was more prominent in premenopausal ladies than in postmenopausal ladies (relative danger 0.38; 95% CI 0.19–0.79).[21] The justification the decrease of hazard in practicing ladies might be identified with postponed menarche in young ladies associated with arduous active work. Likewise, moderate degrees of actual work in premenopausal ladies are related with an ovulatory cycle, which additionally are related with diminished risk.[22]

Women treated for bosom disease have about a 1% more prominent possibility each time of building up another second malignancy in either the treated bosom or the other bosom. In this way, past bosom malignancy is an acknowledged danger factor for improvement of bosom cancer.[23] 10% of ladies with bosom disease build up a second bosom malignant growth, and ladies with bosom disease have a 3-to 7-overlay expanded family member. hazard of disease creating in the inverse bosom. Ladies who have had high portions of radiation to the chest before age 45—for the most part for Hodgkin's sickness—are at altogether expanded danger of bosom malignancy as grown-ups. Radiation after age 45 doesn't present expanded hazard. The weakest ages seem, by all accounts, to be the prepubertal long stretches of 10 to 14. These ladies ought to have yearly mammograms and clinical bosom tests starting either 10 a long time after the radiation therapies or by age 35.[24]

RECOGNITION OF BREAST CANCER

As bosom disease seldom causes torment, an effortless mass is significantly more troubling for danger than is one causing side effects. Mammography done yearly start at age 40 is the current suggestion for ladies with no danger factors.25 The most usually experienced classification of mammography discoveries is summed up in Table 2. Despite the fact that mammograms may identify harm as little as 0.5 cm, 10% to 20% of malignancies escape location by mammography, in any event, when they happen at a lot bigger size.[26] In a patient with a strong, predominant mass (dubious mass) the main role of the mammogram is to screen the typical encompassing bosom tissue and the contrary bosom for nonpalpable tumors, not to make a determination of the tangible mass.8 Thus, a negative mammogram is no assurance of nonappearance of threat, and a mass that doesn't vanish or implode with desire should be thought to be a danger and biopsied.

DIAGNOSING BREAST CANCER: THE BIOPSY

There are 3 strategies for acquiring material from a dubious bosom bump. Fine-needle yearning is certifiably not a dependable methods for determination, since it can't recognize ductal carcinoma in situ from obtrusive malignant growth and it might prompt a bogus negative result.1 Fine needle desire (FNA) is for the most part saved for unmistakable blister like bumps obvious on a mammogram or ultrasound. Bogus positives are insignificant however bogus negative outcomes happen in 15% to 20%, prompting the proposal that if the growth or bump doesn't vanish with FNA, further biopsy is mandatory.[8]

Core needle biopsy has commonly supplanted fine needle yearning in everything except clear pimples. Center needle biopsies neglect to distinguish spaces of intrusion in around 20% of cases which are initially analyzed as ductal carcinoma in situ. Abnormal ductal hyperplasia in a center needle biopsy has a moderately high occurrence of concurrent carcinoma (around half). This conclusion, subsequently, requests excisional biopsy.[27]

Seventy-five percent to 80% of excisional biopsies are required to be amiable. Of the leftover 20% to 25% that uncover disease, a subsequent medical procedure is regularly expected to guarantee evacuation of all destructive tissue.

Axillary lymph hub inclusion is the most significant regularly accessible indicator of backslide and of survival.[28] See later conversation on cyclin E estimations and DNA microarrays that may challenge this assertion later on. Axillary repeat or tumor contribution

in inside mammary or supraclavicular lymph hubs consistently shows a poor prognosis.[29] Sentinel lymph hub biopsy is a biopsy of level I axillary lymph hubs. It has a positive prescient worth moving toward 100%, with an affectability of 89% and a particularity of 100%.[30] Three percent of positive sentinel hubs, nonetheless, are found in non-axillary locales. There gives off an impression of being a 15% occurrence of "skip" metastases, characterized as metastases to level II and III axillary hubs without association of level I nodes.28 Thus, the expense of performing sentinel hub biopsy alone is reflected in an examination in which the 10-year endurance pace of 85% for stage I bosom malignant growth patients who have full axillary analyzation tumbles to 66% when axillary analyzation was not performed.[31] A more complete conversation of sentinel lymph hub biopsy can be found in a new issue of this journal.[32]

High atomic evaluation (high core to-cytoplasmic proportion), high mitotic record and inadequately separated all imply helpless anticipation. Penetrating ductal carcinoma is by a wide margin the most well-known kind of intrusive bosom disease, with generally less fortunate endurance. Rounded, medullary, mucinous, and papillary diseases have a more ideal visualization, yet represent just 6% of intrusive cancers.[29] Peritumoral lymphatic and vein attack indicates a lot more unfortunate guess. Estrogen or potentially progesterone receptorpositive tumors have a superior forecast and a preferable reaction to chemical treatment over receptor-negative tumors. Stream cytometry measures DNA Index (or DNA content), with diploid malignant growth cells (ordinary DNA content, DNA record of 1) having a preferable guess over those with aneuploidy.[33] S-stage part alludes to the quantity of cells effectively incorporating DNA. Tumors with high S-stage cells have a more unfortunate separation and less fortunate prognosis.[34] Tumor marker CA 15–3 is expanded in any ladies with metastatic bosom disease. HER-2/neu oncoprotein (likewise called c-erbB2) is related with more limited endurance, more limited opportunity to-backslide, and a general more terrible prognosis.1 This tumor marker is particularly significant with the presentation of trastuzumab for treatment. CA 27. is the principal FDA-endorsed (in June 1996) blood test for bosom malignancy repeat. A new study45 tracked down that the peril proportion for bosom malignant growth passing in patients with undeniable degrees of absolute cyclin E in the tumor was higher than some other organic marker, including the presence of lymph hub metastases (multiple times higher), chemical receptor status, and levels of HER-2/NEU. Among 114patients with Stage I bosom malignant growth, none of the 102 patients with low degrees of cyclin E in the tumor had kicked the bucket of bosom

disease 5 years after conclusion, while every one of the 12 patients with a significant degree of low-atomic weight cyclin E had passed on of bosom malignant growth inside that period. The danger proportion for death in bosom malignancy patients with high absolute cyclin E levels when contrasted with those with low levels was 13.3, multiple times as high as the peril proportion for other clinical and pathologic danger factors. All the more as of late, DNA-microarray information showed the quality articulation profile is an all the more remarkable indicator of result for youthful patients with bosom malignancy than the beforehand standard frameworks dependent on clinical and histologic models. Patients with a poor-anticipation signature had a general 10-year endurance pace of 54.6%; those with a decent visualization signature had a general 10-year endurance pace of 94.6%. These information appear to show that right now utilized measures misclassify a critical number of patients. This information demonstrates hematogenous metastasis to removed locales might be free of lymphogenic metastases, and that such tumorigenesis is an early and characteristic hereditary property of bosom cancer.[35] If checked, these investigations ought to precisely distinguish patients destined to profit by adjuvant treatment.[36]

ARRANGING AND PROGNOSIS OF BREAST CANCER

At beginning analysis, more than half of bosom tumor are stages 0 or I,78 and 75% are Stage 0, I, or II. 79 The amount of lymph hub contribution significantly affects endurance. Stage IIA malignant growth (T0-T1, N1) with just 1 included lymph hub has a 10-year illness free endurance of 71% and a 20-year infection free endurance of 66%. On the off chance that 2 to 4 lymph hubs are included, the 10-year sickness free endurance is 62% and the 20-year illness free endurance is 56%.[37]

SURGICAL TREATMENT OF BREAST CANCER

The Consensus Development Conference on the Treatment of Early-Stage Breast Cancer (June 1990, NCI) has reasoned that bosom preservation therapy is a suitable technique for essential treatment for most of ladies with Stage I and Stage II bosom tumors. This therapy is best much of the time since it gives endurance identical to add up to mastectomy and axillary analyzation while protecting the breast.[38] Subsequent investigations have affirmed that there is no distinction in long haul endurance between careful evacuation of the bosom (mastectomy) and extraction of the tumor mass and radiation treatment to lingering bosom tissue (bosom preservation therapy).[39–42]

Breast-rationing a medical procedure incorporates lumpectomy, re-extraction, halfway mastectomy, quadrantectomy, segmental extraction, and wide extraction. Axillary lymph hubs are eliminated for assessment through a different cut. The most widely recognized bosom expulsion system is a changed revolutionary mastectomy, which includes making a circular entry point around a space including the areola and biopsy scar, eliminating that part, and burrowing under the leftover skin to eliminate the bosom tissue and some lymph hubs. Extremist mastectomy, which eliminates the whole bosom, chest divider muscles, and all axillary lymph hubs, is once in a while done today since it offers no endurance advantage over an adjusted revolutionary mastectomy. A straightforward, or absolute mastectomy, eliminates the whole bosom yet none of the axillary lymph hubs. This is normally accomplished for ladies with DCIS, or prophylactically for ladies at particularly high danger for creating bosom malignancy. A more up to date technique is the skinsparing mastectomy, which includes eliminating the bosom tissue through a roundabout cut around the areola and supplanting the bosom with fat taken from the mid-region or back.[39–42]

Table 2: Standard Adjuvant Chemotherapy Regimens.

Standard Regimens	Components
AC (w or w/o T)	Adriamycin, cyclophosphamide, Taxol
CMF	Cyclophosphamide, methotrexate, fluorouracil (5-FU)
CEF	Cyclophosphamide, epirubicin, fluorouracil (5-FU)
CAF	Cyclophosphamide, adriamycin, fluorouracil (5-FU)

ADJUVANT THERAPIES FOR BREAST CANCER

Radiation adjuvant treatment is normal after bosom saving a medical procedure (eg, lumpectomy) to forestall repeat of malignancy in the bosom, and it could be utilized after mastectomy to forestall repeat on the chest divider and axilla. Radiation treatment is for the most part given 5 days every week over a 5-or 6-week time interval, with care taken to attempt to keep away from harm to the heart or lungs. The lone common changes with bosom radiation are skin erythema and perhaps some transient lymphedema. Foundational adjuvant chemotherapy is never suggested for non-intrusive, in situ malignancy (DCIS). The most generally utilized standard adjuvant chemotherapy regimens are recorded in Table 2. Chemical adjuvant treatment assists with forestalling repeat by hindering the impacts of

estrogen, which is known to animate malignancy cell development. Chemicals are best in ladies whose essential tumor has chemical receptors (ie, estrogen-receptor or progesterone-receptor positive). Tamoxifen is the standard best option of most experts.[43] Other hormonal helpful specialists incorporate aromatase inhibitors, which meddle with the catalyst aromatase, which assumes a basic part in the creation of estrogen in postmenopausal ladies. Instances of this class incorporate anastrozole, letrozole and exemestane.[44,45] A new investigation of ladies who had finished 5 years of tamoxifen treatment and were as endorsed to either no treatment or proceeding with treatment with letrozole was rashly finished when fundamental outcomes uncovered a more noteworthy than 40% decrease in intermittent bosom malignant growths in the letrozole arm. Unanswered questions are whether ladies should take letrozole for a very long time (the first examination plan) or uncertainly, and whether ladies should take letrozole (or one of the other aromatase inhibitors) rather than tamoxifen at first. A prior no holds barred examination of anastrozole and tamoxifen found that it was fairly more compelling in lessening the danger of a repeat than tamoxifen.

Natural adjuvant treatment incorporates trastuzumab, which hinders the activity of a development advancing protein called Her-2/neu that is found in bigger than-typical sums in about 30% of bosom cancers.[46] Trastuzumab all the more explicitly targets malignant growth cells and in this way has less results than standard chemotherapy, in spite of the fact that it might effectsly affect ordinary heart tissue when utilized with chemotherapy.47 The medication has been endorsed for metastatic bosom disease and is at present under examination as a first-line specialist in blend with other chemotherapy.[48]

SUGGESTED SURVEILLANCE IN BREAST CANCER SURVIVORS

One preliminary haphazardly alloted bosom malignancy survivors to either a trained professional or a family doctor, and discovered no contrasts between the 2 gatherings in estimated results, including time to determination of repeat, nervousness, or wellbeing related nature of life.[49] An ensuing financial investigation of this examination tracked down the personal satisfaction as estimated by recurrence and length of patient visits and expenses were better when follow-up was given by the family doctor when contrasted with the specialist.[50]

Routine history and actual assessment and consistently planned mammograms are the backbone of care for the bosom disease survivor.[51] Recurrence of bosom malignancy is all the more much of the time found by the patient (71%) than by her doctor (15%).6 Women

ought to be urged to perform bosom self assessment month to month. Mammograms ought to be done at 6 and a year after medical procedure and afterward yearly from that point. A few tumor-related antigens, including CA 15-3 and CEA, may recognize bosom malignant growth repeat, however not with adequate affectability and explicitness to be regularly utilized by either clinicians or protection guarantors.[52] A more up to date marker, CA 27.29, showed guarantee in one all around planned investigation of 166 ladies with stage II and III bosom disease. The affectability and particularity of this test were 58% and 98%, individually. Repeat was identified around 5 months sooner than with routine surveillance.[53] However, improvement in endurance or personal satisfaction utilizing this marker has not yet been proven. Neither routine chest x-beams nor sequential radionucleotide bone outputs have been discovered to be helpful in identifying metastatic illness in asymptomatic women.[54.55]

INTRODUCTION TO SILVER NANOPARTICLES

Metallic silver (Ag) is a strong change component and due to is extraordinariness (67th in bounty among the components) and its appealing white metallic radiance, silver has for some time been utilized as gems, money coins and flatware. Among its wide applications its antimicrobial movement is of extraordinary interest. The utilization of silver vessels to keep water and wine clean most likely traces all the way back to antiquated occasions. Silver's therapeutic use is additionally of incredible vestige. Silver nitrite was applied for the treatment of ulcers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries,[56] and around 1884, 1% silver nitrite was presented by German obstetrician C. S. F. Crede as an eye answer for forestall gonococcal conjunctivitis for new conceived babies.[57] In 1967, Fox presented silver sulfadiazine in the treatment of consume patients, and surprisingly today silver sulfadiazine cream stays the most generally utilized medication for serous consume wounds.[58]

In any case, delayed openness to silver may cause silver testimony in the body, bringing about irreversible staining of skin or eyes, for example argyria or argyrosis.[59] Because of this and with the coming of more accessible anti-infection agents like penicillin and cephalosporin, therapeutic interest in silver blurred around the Second World War. However, it didn't require numerous years for interest in silver to restore, under the enormous expansion in the quantity of different safe bacterial strains because of the maltreatment of anti-microbials and the disclosure that silver nanoparticles (AgNPs) showed amazing execution in antibacterial application. It was accounted for that AgNPs show biocidal activity by the lethargic arrival of Ag+, and by different components, (for example, cooperation with thiol

bunches in proteins and catalysts, hindrance of DNA replication, acceptance of oxidative pressure) making it more hard for microbes to create safe strains.[60] Also, the huge surface region, which advances the reactivity and sorption with microorganisms, makes AgNPs an ideal contender for antibacterial application.

In reality, nanosilver isn't new. As ahead of schedule as 1889, Lea had detailed the primary blend of a silver colloid corralled by citrate.[61] Though not officially enlisted or under the name of "nano", writing shows that silver colloids have been utilized in the clinical territory for over a long time since 1897 by the name of "Collargol". The first biocidal silver item "Algaedyn" was enlisted in 1954 in the U.S., which is as yet utilized in sanitizers today.[62] During the previous twenty years, the progression of nanotechnology has opened new roads for AgNPs. Being in the nano-scale measurement, AgNPs show numerous novel properties comparative with the mass metal, which has stimulated exceptional interest in the advancement of new applications.

Properties and applications

Unadulterated silver has high warm and electrical conductivity and generally low contact opposition, which makes it a well known choice in hardware. Silver nanoparticles or nanowires have been utilized to manufacture slim film semiconductor electrodes,[63] as glues and inks for printed circuit boards, optoelectronics, information stockpiling gadgets and battery-based intercalation materials.[64]

By goodness of their tiny size, AgNPs have enormous surface territory, which offers them high surface energy and more conceivable responsive locales. These attributes qualify AgNPs as quite possibly the most encouraging materials in catalysis. AgNPs and nanocomposites are fit for catalyzing various responses, for example, CO and benzene oxidation,[65] decrease of 4-nitrophenol within the sight of NaBH4, decrease of Rhodamine B (RhB), and decrease of 4-nitrophenol to 4-aminophenol.[66]

Not the same as the mass metal, AgNPs additionally show surface plasmon reverberation (SPR) under illumination of light, which actuates SPR tops in the UV-vis frequency range. Commonly, the width and position of the SPR tops are affected by the size, shape and scattering of the nanoparticles.[10] AgNPs are additionally utilized for surface-upgraded Raman dispersing (SERS). It is accounted for that they can improve the efficiencies of SERS by as much as 1014 to 1015 overlay, which permits recognition and recognizable proof of

single molecules.[67] because of these extraordinary properties, AgNPs are utilized in detecting and imaging applications, including the location of DNA,[68] specific colorimetric detecting of cysteine,17 detecting purine nucleoside phosphorylase activity,[69] and particular colorimetric detecting of mercury(II).[70]

For quite a long time, information about nanosilver's capacity to kill unsafe microscopic organisms has drawn broad consideration, making it famous for fuse into different items. Nanosilver displays a wide range of antimicrobial movement, and can hinder the development of both Gram-positive and Gram-negative microorganisms (counting Escherichia coli, Pseudomonas aeruginosa and Staphylococcus aureus).[71] The antibacterial action on various medication safe microbes of clinical significance, for example, multidrug-safe Pseudomonas aeruginosa, ampicillin-safe E. coli O157:H7 and erythromycin-safe Streptococcus pyogenes, was additionally reported.[72] An examination likewise uncovered that the antimicrobial action of a few anti-toxins was expanded within the sight of AgNPs.[73] Nanosilver is additionally a powerful fungicide. AgNPs can execute various common parasitic strains, including Aspergillus fumigatus, Aspergillus fumigatus, Mucor, Saccharomyces cerevisiae, and Candida tropicalis.[74]

Nanosilver likewise has antiviral properties; it was accounted for that AgNPs integrated in Hepes cushion could possess HIV-1 replication, and the counter HIV movement (98%) was a lot higher than that of gold nanoparticles (6–20%).[75] The hindrance of hepatitis B virus[76] and herpes simplex virus[77] was additionally evaluated.

Because of the amazing antimicrobial movement, nanosilver is turning into a blooming field of examination and has been profoundly popularized. It is found in a wide class of items accessible in the shopper market. It is accounted for that of the 1317 items containing nanomaterials on the lookout (March 10, 2011), 313 were professed to contain AgNPs.[78] The items incorporate food bundling materials, food stockpiling compartments, water purificants, scent safe socks and clothing, room showers, clothing cleansers, clothes washers, moisturizers and cleansers. Likewise, AgNPs are broadly utilized in clinical applications including wound dressings, female-cleanliness items, careful instruments, bone concretes and implantable gadgets.

Examination of AgNPs

In sharp differentiation to the expanding regard for the use of AgNPs, data on their event, destiny and transport is restricted. To accomplish bits of knowledge into their conduct in complex natural media, fitting techniques for partition and assurance of AgNPs are exceptionally requested. As methods to distinguish and describe designed nanoparticles in the climate have been investigated recently,[77–79] we underline results on the examination of AgNPs in genuine examples in this part.

As distinguishing genuine natural examples is constantly tested by complex frameworks and low fixations, a preconcentration technique is constantly required before investigation. Liu's group80 detailed interestingly the extraction of follow AgNPs in natural waters by cloud point extraction (CPE). In view of the collaboration of AgNPs and a non-ionic surfactant Triton X-114 (TX-114), AgNPs could be caught in the micelles of the surfactant. At that point by changing the temperature to help achieve the cloud point of TX-114, the arrangement isolates into two stages. AgNPs, which are held in the surfactant-rich stage, can be thought and isolated after centrifugation. Results proposed that AgNPs could be advanced by multiple times by adding 0.2% (w/v) TX-114, and that the presence of humic acids (as high as 30 mg L−1) and Ag+ didn't upset the extraction. For natural waters spiked with 0.1–146 μg L−1 of AgNPs, 57–116% of the all-out AgNPs could be recuperated after the extraction. Furthermore, transmission electron microscopy (TEM)/checking electron magnifying lens combined with energy-dispersive X-beam spectroscopy (SEM-EDS)/bright obvious spectroscopy (UV-vis) results all showed the presence of AgNPs in the surfactant-rich stage, and their size and shape didn't change during the extraction, which offers a promising technique to follow AgNPs in the climate.[80]

Hyphenated methods, which are equipped for giving multidimensional data of test tests, arise as perhaps the most encouraging instruments for the portrayal of nanomaterials. Hydrodynamic chromatography (HDC) combined with ICP-MS was effectively applied to explore AgNPs in sewage sludge.[81,82] By spiking AgNPs into sewage ooze and shaking for a couple of hours, AgNPs could be packed in the supernatant. HDC-ICP-MS chromatography uncovered that AgNPs could then be straightforwardly isolated from the supernatant even without a preparative advance, and the investigation interaction was finished inside 10 min for each example.

Field-stream fractionation (FFF) has end up being another well-known instrument to segregate NPs because of its amazing partition productivity and the ability to couple with different finders. The FFF-ICP-MS method was effectively applied to isolate and portray AgNPs from organic tissues.[83] After AgNPs openness for 28 days, the tissues of freshwater oligochaete Lumbriculus variegates were extricated by sonication and examined by FFF-ICP-MS. Results uncovered that the normal size of AgNPs expanded from 31 to 46 nm, recommending AgNPs may change eminently during natural openness. Another examination likewise utilized FFF-ICP-MS to isolate AgNPs from surface waters and untreated wastewater,[84] showing its imminent use in investigating ecologically pertinent examples.

As AgNPs are broadly utilized in purchaser splash items for their antibacterial capacity, there is a danger that nanoparticles might be straightforwardly breathed in and saved in the respiratory parcel during item use. Marr et al.[85] investigated the outflow conduct of three customer shower items containing AgNPs. In the examination, a polyethylene chamber was utilized to re-enact an impenetrable room and after a consistent showering plan, a few strategies (e.g., ultrafine build up molecule counter, unique light dispersing (DLS), TEM, SEM-EDS and ICP-MS) were led to quantify the focus and size circulations of the mist concentrates. It was shown that discharged mist concentrates went from nanoscale up to 10 μm, and 0.24–56 ng of silver could be delivered per splash activity. It is additionally assessed that up to 70 ng of silver may store in the respiratory lot as indicated by the standard utilization of the splash items.

Speciation examination of AgNPs and Ag+ in monetarily accessible items was additionally detailed as of late by cloud point extraction dependent on TX-114 (Fig. 1).[86] By adding Na2S2O3 as a complexing specialist with Ag+, AgNPs and Ag+ could be isolated from one another, with AgNPs separated into the surfactant-rich stage, and Ag+ safeguarded in the watery stage. The spiked recuperations in various buyer items were in the scope of 71.7–103% for AgNPs and 1.2–10% for Ag+, showing AgNPs and Ag+ were proficiently isolated. TEM/SEM-EDS/UV-vis methods were applied to portray the presence of AgNPs, and the convergence of AgNPs and Ag+ was dictated by ICP-MS after microwave absorption.

Effects of AgNPs

Mechanism of toxicity

Albeit various examinations have attempted to completely clarify the instrument behind the biocidal activity of AgNPs, no all inclusive end has been drawn up until now. There is no uncertainty that the

antibacterial action of AgNPs is a perplexing cycle, and a few potential methods of activity are proposed, including (1) age of responsive oxygen species (ROS),[87–88] (2) direct connection to cell film and interruption of layer integrity,[89] (3) changes in layer permeability,[90] (4) association with proteins and disturbance of their customary function and (5) obstruction with DNA replication and causing DNA damage.[91]

By and large, ROS are regular results of ordinary cell digestion of oxygen, and can be cleared by cell's extremist searching exercises. Be that as it may, expanded creation of ROS is past the capacity of cancer prevention agent protections, and may bring about oxidative pressure because of the aggregation of overabundance ROS. These free revolutionaries may assault cell films, respond with lipids, proteins and nucleic acids, and upset the typical cell transport system.[5,92]

In an examination of the AgNP harmfulness to human HepG2 cells, Kim et al. tracked down that the harmfulness was straightforwardly identified with the oxidative stress.[89] In the investigation, portion subordinate creation of cell oxidants and DNA twofold strand breaks were recognized in HepG2 cells when presented to AgNPs or Ag+. Notwithstanding, when cells were pretreated with a cancer prevention agent N-acetylcysteine, both of the oxidative pressure and AgNPs instigated DNA harm were missing, showing that the poisonousness of AgNPs was subject to the creation of ROS. Essentially, Choi and Hu likewise saw that the hindrance degree of nitrifying microbes was corresponded well with the creation of ROS in AgNP openness, however no immediate proof was obtained.[87]

A board of recombinant bioluminescent microorganisms was additionally concentrated to examine the poisonous methods of AgNPs. As the bacterial strains could explicitly react to protein/film, oxidative pressure, and DNA harm, advertiser exercises of the microorganisms could straightforwardly demonstrate various pathways of harmfulness. Results showed that AgNPs could cause the creation of superoxide revolutionaries and harm the layer protein, however no DNA harm was observed.[88]

In any case, in another report that surveyed the impact of AgNPs on rainbow trout hepatocytes, no abundance ROS was recognized after openness. The cytotoxicity was basically connected with the diminished mitochondrial movement and layer integrity.[91] Membrane interruption related poisonousness of AgNPs was likewise announced in numerous different investigations. The arrangement of pits and pores in the cell film of growth C. albicans was noticed, and the creators recommended that AgNPs may assault cell layer lipid bilayers and obliterate the film penetrability

hindrance, bringing about the spillage of particles, development of pores and cell death.[93] E. coli layer harm brought about by AgNPs was likewise affirmed by Sondi and coworkers.[89] TEM/SEM/EDS results all showed that AgNPs aggregated on cell layers and some were effectively joined into the lipid bilayer structure, framing unpredictable molded pits in the external film. It was guessed that AgNPs may prompt the reformist arrival of lipopolysaccharide atoms and proteins, causing changes in layer uprightness and penetrability, lastly actuating cell glitch and passing.

In another proteomic investigation, a few envelope protein forerunners were seen to aggregate in E. coli after openness to AgNPs, recommending AgNPs may destabilize the bacterial film, initiate breakdown of proton rationale power, and decline the cell ATP levels.[91] AshaRani et al. additionally recommended that the AgNPs poisonousness may potentially be related with the disturbance of the mitochondrial respiratory chain, which prompts the decrease of ATP content and thusly causing DNA damage.[91]

Restricting the medication to silver nanoparticle (AgNPs-Cp)

Silver nanoparticles have been integrated as proposed in the writing, an answer of 100 µM has been readied.[94] 10 mL of this arrangement was added to 10 mL of capecitabine arrangement (100 µM) and blended in with an attractive stirrer for 24 h, at 25 °C (Fig. 1). At that point, these arrangements were centrifuged and FTIR examination was performed. Numerous scientists have been contemplated discharge active of the Capecitabine.[95]

Cell culture

Antiproliferative impact was performed on MCF-7 cells, which has been secured from ATCC. The medium that we have utilized is DMEM medium containing 10% fetal cow-like serum (FBS), 1% L-Glutamine, 100 IU/mL penicillin-streptomycin. MCF-7 cells were recreated in a hatchery at 37 °C, with 95% moistness and 5% CO2. Antiproliferative impact of AgNP, AgNPs-Cp, and capecitabine were controlled by XTT examine for 24 h on MCF-7 cells.[96] 2.4.1. Multiplication examination Antiproliferative impact of capecitabine and nanoparticles (10 nmsized) on MCF-7 cells were assessed utilizing XTT technique.[96] XTT (2,3-bis (2-methoxy-4-nitro-5-sulfophenyl)- 5-[(phenylamino) carbonyl]-2H-tetrazolium hydroxide) examination is a strategy for cell practicality. Clean 96-well plates were developed in a manner that there were 1 × 104 cells in each well. XTT arrangement was set up by blending XTT specialist (Labeling reagent) and initiation specialist (electron coupling reagent) with 50/1 proportion. Cell feasibility was controlled by perusing the power of the orange tone happened toward the finish of the brooding time frame, in a microplate peruser at 475 nm frequency.[96]

CONCLUSION

Regardless of the relative multitude of late headways in disease therapy, malignancy stays perhaps the most well-known reasons for death all throughout the planet. It is now known to us that the regular treatment systems frequently have many symptoms of their own. In this way, researchers are hoping to plan novel systems for the determination and therapy of malignancy. As of late, green union of AgNPs has acquired a lot of consideration in the drug field. The utilization of green science is non-harmful, modest and harmless to the ecosystem, despite the fact that there are a few burdens of biologic strategies . The high biodegradability and freedom of AgNPs likewise assume a vital part in keeping away from the expected impact of long haul poisonousness. The AgNPs showed incredible guarantees in instances of nanomedicine-based treatment. Notwithstanding, clinical preliminaries of AgNPs-based nanomedicine are important for controlling the future course of their application. At present, examinations concerning the biodegradability, portion and course of organization are the significant obstacles that should be handled in clinical preliminaries. In addition, AgNPs can be utilized as a crucial malignancy cell representation and discovery apparatus in diagnosing disease at its beginning phases . It has effectively been shown that green blend of AgNPs can assist with in vivo fluorescent tumor imaging . We accept that green-combined AgNPs will be utilized as potential disease therapeutics and diagnostics specialists in the impending period of malignant growth treatment.

REFERENCES

1. Harris J, Lippman M, Veronesi U, et al. Breast Cancer (3 parts). N Engl J Med, 1992; 327: 319–479.
2. Greenlee RT, Hill-Harmon MD, Murry T, Thun M. Cancer Statistics, 2001. CA Cancer J Clin, 2001; 51: 15.
3. From the Centers for Disease Control and Preven-tion: Breast Cancer Incidence and Mortality—Unit-ed States 1992. JAMA, 1996; 276: 1293.
4. Smith H, Kammerer-Doak D, Barbo D, Sarto G.Hormone Replacement Therapy in the Menopause: A Pro Opinion. CA—A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, 1996; 46: 343.
5. Costanza ME. Epidemiology and risk factors for breast cancer. In: UpToDate, 2001; 9: 2–3.
6. Shapira D, Urban N. A minimalist policy for breast cancer Surveillance. JAMA, 1991; 265: 380–382.
7. McKay M, Langlands A. Prognostic Factors in Breast Cancer (Letter). N Engl J Med, 1992; 327: 1317–1318.

8. Cady B, Steele G, Morrow M, et al. Evaluation of common breast problems: Guidance for primary care providers. CA—A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, 1998; 48: 49–61.
9. Malone KE, Daling JR, Thompson JD, O'Brien CA, Francisco LV, Ostrander EA. BRCA1 mutations and breast cancer in the general population: analysis in women before age 35 years and in women before age 45 years with first-degree family history. JAMA, 1998; 279: 922–929.
10. Haber D. Prophylactic oophorectomy to reduce the risk of ovarian and breast cancer in carriers of BRCA mutations. N Engl J Med, 2002; 346: 1660–1661.
11. Hoskins K, Stopfer J, Calzone K, et al. Assessment and counseling for women with a family history of breast cancer. A Guide for Clinicians. JAMA, 1995; 273: 577–585.
12. Greene MH. Genetics of breast cancer. Mayo Clin Proc, 1997; 72: 54–65.
13. Grady D. A 60-year-old woman trying to discontinue hormone replacement therapy. JAMA, 2002; 287: 2130–2137.
14. Rossouw JE, Anderson GL, Prentice RL, et al. Writing Group for the Women's Health Initiative. Risks and benefits of estrogen plus progestin in health post-menopausal women: Principal results from the Women's Health Initiative. JAMA, 2003; 288: 321–333.
15. Chlebowski RT, Hendrix SL, Langer RD, et al. In fluence of estrogen plus progestin on breast cancer and mammography in healthy postmenopausal women. The Women's Health Initiative Randomized Trial. JAMA, 2003; 289: 3243–3253.
16. Gann P, Morrow M. Combined hormone therapy and breast cancer. A single-edged sword (editori- al). JAMA, 2003; 289: 3304–3306.
17. Li C, Malone K, Porter P, et al. Relationship between long durations and different regimens of hormone therapy and risk of breast cancer. JAMA, 2003; 289: 3254–3263.
18. Singletary K, Gapstur S. Alcohol and breast cancer: review of epidemiologic and experimental evidence and potential mechanisms. JAMA, 2001; 286: 2143.
19. Huang Z, Hankisen S, Colditz G, et al. Dual effects of weight and weight gain on breast cancer risk. JAMA, 1997; 278: 1407.
20. Potischman N, Swanson C, Siiteri P, Hoover R. Re- versal of relation between body mass and endogenous estrogen concentrations with menopausal status. J Natl Canc Instit, 1996; 88: 756.
21. Thune I, Brenn T, Lund E, Gaard M. Physical activity and the risk of breast cancer. N Engl J Med, 1997; 336: 1269.
22. Briton L, Bornstein L, Colditz G. Summary of the workshop: Workshop on physical activity and breast cancer, Nov. 13–14, 1997. Cancer, 1998; 83: 595.

23. Fisher B, Dignon J, Wolmark N, et al. Tamoxifen in treatment of intraductal breast cancer: National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel (Project B-24 randomized controlled trial). Lancet, 1999; 353: 1993.
24. John E, Kelsey J. Radiation and other environmental exposures and breast cancer. Epidemiol Rev, 1993; 15: 157.
25. Smith R, von Eschenbach A, Wender R, et al. American Cancer Society Guidelines for the early detection of cancer. CA—Cancer J. Clin, 2001; 51: 38–75.
26. Donegan W. Evaluation of a palpable breast mass.N Engl J Med, 1992; 327: 937–942.
27. Bassett L, Winchester D, Caplan R, et al. Stereotactic core needle biopsy of the breast: A report of the Joint Task Force of the American College of Radiology, American College of Surgeons, and College of American Pathologists. CA—Cancer J Clin, 1997: 47: 171.
28. Albertini J, Lyman G, Cox C, et al. Lymphatic mapping and sentinel node biopsy in the patient with breast cancer. JAMA, 1996; 276: 1818–1822.
29. Donegan W. Tumor-related prognostic factors for breast cancer. CA—Cancer J Clin, 1997; 47: 28–51.
30. Krag D, Weaver D, Ashikaga T, et al. The sentinel node in breast cancer—A multicenter study. N Engl J Med, 1998; 339: 941.
31. Bland K, Scott-Conner C, Menck H, Winchester D. Axillary dissection in breast-conserving surgery for stage I and II breast cancer: A national cancer database study of patterns of omission and impli- cations for survival. J Am Coll Surg, 1999; 188: 586– 595.
32. Swanson JO. Sentinel lymph node biopsy for breast cancer. J Insur Med, 2001; 33: 195.
33. Hutter RV. The role of the pathologist in the management of breast cancer. CA—Cancer J Clin, 1991; 41: 283–297.
34. Sigurdsson H, Baldetorp B, Borg A, et al. Indicators of prognosis in node-negative breast cancer. Engl J Med. 1990; 322: 1045–1053.
35. Keyomarsi K, Tucker SL, Buchholz TA, et al. Cyclin E and survival in patients with breast cancer. N Engl J Med, 1990; 347: 1566–1575.
36. Van de Vijver MJ, He YD, van't Veer LJ. A gene expression signature as a predictor of survival in breast cancer. N Engl J Med, 2002; 347: 1999–2009.
37. Kallioniemi A. Molecular signatures of breast cancer—predicting the future (editorial). N Engl J Med, 2002; 347: 2067–2068.
38. Moore M, Kinne D. Clinical Highlights from the National Cancer Data Base, 1999. CA—Cancer JClin, 1995; 49(3): 145–158.

39. NIH Consensus Conference: Treatment of early stage breast cancer. JAMA, 1991; 265: 391–395.
40. Winchester DJ, Menck HR, Winchester DP. The national cancer data base report on the results of alarge non-randomized comparison of breast preservation and modified radical mastectomy. Cancer, 1997; 80: 162.
41. Lee-Feldstein A, Anton-Culver H, Feldstein P.Treatment differences and other prognostic factors related to breast cancer survival. JAMA, 1994; 271: 1163–1168.
42. Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group: Effects of Radiotherapy and Surgery in Early Breast Cancer: An Overview of the Randomized Trials. N Engl J Med, 1995; 33: 1445–1455.
43. Tamoxifen for early breast cancer: an overview of the randomized trials. Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group. Lancet, 1998; 351: 1451.
44. Nabholtz JM, Buzdar A, Pollak M, et al. Anastrozole is superior to tamoxifen as first-line therapy for advanced breast cancer in postmenopausal women: results of a North American multicentre randomized trial (In Process Citation). J Clin Oncol, 2000; 18: 3789.
45. Mouridsen H, Gershavovich M, Sun Y, et al. Superior efficacy of letrozole (Femeray) versus tamoxifen as first-line therapy for postmenopausal women with advanced breast cancer: results of a phase III study of the International Letrozole Breast Cancer Group. J Clin Oncol, 2001; 19: 2596.
46. Pietras RJ, Fendly BM, Chazim VR, et al. Antibody to HER-2/neu receptor blocks DNA repair after cisplatin in human breast and ovarian cancer cells. Oncogene, 1994; 9: 1829.
47. Cobleigh MA, Vogel CL, Tripathy D, et al. Multinational study of the efficacy and safety of humanized anti-HER2 monoclonal antibody in wom- en who have HER2 overexpressing metastatic breast cancer that has progressed after chemotherapy for metastatic disease. J Clin Oncol, 1999; 17: 2639.
48. Vogel CL, Cobleigh MA, Tripathy D, et al. Efficacy and safety of trastuzumab as a single agent in first-line treatment of HER2-overexpressing meta-static breast cancer. J Clin Oncol, 2002; 20: 719.
49. Morrow M. A 47-year old woman with ductal carcinoma in situ. JAMA, 1996; 275: 61–66.
50. Grunfeld E, Mant D, Vudkin P, et al. Routine followup of breast cancer in primary care: Randomized trial. BMJ, 1996; 313: 665.
51. Grunfeld E, Gray A, Mant D, et al. Follow-up of breast cancer in primary care vs specialists care: results of an economic evaluation. Br J Cancer, 1999; 79: 1227.

52. Loprinzi CL. Follow-up testing for curatively treated cancer survivors. JAMA, 1995; 273: 1877–1878.
53. 1997 update of recommendations for the use of tumor markers in breast and colorectal cancer. Adopted on May 17, 1997 by the American Society of Clinical Oncology. J Clin Oncol, 1998; 16: 793.
54. Chan DW, Beveridge RA, Muss H, et al. Use of Truquant BR radioimmjunoassay for early detection of breast cancer recurrence in patients with stage II and III disease. J Clin Oncol, 1997; 15: 2322.
55. Palli D, Russo A, Saieva C, et al. Intensive vs. clinical follow-up after treatment of primary breast cancer. 10-year update of a randomized trial. JAMA, 1999; 281: 1586.
56. Impact of follow-up testing on survival and health-related quality of life in breast cancer patients. A ulticenter randomized controlled trial. The GIVIO Investigators. JAMA, 1994; 271: 1587
57. H. J. Klasen, Burns, 2000; 26: 117–130.
58. A. D. Russell and W. B. Hugo, Prog. Med. Chem, 1994; 31: 351–370.
59. H. J. Klasen, Burns, 2000; 26: 131–138.
60. P. L. Drake and K. J. Hazelwood, Ann. Occup. Hyg, 2005; 49: 575–585.
61. S. N. Luoma, Silver Nanotechnologies and the Environment: Old Problems or New Challenges?, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington, DC, 2008 Search PubMed.
62. M. C. Lea, Am. J. Sci, 1889; 37: 476–491 Search PubMed.
63. B. Nowack, H. Krug and M. Height, Environ. Sci. Technol, 2011; 45: 3189.
64. J. Tate, J. A. Rogers, C. D. W. Jones, B. Vyas, D. W. Murphy, W. J. Li, Z. A. Bao, R. E. Slusher, A. Dodabalapur and H. E. Katz, Langmuir, 2000; 16: 6054–6060.
65. T. M. Tolaymat, A. M. El Badawy, A. Genaidy, K. G. Scheckel, T. P. Luxton and M. Suidan, Sci. Total Environ, 2010; 408: 999.
66. Q. Ye, J. S. Zhao, F. F. Huo, J. Wang, S. Y. Cheng, T. F. Kang and H. X. Dai, Catal. Today, 2011; 175: 603–609.
67. B. Naik, S. Hazra, V. S. Prasad and N. N. Ghosh, Catal. Commun, 2011; 12: 1104–1108.
68. X. M. Qian and S. M. Nie, Chem. Soc. Rev, 2008; 37: 912–920.
69. M. M. Harper, J. A. Dougan, N. C. Shand, D. Graham and K. Faulds, Analyst, 2012; 137: 2063–2068.
70. A. Ravindran, V. Mani, N. Chandrasekaran and A. Mukherjee, Talanta, 2011; 85: 533–540.
71. Y. Cao, J. Wang, Y. Y. Xu and G. X. Li, Biosens. Bioelectron., 2010; 25: 1032–1036.
72. B. Roy, P. Bairi and A. K. Nandi, Analyst, 2011; 136: 3605–3607 RSC.

73. W. R. Li, X. B. Xie, Q. S. Shi, S. S. Duan, Y. S. Ouyang and Y. B. Chen, BioMetals, 2010; 24: 135–141 CrossRef.
74. H. H. Lara, N. V. Ayala-Nunez, L. D. I. Turrent and C. R. Padilla, World J. Microbiol. Biotechnol, 2009; 26: 615–621 CrossRef.
75. A. R. Shahverdi, A. Fakhimi, H. R. Shahverdi and S. Minaian, Nanomed.: Nanotechnol., Biol. Med, 2007; 3: 168–171 CrossRef CAS.
76. J. B. Wright, K. Lam, D. Hansen and R. E. Burrell, Am. J. Infect. Control, 1999; 27: 344–350 CrossRef CAS.
77. R. W. Y. Sun, R. Chen, N. P. Y. Chung, C. M. Ho, C. L. S. Lin and C. M. Che, Chem. Commun, 2005; 5059–5061 RSC.
78. L. Lu, R. W. Y. Sun, R. Chen, C. K. Hui, C. M. Ho, J. M. Luk, G. K. K. Lau and C. M. Che, Antiviral Ther, 2008; 13: 253–262 CAS.
79. D. Baram-Pinto, S. Shukla, N. Perkas, A. Gedanken and R. Sarid, Bioconjugate Chem, 2009; 20: 1497–1502. CrossRef CAS.
80. http: //www.nanotechproject.org/inventories/consumer/analysis_draft/.
81. T. M. Benn and P. Westerhoff, Environ. Sci. Technol, 2008; 42: 4133–4139 CrossRef CAS.
82. L. Geranio, M. Heuberger and B. Nowack, Environ. Sci. Technol, 2009; 43: 8113–8118 CrossRef CAS.
83. K. Kulthong, S. Srisung, K. Boonpavanitchakul, W. Kangwansupamonkon and R. Maniratanachote, Part. Fibre Toxicol, 2010; 7: 8–17 CrossRef.
84. C. Lorenz, L. Windler, N. von Goetz, R. P. Lehmann, M. Schuppler, K. Hungerbuhler, M. Heuberger and B. Nowack, Chemosphere, 2012; 89: 817–824. CrossRef CAS.
85. Y. Yan, H. F. Yang, J. F. Li, X. J. Lu and C. Wang, Text. Res. J., 2012; 82: 1422–1429. CrossRef.
86. R. Kaegi, B. Sinnet, S. Zuleeg, H. Hagendorfer, E. Mueller, R. Vonbank, M. Boller and M. Burkhardt, Environ. Pollut, 2010; 158: 2900–2905. CrossRef CAS.
87. J. Farkas, H. Peter, P. Christian, J. A. G. Urrea, M. Hassellov, J. Tuoriniemi, S. Gustafsson, E. Olsson, K. Hylland and K. V. Thomas, Environ. Int, 2011; 37: 1057–1062. CrossRef CAS.
88. D. Cleveland, S. E. Long, P. L. Pennington, E. Cooper, M. H. Fulton, G. I. Scott, T. Brewer, J. Davis, E. J. Petersen and L. Wood, Sci. Total Environ, 2012; 421–422, 267–272 CrossRef CAS.
89. A. Dudkiewicz, K. Tiede, K. Loeschner, L. H. S. Jensen, E. Jensen, R. Wierzbicki, A. B. A. Boxall and K. Molhave, TrAC, Trends Anal. Chem, 2011; 30: 28–43 CrossRef CAS.
90. J. F. Liu, S. J. Yu, Y. G. Yin and J. B. Chao, TrAC, Trends Anal. Chem, 2012; 33: 95–106. CrossRef CAS.

91. K. Tiede, A. B. A. Boxall, S. P. Tear, J. Lewis, H. David and M. Hassellov, Food Addit. Contam., Part A, 2008; 25: 795–821 CrossRef CAS.
92. J. F. Liu, J. B. Chao, R. Liu, Z. Q. Tan, Y. G. Yin, Y. Wu and G. B. Jiang, Anal. Chem, 2009; 81: 6496–6502 CrossRef CAS.
93. K. Tiede, A. B. A. Boxall, D. Tiede, S. P. Tear, H. David and J. Lewis, J. Anal. At. Spectrom, 2009; 24: 964–972 RSC.
94. M. E. Hoque, K. Khosravi, K. Newman and C. D. Metcalfe, J. Chromatogr., A, 2012; 1233: 109–115 CrossRef CAS.
95. M. E. Quadros and L. C. Marr, Environ. Sci. Technol, 2011; 45: 10713–10719.
96. Abdel-Mohsen, A.M., Abdel-Rahman, R.M., Fouda, M.M.G., Vojtova, L., Uhrova, L., Hassan, A.F., Al-Deyab, S.S., El-Shamy, I.E., Jancar, J.,2014. Preparation, characterization and cytotoxicity of schizophyllan/silver nanoparticle composite. Carbohydr. Polym, 102: 238–245.
97. Zhang, M., Liu, E., Cui, Y., Huang, Y., 2017. Nanotechnology-based combination therapy for overcoming multidrug-resistant cancer. Cancer Bio. Med, 14: 212–227.
98. Tutar, U., Hepokur, C., Misir, S., Hepokur, A.İ., Duman, F., 2018. Antimicrobial, anti- oxidant, cytotoxicity, and wound healing effects of Thymbra sintenisii extract. Indian J. Pharm. Sci, 80(5): 868–874.