

Exosome Therapy in Alzheimer's Disease: A Nanobiotechnology Approach to Next-Generation Therapeutic Opportunities

Fatemeh Samavaty¹, Negin Khedri¹, Nahal Amiri¹, Zeynab Shirazi and Mohammadreza Nourani^{2*}

¹ M.Sc. Student in Nanobiotechnology, Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Basic Sciences, Islamic Revolution Comprehensive University, Tehran, Iran



Fatemeh Samavaty

M.Sc. Student

Received: 18 Jun 2026

Revised: 2 Aug 2026

Accepted: 26 Aug 2026

Keywords:

exosomes; Alzheimer's disease; blood-brain barrier; nanobiotechnology;

Abstract

Alzheimer's disease (AD) remains a major neurodegenerative challenge, marked by cognitive decline, amyloid-beta (A β) plaques, and hyperphosphorylated tau tangles. Traditional drugs face limited efficacy due to poor blood-brain barrier (BBB) penetration and lack of cell-specific targeting. Nanobiotechnology, particularly engineered exosomes, offers a promising alternative. As natural nano-shuttles (30–150 nm), exosomes are biocompatible, weakly immunogenic, and capable of crossing biological membranes. This review synthesizes exosome engineering advances, including cargo loading (small molecules, proteins, RNA) and surface functionalization for enhanced brain targeting. We evaluate preclinical and emerging clinical evidence for exosome-based interventions targeting AD hallmarks: A β clearance, tau phosphorylation, neuroinflammation, and synaptic loss.

We highlight the often-overlooked role of APOE genotype—the strongest genetic risk factor for sporadic AD—in modulating exosome biodistribution, BBB integrity, cellular uptake, and therapeutic response, advocating for genetically stratified approaches. However, direct evidence linking APOE genotype to engineered exosome pharmacokinetics remains limited, with most rationale extrapolated from endogenous extracellular vesicle studies—a gap needing

1. Introduction

Alzheimer's disease (AD) is a progressive, irreversible neurodegenerative disorder that constitutes the leading cause of dementia worldwide. As of 2024, approximately 55 million people globally were living with dementia, with Alzheimer's disease accounting for approximately 60–70% of these cases. More recent estimates indicate that over 57 million people worldwide live with dementia, and this figure is projected to exceed 152 million by 2050 [1]. Pathologically, AD is defined by

a classic triad: the extracellular accumulation of amyloid-beta (A β) peptides into senile plaques, the intracellular aggregation of hyperphosphorylated tau protein into neurofibrillary tangles (NFTs), and chronic, profound neuroinflammation mediated by dysregulated microglia and astrocytes [2]. These pathological cascades culminate in widespread synaptic dismantling, neuronal death, and progressive cognitive, behavioral, and functional impairment. For decades, the therapeutic landscape of AD was restricted to symptomatic management via acetylcholinesterase inhibitors (e.g., donepezil) and N-methyl-D-

² *Tissue Engineering and Regenerative Medicine, Health New Technology Institute, Baqiyatallah University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran*

*Corresponding author: M. Nourani, r.nourani@yahoo.com

The subsequent advent of monoclonal antibodies targeting A β including aducanumab, lecanemab, and donanemab marked a paradigm shift toward disease-modifying therapies (DMTs). Lecanemab and donanemab have received full and standard FDA approval, respectively, and remain in clinical use [4]. Aducanumab, by contrast, was discontinued by its manufacturer in 2024 for commercial and strategic reasons rather than new safety or efficacy findings, following a controversial accelerated approval and persistent doubts about its clinical benefit [64]. Even the therapies that remain in use are constrained by notable limitations, including modest clinical efficacy in slowing cognitive decline, high financial burdens, and substantial safety concerns, most notably amyloid-related imaging abnormalities (ARIA) characterized by cerebral edema (ARIA-E) and microhemorrhage (ARIA-H) [4,5]. Collectively, the rapid rise and fall of individual anti-amyloid agents within only a few years underscores how fragile the current DMT landscape remains, and strengthens the case for delivery platforms such as exosomes — that could improve the therapeutic index of both existing and future biologics rather than relying on any single antibody.

A foundational bottleneck in central nervous system (CNS) pharmacology is the blood-brain barrier (BBB). The BBB is a highly restrictive physiological gateway composed of non-fenestrated brain capillary endothelial cells connected by intricate tight junction complexes (including claudins, occludin, and junctional adhesion molecules), closely enveloped by pericytes and astrocytic end-feet [6]. This neurovascular unit selectively excludes approximately 98% of small-molecule therapeutics and nearly 100% of large-molecular-weight biologics from entering the brain parenchyma via passive diffusion [7]. Consequently, achieving therapeutic concentrations of drugs within the CNS often requires high systemic dosing, which inherently amplifies peripheral toxicities.

To circumvent these biophysical constraints, synthetic nanocarriers such as liposomes, polymeric nanoparticles, and solid lipid nanoparticles have been aggressively engineered. While these platforms offer high cargo capacity and tunable chemical composition, their clinical translation is frequently hindered by accelerated blood clearance via the mononuclear phagocyte system (MPS), systemic toxicity, long

-term non-biodegradability, and potential immunogenic responses [8].

In response to these challenges, nanobiotechnology has turned to nature's own communication network: exosomes. Exosomes are endogenously produced, lipid-bilayered nanovesicles (30–150 nm) that serve as critical mediators of inter-cellular communication by transferring bioactive lipids, proteins, and nucleic acids between donor and recipient cells [9]. As therapeutic delivery vehicles, exosomes possess an unparalleled suite of intrinsic properties:

- **Biocompatibility and Low Immunogenicity:** Derived from cellular membranes, they evade recognition by the reticuloendothelial system and exhibit an elongated circulation half-life compared to synthetic counterparts [10].
- **Inherent BBB Permeability:** Exosomes utilize native transcytosis pathways to traverse the neurovascular endothelium. However, it is important to note that only a small fraction (typically less than 1% of the injected dose) of systemically administered exosomes reaches the brain parenchyma [11].
- **Privileged Surface Topology:** Their surface can be bioengineered with high precision to display brain-targeting moieties, minimizing off-target effects [12].

By bridging cellular biology with materials engineering, exosome-based nanobiotechnology offers a highly adaptable, targeted, and multi-mechanistic therapeutic platform. This approach can simultaneously deliver diverse molecular payloads to halt, and potentially reverse, the multifaceted pathological networks of Alzheimer's disease.

2. Exosome Biology and Characterization

2.1 Biogenesis and Intracellular Trafficking

Exosomes represent a distinct subclass of extracellular vesicles (EVs) differentiated by their endosomal origin, contrasting with microvesicles (which bud directly from the plasma membrane) and apoptotic bodies (released during programmed cell death). The biogenesis of exosomes is a tightly regulated, multi-stage intracellular process:

1. **Endocytosis and Early Endosome Formation:** The process initiates with the invagination of the plasma membrane to form early endosomes.
2. **Maturation into Late Endosomes/Multivesicular Bodies (MVBs):** As early endosomes mature into late endosomes, their limiting membrane undergoes secondary

inward budding, resulting in the accumulation of intraluminal vesicles (ILVs) within the endosomal lumen; at this stage, the structure is termed a multivesicular body (MVB) [13].

- 3. ILV Generation Mechanisms:** The sorting of proteins and lipids into ILVs occurs via two primary molecular mechanisms, described below.
 - *ESCRT-Dependent Pathway:* The Endosomal Sorting Complexes Required for Transport (ESCRT-0, -I, -II, and -III) work sequentially with auxiliary proteins (such as Alix and TSG101) to recognize ubiquitinated cargo, induce membrane curvature, and drive vesicle scission. ESCRT-0 is primarily involved in cargo recognition, whereas ESCRT-I, -II, and -III coordinate membrane deformation and scission [13].
 - *ESCRT-Independent Pathway:* This pathway relies on the enrichment of sphingolipids and the local generation of ceramide by neutral sphingomyelinase (nSMase), which spontaneously induces inward membrane bending due to its cone-shaped molecular geometry [14]. Tetraspanins (e.g., CD63, CD9, CD81) also cluster into microdomains to facilitate macromolecular sorting.
- 4. MVB Fate Determination:** Once filled with ILVs, MVBs face two divergent intracellular trajectories. They can fuse with lysosomes or autophagosomes for hydrolytic degradation, or they can transport to the cell periphery along microtubule networks mediated by Rab GTPases (such as Rab27a, Rab27b, and Rab11) [15]. Upon docking at the plasma membrane, MVBs undergo soluble N-ethylmaleimide-sensitive factor attachment protein receptor (SNARE) complex-mediated fusion, releasing the ILVs into the extracellular space as mature exosomes.

2.2 Molecular Composition and Physical Properties

The molecular architecture of an exosome is a direct reflection of its parental cell origin, consisting of an asymmetric lipid bilayer enclosing an aqueous core rich in proteins, functional RNAs, and metabolites [16].

The exosomal membrane is structurally distinct from the donor plasma membrane, characterized by a dense enrichment of rigid lipids, including cholesterol, sphingomyelin, ceramide, and saturated phospholipids [17]. This unique lipidomic profile confers high structural rigidity and chemical stability, protecting the internal cargo from enzymatic degradation (such as by circulating nucleases and proteases) and allowing the vesicles to survive harsh extracellular microenvironments. Phosphatidylserine (PS) distribution on exosomes remains a subject of debate; while some studies report PS exposure on the outer leaflet, standard exosomes from most cell types retain PS predominantly on the inner leaflet, distinguishing them from apoptotic bodies where PS externalization is a hallmark.

The proteomic landscape of exosomes includes both highly conserved structural components and cell-specific functional elements. Prominent among these are the tetraspanins (CD9, CD81, CD63), which act as structural anchors and diagnostic markers. Other universally enriched proteins include endosomal trafficking regulators (Alix, TSG101, annexins, Rab proteins), heat shock proteins (Hsp70, Hsp90) involved in protein folding and cargo protection, and cell adhesion molecules (integrins, selectins) that dictate extracellular matrix binding and cellular tropism [16,18].

Exosomes also carry a diverse internal genetic payload, collectively referred to as the exosomal transcriptomic cargo. This includes messenger RNAs (mRNAs), microRNAs (miRNAs), long non-coding RNAs (lncRNAs), small interfering RNAs (siRNAs), and fragments of transfer RNA (tRNA). These nucleic acids are selectively packaged into the endosomal lumen via specific RNA-binding proteins (e.g., hnRNP A2B1, SYNCRIP), protecting them from systemic RNase degradation and enabling them to modulate gene expression in target cells upon uptake [19].

2.3 Characterization Techniques in Nanobiotechnology

To validate exosomes for therapeutic engineering, researchers must adhere to strict quality control frameworks, such as those defined by the International Society for Extracellular Vesicles (ISEV) under the MISEV2023 guidelines [20]. Rigorous characterization requires an orthogonal combination of physical and biochemical techniques, summarized in Table 1.

3. Nanobiotechnology Approaches to Exosome Engineering

3.1 Exosome Isolation and Purification

Table 1. Orthogonal characterization techniques for exosome quality control.

Technique	Methodological Principle	Measured Parameter(s)	Strengths & Limitations
Nanoparticle Tracking Analysis (NTA)	Laser light scattering combined with Brownian motion tracking via a charge-coupled device (CCD) camera.	Hydrodynamic diameter, particle size distribution, absolute concentration (particles/mL).	Strengths: high statistical robustness; tracks individual particles. Limitations: cannot distinguish exosomes from protein aggregates or lipid droplets of identical size.
Dynamic Light Scattering (DLS)	Measures fluctuations in scattered light intensity caused by the collective ensemble of moving particles.	Mean hydrodynamic diameter (z-average), polydispersity index (PDI).	Strengths: rapid, non-destructive bulk measurement. Limitations: highly sensitive to trace large-particle contamination; heavily biased toward larger sizes.
Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM) / Cryo-TEM	Electron beam imaging through a fixed, stained sample (TEM) or flash-frozen vitrified film (Cryo-TEM).	Nanomorphology, membrane integrity, true geometric diameter.	Strengths: Cryo-TEM preserves natural spherical structure, avoiding the artificial 'cup-shaped' artifact of conventional negative-stain TEM. Limitations: destructive, ultra-low throughput, operates under high vacuum.
Western Blotting / ELISA	Antibody-mediated detection of specific proteins separated by gel electrophoresis or immobilized on plates.	Relative/absolute expression of vesicular markers (CD63, Alix) and absence of cellular contaminants (Calnexin).	Strengths: confirms endosomal biogenesis and checks for cellular debris contamination. Limitations: semi-quantitative (Western); requires high protein concentrations.
Flow Cytometry / Nanoflow	High-sensitivity laser interrogation of single vesicles flowing past detection windows.	Surface antigen profiling, single-vesicle multiparameter analysis.	Strengths: high throughput; enables multiplexed immunophenotyping of single exosomes. Limitations: standard cytometers miss particles under 200 nm; requires specialized high-sensitivity nanoflow instrumentation.
Tunable Resistive Pulse Sensing (TRPS)	Measures ionic current changes as individual particles pass through a tunable nanopore.	Particle size, concentration, and zeta potential.	Strengths: provides absolute size and concentration measurements without calibration beads. Limitations: lower throughput than NTA; pore clogging can occur.
Single-Particle Interferometric Reflectance Imaging Sensing (SP-IRIS)	Label-free or fluorescently labeled single-vesicle detection on an antibody-printed chip using interferometric reflectance imaging.	Vesicle size, particle count, and simultaneous multiplexed surface-marker co-localization (e.g., CD9/CD63/CD81).	Strengths: combines sizing with orthogonal surface-marker phenotyping at the single-vesicle level, increasingly used alongside NTA/nanoFCM for MISEV-compliant characterization. Limitations: requires specialized instrumentation (e.g., ExoView); throughput and dynamic range are lower than bulk methods.

Translating exosome therapy into clinical practice requires highly scalable, reproducible, and non-destructive purification workflows that isolate pure exosomes from complex matrices (such as cell culture supernatants or plasma) while maintaining their biological activity and structural integrity.

Differential Ultracentrifugation (UC) and Density-Gradient UC

Differential UC remains the traditional baseline technique, relying on sequential spinning at increasing centrifugal fields to pellet cells (300 × g), cellular debris (2,000 × g), large microvesicles (10,000 × g), and finally, exosomes (100,000–120,000 × g) [21]. While widely implemented, standard pelleting exposes vesicles to high shear stresses that can induce structural damage, membrane rupture, and aggregation. Furthermore, it reg-

ularly co-isolates non-vesicular protein complexes (e.g., Tamm-Horsfall glycoprotein, albumin) and lipoprotein complexes (chylomicrons, VLDL, LDL).

To achieve higher purity, researchers use density-gradient ultracentrifugation, layering samples onto continuous or discontinuous sucrose or iodixanol (OptiPrep) gradients. Exosomes migrate to their specific buoyant density fraction (1.13–1.19 g/mL), cleanly separating them from denser protein aggregates and lighter lipoprotein fractions [22]. However, this method is limited by low throughput, high operational time (often exceeding 16 hours), and a lack of scalability for industrial pharmaceutical manufacturing.

Size-Exclusion Chromatography (SEC)

SEC has emerged as a preferred method for clinical-grade purification. It operates by gravity or low-pressure flow through a column packed with porous polymeric beads (such as Sepharose or Sephacryl). Macromolecules larger than the pore size rating cannot enter the gel matrix and elute early in the void volume, while smaller components, such as free proteins, penetrate the porous beads and elute in later fractions [23]. SEC preserves the natural structure and function of exosomes because it avoids high shear forces, and achieves highly effective separation of exosomes from free proteins, though it can still co-elute non-exosomal particles of similar size, such as very low-density lipoproteins (VLDLs).

Tangential Flow Filtration (TFF)

For industrial, large-scale production, TFF represents a leading approach. Unlike dead-end filtration, where fluid is pushed perpendicularly through a membrane, causing rapid clogging, TFF directs the feed stream tangentially across the surface of a semi-permeable membrane filter. A trans-membrane pressure drives fluid and particles smaller than the molecular weight cut-off (MWCO) through the membrane (permeate), while larger vesicles are retained and swept along the surface, preventing filter fouling (retentate) [24]. TFF allows for simultaneous concentration and buffer exchange (diafiltration) of liters of cell culture media within hours, offering high vesicle recovery yields and excellent batch-to-batch consistency. However, achieving full compliance with Current Good Manufacturing Practice (cGMP) standards requires closed, single-use systems, automated process controls, in-process monitoring, and full validation of cleaning and sterility.

3.2 Cargo Loading Strategies

An engineered exosome is only as powerful as its therapeutic payload. Loading external therapeutics into the exosomal lumen or membrane can be achieved using two primary approaches: endogenous or exogenous loading. Reported loading efficiencies vary considerably across studies and cargo types, and should be interpreted as approximate, method- and cargo-dependent ranges rather than fixed values, given inconsistent quantification methods across the field.

Endogenous Loading (Pre-isolation)

Endogenous loading leverages the cell's native synthetic machinery. Genetic engineering of donor cells (via plasmid transfections, lentiviral transduction, or CRISPR modulations) forces the expression of desired proteins, shRNAs, or miRNAs. To ensure these molecules are actively packaged into budding ILVs rather than remaining loose in the cytoplasm, the cargo is often genetically fused to highly expressed endosomal sorting proteins [25].

For example, fusing a therapeutic peptide or protein sequence to the cytoplasmic loops of tetraspanins (CD63), the C-terminus of Alix, or membrane-anchoring domains (such as the C1C2 domain of lactadherin) forces the cellular machinery to package the payload directly into the emerging exosome [26]. While this approach maintains pristine membrane architecture and ensures the therapeutic proteins are correctly folded and post-translationally modified, its loading efficiency is bound by biological constraints, resulting in variable cargo density per vesicle.

Exogenous Loading (Post-isolation)

Exogenous loading involves introducing payloads into purified, naïve exosomes using physical or chemical methods to temporarily disrupt the stable lipid bilayer:

Passive Incubation: Hydrophobic small-molecule drugs (such as curcumin or paclitaxel) can diffuse spontaneously through the lipid bilayer, partitioning into the hydrophobic core or membrane leaflet [27]. While this method preserves membrane integrity, reported loading efficiencies are typically low (often only a few percent of input drug), particularly for hydrophilic drugs and macromolecules.

Electroporation: Exosomes in a conductive buffer are exposed to controlled electrical pulses, creating transient, nanometer-scale pores in the lipid bilayer through which charged molecules — especially hydrophilic siRNAs, miRNAs, or antisense oligonucleotides — can enter. Reported nucleic-acid loading efficiencies vary widely (roughly in the range of 10–30% in optimized protocols) and are highly sensitive to voltage and buffer conditions. A major challenge of this technique is the

potential induction of nucleic acid aggregation and exosome precipitation if the voltage parameters are not precisely optimized: Mäger et al. demonstrated that electroporation can induce significant siRNA aggregation, which may be mistaken for successful loading and can substantially overestimate true encapsulation efficiency if aggregates are not distinguished from vesicle-encapsulated cargo [28].

Sonication: Applying low-frequency mechanical ultrasound waves temporarily deforms and destabilizes the exosomal membrane, allowing macromolecules (such as large enzymes or neuroprotective proteins) to enter the internal cavity [29]. The mechanical energy causes the membrane to re-form during subsequent rest phases. While sonication can yield comparatively high loading efficiency for some protein cargoes, it can alter the size distribution and surface protein topology of the vesicles.

Extrusion: Exosomes are mixed with therapeutic cargo and repeatedly forced through polycarbonate membranes with precise pore sizes (100–200 nm) using a mechanical syringe plunger [30]. This intense physical shearing causes complete restructuring of the vesicle membrane, incorporating surrounding drugs during the breakdown and reassembly process, often achieving moderate-to-high nominal loading yields, at the cost of more pronounced changes to membrane composition and surface-protein topology than gentler methods.

Chemical Permeabilization (Saponin): Saponin is a natural surfactant that selectively removes cholesterol from lipid membranes, creating transient pores that increase permeability to large hydrophilic proteins [31]. This chemical method requires careful post-loading washing steps to remove residual saponin and prevent in vivo hemolytic toxicity.

Overall, no single loading strategy is uniformly superior: the optimal choice depends on cargo physicochemistry (size, charge, hydrophobicity), the acceptable trade-off between loading efficiency and membrane/surface integrity, and the intended clinical route of administration. Head-to-head, standardized comparisons of loading efficiency across methods and cargo classes remain a notable gap in the field.

3.3 Surface Modification and Brain Targeting

Unmodified, systemically injected naïve exosomes are predominantly sequestered by the liver, spleen, and lungs due to non-specific clearance by resident macrophages of the mononuclear phagocyte system. Quantitative biodistribution studies demonstrate that exosomes are rapidly cleared from the blood circulation, with a half-life of less than 2 to 30 minutes, and accumulate primarily in the liver and spleen, with minimal brain enrichment [10,11].

To overcome this limitation and ensure high therapeutic delivery across the blood-brain barrier into AD-affected brain regions, the exosomal surface must be functionalized with specific targeting ligands.

Genetic Engineering Strategies

Genetic engineering involves fusing a targeting peptide sequence with an endogenous exosomal transmembrane protein within the donor cells. A landmark study demonstrated the fusion of the rabies virus glycoprotein (RVG) peptide which binds specifically to nicotinic acetylcholine receptors (nAChRs) expressed abundantly on brain endothelial cells and neurons to the Lamp2b (lysosome-associated membrane protein 2b) protein [32]. Systemic injection of these RVG-Lamp2b engineered exosomes resulted in high accumulation within the CNS, delivering therapeutic siRNA specifically to neurons and microglia.

A technical challenge of this approach is that standard Lamp2b is susceptible to degradation by endosomal proteases during vesicle biogenesis. To safeguard the targeting moiety, researchers insert a protective GNSTM (glycine-asparagine-serine-threonine-methionine) glycosylation motif at the N-terminus of the engineered peptide, which shields it from enzymatic cleavage and preserves its targeting functionality [33].

Chemical Conjugation (Click Chemistry)

Chemical conjugation allows for the direct attachment of targeting ligands to pre-isolated exosomes. Copper-catalyzed or copper-free strain-promoted azide-alkyne cycloaddition (SPAAC) click chemistry is widely used for this purpose due to its high selectivity and efficiency under mild physiological conditions [34]. It is important to note that copper-catalyzed click chemistry is not truly bioorthogonal due to copper toxicity; only SPAAC is fully bioorthogonal.

Typically, the amine groups on exosomal surface proteins are first functionalized with an azide-NHS ester linker. These azide-tagged vesicles are then reacted with dibenzocyclooctyne (DBCO)-modified targeting ligands, such as transferrin, angiopoietin-2 (which targets low-density lipoprotein receptor-related protein-1, LRP1) [35], or c(RGDyK) peptides (targeting integrin $\alpha\beta3$ on activated endothelial profiles), creating a stable covalent linkage. This chemical modification is fast and highly efficient, but it must be closely controlled to prevent over-functionalization, which can mask essential native surface markers and trigger rapid systemic clearance [36].

Non-Covalent Functionalization

Non-covalent strategies modify the exosomal surface without disrupting its primary chemical structure, relying instead on

hydrophobic interactions, electrostatic forces, or affinity binding:

- **Hydrophobic Insertion:** Targeting elements are linked to lipid anchors, such as palmitic acid, cholesterol, or distearoylphosphatidylethanolamine-polyethylene glycol (DSPE-PEG) chains. When incubated with exosomes, these lipid anchors insert spontaneously into the liquid-crystalline exosomal membrane bilayer, positioning the targeting ligand outward [36].
- **Electrostatic Interactions:** Positively charged polymers or cell-penetrating peptides (e.g., Tat peptide) can be electrostatically adsorbed onto the net-negative outer leaflet of the exosomal membrane, enhancing cellular internalization [37].
- **Aptamer Conjugation:** Single-stranded DNA or RNA aptamers designed to recognize specific cell-surface receptors (such as the transferrin receptor) can be anchored to the exosomal surface, providing high-affinity binding without altering the structural properties of the vesicular membrane [38].

4. Exosome Therapy in Alzheimer's Disease

4.1 Pathological Targets and Mechanisms of Action

The pathological landscape of Alzheimer's disease involves multiple interconnected pathways. Engineered exosomes can be designed to act at different points in these cascades, serving as multi-functional therapeutic agents.

Amyloid-Beta Clearance and Degradation

The accumulation of toxic A β ₁₋₄₂ monomers and their subsequent assembly into soluble oligomers and insoluble fibrils drive synaptic injury and downstream neurodegeneration. Exosomes can lower A β burdens through several distinct mechanisms:

Enzymatic Degradation: Exosomes derived from specific cell types, such as adipose-derived stem cells (ADSCs), are naturally enriched with matrix metalloproteinases, including neprilysin (NEP) and insulin-degrading enzyme (IDE) [39]. These membrane-bound endopeptidases hydrolyze extracellular A β peptides into non-toxic peptide fragments, reducing plaque burdens in the brain parenchyma.

Decoy Receptor Cleansing: Exosomes can be bioengineered to display high densities of A β -binding receptors, such as the cellular prion protein PrP^c or low-density lipoprotein receptor-related protein 1 (LRP1) clusters [40]. These engineered vesicles act as nanoscale 'sponges' or decoy traps, binding circulating toxic A β oligomers with high affinity and redirecting them to microglia for safe phagocytosis and lysosomal degradation.

Sequestration and Clearance: Surface glycans and sialic acid residues on specific exosomal subpopulations can interact with the bunching domains of A β , promoting its internalization and subsequent clearance by the mononuclear phagocyte system.

Tau Pathology Modulation

Intracellular neurofibrillary tangles composed of hyperphosphorylated tau protein correlate strongly with clinical cognitive decline in AD patients. Unlike standard small-molecule drugs, which struggle to target intracellular proteins, engineered exosomes can deliver genetic modifiers to disrupt tau production at the translational level.

Exosomes loaded with siRNAs or antisense oligonucleotides (ASOs) targeting the MAPT (microtubule-associated protein tau) transcript can penetrate neurons via surface-directed targeting (e.g., via RVG functionalization). Once internalized, they release their genetic payload into the cytoplasm, inducing sequence-specific degradation of MAPT mRNA. This suppresses the translation of tau monomers and limits downstream hyperphosphorylation and prion-like trans-synaptic seeding of pathological tau aggregates [41].

Neuroinflammation Reduction and Microglial Reprogramming

Chronic neuroinflammation in AD is sustained by the persistent activation of microglia and astrocytes. In the AD microenvironment, microglia often adopt a pro-inflammatory M1 phenotype, secreting neurotoxic cytokines (such as IL-1 β , TNF- α , and IL-6) and reactive oxygen species (ROS) that exacerbate synaptic loss [42].

Exosomes can be used to reprogram this inflammatory microenvironment. For example, mesenchymal stem cell-derived exosomes (MSC-Exos) contain anti-inflammatory miRNAs, such as miR-146a, miR-21, and miR-133b. When internalized by overactivated microglia, these miRNAs suppress the expression of key signaling nodes, such as interleukin-1 receptor-associated kinase 1 (IRAK1) and tumor necrosis factor receptor-associated factor 6 (TRAF6). This inhibits the pro-inflammatory nuclear factor kappa B (NF- κ B) pathway and shifts microglia from the neurotoxic M1 profile to a neuroprotective, phagocytic M2 phenotype, restoring homeostatic clearance mechanisms and reducing tissue injury [43]. It should be noted, however, that the miRNA cargo of MSC-derived exosomes is not fixed: expression of individual miRNAs such as miR-146a can vary considerably between donor sources, culture passage number, and isolation protocol, and this donor-to-donor and batch-to-batch heterogeneity in car-

go composition remains an underappreciated source of variability in reported therapeutic outcomes across studies.

Neuroprotection and Synaptic Regeneration

AD is ultimately a disease of synaptic failure. Exosomes can deliver neurotrophic factors directly to damaged neurons to promote survival and structural plasticity. For instance, exosomes can be loaded with brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF) or nerve growth factor (NGF) proteins, protecting these sensitive biologics from peripheral proteolytic degradation [44].

Upon binding to neuronal tropomyosin receptor kinase B (TrkB) receptors, these exosome-delivered neurotrophins activate downstream survival pathways, including the phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase/Akt (PI3K/Akt) and mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK/ERK) cascades. This activation stimulates axonal sprouting, repairs damaged dendritic spines, restores long-term potentiation (LTP), and stabilizes synaptic transmission [45].

4.2 Critical Evaluation of Preclinical and In Vivo Evidence

A substantial body of preclinical evidence supports the therapeutic potential of engineered exosomes in animal models of Alzheimer's disease, demonstrating biochemical efficacy and cognitive improvements.

In standard transgenic mouse models such as the double-transgenic APP/PS1 mouse or the aggressive 5xFAD model systemic administration of surface-targeted exosomes has yielded promising therapeutic outcomes. For example, Alvarez-Erviti et al. used RVG-targeted, bone marrow MSC-derived exosomes loaded with BACE1 (beta-site APP cleaving enzyme 1) siRNA via electroporation. Intravenous injection into wild-type mice led to a 62% reduction in BACE1 mRNA expression and a 55% decrease in total A β_{1-42} peptide levels in the cortical parenchyma [32]. It is critical to note that this landmark study was conducted in wild-type mice, not in AD model animals; subsequent studies have shown variable efficacy when translating these findings to A β -depositing models, and the direct translation of these results to AD-relevant pathology remains an area of active investigation [32].

Similarly, studies using MSC-derived exosomes have reported significant reductions in A β plaque burdens and a suppression of activated Iba1-positive microglial numbers in the hippocampus. These structural improvements correlated with functional recovery in behavioral assays assessing spatial memory and cognitive performance, such as the Morris Water Maze and Y-Maze Spontaneous Alternation tests. Treated mice showed significant decreases in escape latency and improved platform

zone retention, indicating a rescue of hippocampal synaptic plasticity.

Despite these promising results, several critical limitations remain in current preclinical models:

Over-reliance on Artificial Genetic Transgenics: Most pre-clinical studies rely on models (like APP/PS1 or 5xFAD) that express human mutations linked to rare, early-onset familial AD. These models do not fully replicate the complex, age-dependent etiology of late-onset sporadic AD, which represents over 95% of the clinical patient population. Models such as Tg2576, 3xTg-AD, and APP-KI (which do not overexpress APP and are more physiologically relevant) are increasingly being adopted, but remain underutilized in exosome research. The rTg4510 tauopathy model is also critically important for studies specifically targeting tau pathology.

Short Study Durations: Many in vivo interventions are evaluated over brief experimental windows (typically 2 to 8 weeks). These short timeframes fail to capture the long-term safety, potential immunogenicity, or durability of therapeutic responses required for a chronic, decades-long human disease.

Inconsistent Biodistribution Data: Quantitative tracking metrics vary widely between studies, often due to differences in vesicle labeling methods (e.g., lipophilic dyes like DiR/DiO vs. radionuclide tracing). This variability highlights the need for standardized pharmacological evaluations before advancing to human clinical trials.

Methodological Limitations: Many cited studies use small sample sizes (n=5–8 per group) without power calculations, lack blinding in behavioral assessments, and fail to apply multiple comparison corrections. These methodological shortcomings should be acknowledged when interpreting reported outcomes.

4.3 The Double-Edged Sword: Exosomes in Tau Propagation

A critical consideration that is often overlooked in the therapeutic exosome literature is the role of endogenous exosomes in spreading tau pathology. Asai et al. demonstrated that microglia spread tau via exosome secretion, and that inhibiting exosome synthesis significantly reduced tau propagation both in vitro and in vivo [61]. Depleting microglia dramatically suppressed the propagation of tau and reduced excitability in the dentate gyrus. This finding has profound implications for exosome-based therapy: while engineered exosomes can be designed to deliver therapeutic cargo, they may also inadvertently

ently facilitate the spread of pathological tau species if not properly designed. Furthermore, TREM2 deficiency has been reported to augment the transportation, dissemination, and propagation of tau through microglial exosomes, suggesting that genetic background significantly influences the balance between therapeutic benefit and pathological propagation.

This risk highlights the importance of designing therapeutic exosomes so that their engineering strategy actively works against, rather than passively coexists with, this endogenous propagation mechanism. Several design principles follow directly from the mechanisms above: (i) targeting ligands and membrane compositions should be selected to minimize overlap with the natural receptors and uptake pathways that recipient neurons and microglia use to internalize endogenous tau-laden exosomes, reducing the chance that a therapeutic vesicle is mistaken for, or co-trafficked with, a pathological one; (ii) donor cell sources with low intrinsic tau content (e.g., MSCs rather than neuronal or microglial donor lines) should be preferred, and cargo-loading and purification workflows should include explicit quality-control steps to exclude co-isolated endogenous tau species from the donor cell population; and (iii) surface engineering could incorporate decoy or blocking moieties that competitively occupy tau-uptake receptors on recipient cells, in principle limiting secondary propagation while the therapeutic payload is delivered. None of these mitigation strategies has yet been systematically validated in the context of AD-directed exosome therapeutics, and we identify this as a priority area for future mechanistic and safety-focused research.

5. Genetic Considerations in Exosome-Based AD Therapy

The genetic architecture of Alzheimer's disease has profound implications for the development and application of exosome-based therapies. Despite the central importance of genetics in AD pathogenesis, this dimension has been largely overlooked in the exosome therapy literature. This section addresses this critical gap.

5.1 APOE Genotype: The Master Modulator

The apolipoprotein E (APOE) gene is the greatest known genetic risk factor for sporadic AD [63]. The three major APOE isoforms $\epsilon 2$, $\epsilon 3$, and $\epsilon 4$ differ by only one to two amino acids but have profoundly different effects on AD risk. In White individuals, the risk of late-onset AD is approximately 12- to 15-fold higher for APOE4 homozygosity and 2- to 3-fold higher for heterozygosity compared to $\epsilon 3/\epsilon 3$ carriers. APOE genotype affects several aspects of AD pathogenesis that are plausibly relevant to exosome therapy, although as empha-

sized below direct evidence in the context of engineered therapeutic exosomes specifically remains limited:

APOE and BBB Integrity

APOE4 compromises the integrity of the blood-brain barrier through multiple mechanisms, including the activation of the CypA-MMP9 pathway, which facilitates the infiltration of peripheral inflammatory cytokines. Recent neuroimaging studies demonstrate that BBB permeability is elevated for APOE4 carriers across cortical gray matter, with the strongest differences observed even among cognitively normal, amyloid-negative individuals. This APOE4-related BBB breakdown occurs in the absence of detectable cognitive decline or amyloid pathology, suggesting that APOE4 carriers may have intrinsically different BBB permeability profiles that could affect exosome biodistribution. Importantly, associations between entorhinal BBB permeability and microstructural injury are strongest in amyloid-positive APOE4 carriers.

APOE and Exosome Cargo

APOE itself is trafficked via exosomes. Peng et al. demonstrated that liver-derived ApoE4-laden exosomes are transported into the brain, where they activate the NLRP3 inflammasome by increasing cholesterol levels in neural cells, affecting cognition, locomotion, and mood [62]. The ApoE4 content of serum exosomes is significantly elevated in older healthy subjects and AD patients carrying the ApoE4 allele, and this elevation shows a significant inverse correlation with cognitive function. Furthermore, brain-derived extracellular vesicles (bdEVs) from patients with different APOE genotypes show moderate differences in small RNA and protein profiles, suggesting that APOE genotype influences the molecular cargo of endogenous exosomes.

APOE and Cellular Uptake

APOE4/4 brain-derived extracellular vesicles demonstrate stronger neuronal uptake and tau transfer compared to APOE3/3 vesicles, impairing neuronal activity in iPSC-derived neurons. This suggests that APOE genotype affects both the efficiency of exosome uptake and the downstream consequences of that uptake.

An Important Evidentiary Caveat

The observations summarized above are drawn predominantly from studies of endogenous, patient- or animal-derived extracellular vesicles and from general AD neurobiology, rather than from controlled studies of engineered, exogenously administered therapeutic exosomes in genotype-stratified models. It therefore remains an open empirical question not

yet directly demonstrated whether and to what extent APOE genotype meaningfully alters the pharmacokinetics, biodistribution, or efficacy of a therapeutic exosome product administered to a patient. We regard this translation from endogenous EV biology to therapeutic exosome pharmacology as biologically plausible and mechanistically well-motivated, but currently inferential; closing this specific evidentiary gap through genotype-stratified preclinical and early-phase clinical studies (Section 5.3) should be treated as a priority rather than an assumed conclusion.

5.2 Implications for Exosome Therapy Design

These findings have several potential implications for the design of exosome-based therapies, pending the confirmatory studies noted above:

Dosing Stratification: APOE4 carriers may require different dosing regimens due to altered BBB permeability and clearance kinetics.

Targeting Strategy Optimization: The choice of targeting ligand may need to be optimized based on APOE genotype, as receptor expression profiles may differ.

Patient Selection: Clinical trials should stratify patients by APOE genotype to determine whether therapeutic efficacy varies across genetic subgroups.

Donor Cell Selection: The APOE genotype of donor cells used for exosome production may influence the properties of the resulting vesicles; autologous approaches using patient-derived cells would eliminate allogeneic APOE mismatches but may carry the same genetic risk factors.

5.3 Other Genetic Modifiers

Beyond APOE, several other genetic variants influence AD pathogenesis and may affect exosome therapy outcomes:

TREM2 (Triggering Receptor Expressed on Myeloid Cells 2) variants increase AD risk and affect microglial function. TREM2 is predominantly found in microglia and has emerged as a possible therapeutic target. Microglial exosomes carrying TREM2 can ameliorate ferroptosis and neuroinflammation by activating the Wnt/ β -catenin signaling pathway. However, as noted in Section 4.3, TREM2 deficiency augments tau propagation through microglial exosomes, suggesting that patients with TREM2 variants may have altered responses to exosome-based therapies.

SORL1 (Sortilin-Related Receptor 1) variants affect APP trafficking and A β production. ABCA7 variants influence lipid metabolism and microglial function [63]. Both have been implicat-

ed in AD risk and may affect exosome biogenesis, cargo loading, or cellular uptake.

5.4 Recommendation for Genetically Stratified Approaches

Given the profound influence of genetic variation on AD pathogenesis and exosome biology, we recommend that future pre-clinical studies:

Utilize isogenic iPSC-derived neurons and microglia with different APOE genotypes to model patient-specific responses to exosome therapy.

Incorporate genetically diverse mouse models (e.g., humanized APOE knock-in mice) rather than relying exclusively on APP/PS1 or 5xFAD models on a uniform genetic background.

Stratify clinical trial populations by APOE genotype and other key genetic variants to identify subgroups most likely to benefit from exosome-based interventions.

6. Delivery Systems and Bioavailability

6.1 Mechanisms of Blood-Brain Barrier Penetration

The ability of exosomes to traverse the blood-brain barrier (BBB) is a key feature that distinguishes them from conventional synthetic nanocarriers. They cross the neurovascular endothelium primarily through receptor-mediated transcytosis (RMT) [46].

During this process, specific ligands on the exosomal membrane bind to corresponding receptors on the luminal surface of brain capillary endothelial cells (BCECs). For instance, transferrin or insulin-like growth factors endogenous to the exosome surface interact with the Transferrin Receptor (TfR) or Insulin Receptor, triggering clathrin-coated vesicle invagination. Instead of sorting into lysosomes for degradation, these endocytosed vesicles are routed across the cytoplasm along polarized microtubule networks to the basolateral membrane, where they fuse and release their payload into the perivascular space [47].

Additionally, exosomes can exploit adsorptive-mediated transcytosis (AMT), where electrostatic interactions between positively charged patches on certain vesicle profiles and negatively charged sialic acid residues on the endothelial glycocalyx stimulate non-specific internalization and transport [48]. In pathological states like advanced AD, chronic neuroinflammation can compromise BBB integrity, leading to localized tight junction disruption and increased endothelial permeability. This allows a fraction of systemically administered exosomes to enter the brain parenchyma through passive paracellular translocation.

It is important to note that only a small fraction of systemically administered exosomes (typically less than 1% of the injected dose) successfully crosses the BBB and reaches the brain parenchyma. This underscores the need for enhanced targeting strategies and alternative routes of administration.

6.2 Pharmacokinetics, Biodistribution, and Clearance Pathways

Understanding the systemic disposition of exosomes is critical for refining dosing regimens and ensuring therapeutic safety. Upon intravenous administration, unmodified naïve exosomes exhibit a brief circulation half-life, typically ranging from less than 2 to 30 minutes [49]. They are rapidly cleared from circulation by resident macrophages of the reticuloendothelial system (primarily Kupffer cells in the liver and splenic red pulp macrophages). This rapid clearance occurs because circulating opsonins bind to the vesicle surface, marking them for phagocytosis via scavenger receptors.

Consequently, biodistribution studies consistently show high accumulation in the liver, spleen, and lungs, while only a small fraction (typically less than 1% of the injected dose) reaches the brain parenchyma [50]. Exosomes that evade hepatic and splenic clearance undergo cellular internalization or hepatic metabolism, and smaller breakdown products are eliminated via renal filtration.

To extend circulation residence times and enhance brain bioavailability, researchers employ several optimization strategies:

PEGylation: Conjugating hydrophilic polyethylene glycol (PEG) chains to the exosome surface creates a hydration barrier that sterically hinders opsonin binding and macrophage recognition, extending the circulation half-life [51].

CD47 Exploitation (“Don’t Eat Me” Signaling): Engineering exosomes to express high levels of the transmembrane protein CD47 allows them to interact with signal regulatory protein alpha (SIRP α) receptors on macrophages. This interaction transmits an inhibitory signaling cascade that prevents phagocytosis, shielding the vesicles from immune clearance and increasing their availability for brain uptake [52].

6.3 Routes of Administration

The choice of administration route significantly influences the pharmacokinetics and therapeutic window of exosome therapies in AD.

Intravenous (IV) Injection

IV delivery is a highly standard, clinically familiar approach that allows for systemic administration of large fluid volumes. However, it exposes exosomes to immediate hepatic filtration, splenic sequestration, and dilution within the systemic blood volume, requiring higher doses to achieve therapeutic levels in the brain.

Intranasal (IN) Delivery

Intranasal administration offers a non-invasive strategy designed to bypass the blood-brain barrier largely, directing therapeutics toward the CNS. Upon atomized delivery into the nasal cavity, exosomes traverse the olfactory neuroepithelium and respiratory mucosa. They migrate along the perineural and perivascular spaces of the olfactory and trigeminal nerves, passing through the cribriform plate to enter the cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) and brain parenchyma within minutes [53].

This route avoids hepatic first-pass clearance and limits systemic off-target toxicities. However, its efficiency can be constrained by anatomical factors, including the low volume capacity of the nasal cavity, rapid mucociliary clearance, and potential enzymatic degradation by local mucosal proteases. Furthermore, some evidence suggests that intranasally delivered exosomes may still enter the systemic circulation before reaching the brain, and the precise pathway remains incompletely understood.

Intracerebroventricular (ICV) / Intrathecal Injection

ICV and intrathecal delivery involve direct injection into the cerebral ventricles or spinal subarachnoid space, ensuring immediate access to the CSF network [54]. While these methods achieve high local bioavailability and bypass all vascular barriers, they are highly invasive surgical procedures that carry risks of infection, tissue trauma, and elevated intracranial pressure, limiting their feasibility for chronic, long-term AD management.

7. Clinical Translation and Challenges

7.1 Manufacturing Scalability and Standardization

Transitioning exosome therapy from specialized laboratory settings to industrial-scale pharmaceutical production presents significant technical and quality control hurdles.

Cell Sources and Culture Platforms

Selecting an optimal parental cell line is a critical foundational decision. Common platforms include mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs), human embryonic stem cells (hESCs), induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs), and immortalized cell lines (e.g., HEK293T). While immortalized cells offer high growth rates and production yields, they carry safety risks, such as the potential co-isolation of oncogenic DNA fragments or retroviral elements. Conversely, primary MSCs exhibit excellent safety and anti-inflammatory properties but suffer from donor-to-donor variability and limited proliferative capacity before undergoing cellular senescence.

Traditional 2D planar culture flasks cannot produce the high vesicle yields required for clinical trials. To scale up production, manufacturers utilize 3D bioreactor systems, such as hollow-fiber bioreactors or microcarrier-based suspension cultures [55]. These systems significantly increase the available surface-area-to-volume ratio and continuously supply oxygen and nutrients under precise computer control, boosting exosome production yields per milliliter of media by up to 20-fold.

cGMP Standardization and Quality Control

To comply with regulatory standards, production workflows must be validated under Current Good Manufacturing Practice (cGMP) conditions. This requires establishing strict protocols for every stage of manufacturing [56]. The large-scale production of MSC-EVs under cGMP standards must be implemented and validated for each product, and many ongoing studies have attempted to standardize the methods of isolation, purification, and characterization. Establishing batch-to-batch consistency requires rigorous quality control testing across several criteria:

Identity: Confirming the presence of specific structural markers (e.g., ≥ 3 positive EV markers like CD63, CD81, TSG101) and the absence of cellular contamination (e.g., Calnexin, Tom20).

Purity: Quantifying non-vesicular impurities using the protein-to-particle ratio or lipid-to-particle ratio to ensure the removal of background proteins and lipids. It should be noted that the protein-to-particle ratio as a purity metric is debated, as many argue this ratio is too variable to be useful [57].

Safety: Ensuring complete sterility, the absence of mycoplasma, and endotoxin levels within strict regulatory thresholds (< 5.0 EU/kg body weight).

Potency: Implementing quantitative in vitro bioassays that predict in vivo therapeutic efficacy, such as measuring the dose-dependent reduction of A β toxicity in cultured human neurons [58].

The Cost and Stability Challenge

A critical translational barrier not adequately addressed in the literature is the cost of goods — exosome production is orders of magnitude more expensive than monoclonal antibody manufacturing. Furthermore, exosomes are notoriously unstable; storage at -80°C is impractical for pharmaceutical products. Currently, no comprehensive reports on the shelf-life and in vivo stability of exosome formulations are available. While lyophilization (freeze-drying) has shown promise for extending stability, with some reports suggesting stability for up to a year at room temperature, this approach requires further validation for clinical-grade products [59].

7.2 Regulatory Frameworks and Classification

A significant challenge in clinical translation is the lack of a dedicated regulatory classification for exosome-based therapies. The US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the European Medicines Agency (EMA) evaluate engineered exosomes under the category of Biological Medicinal Products, often classifying them as Advanced Therapy Medicinal Products (ATMPs) or Gene Therapy Products if they contain modified nucleic acid payloads.

In the United States, the FDA regulates exosome/EV products for disease treatment as drugs and biological products subject to premarket requirements, classifying them as 351 products that require studies effectively showing safety and efficacy, along with the purity and potency of a product in treating a disease. In Europe, the EMA classifies exosome preparations as ATMPs under Regulation (EC) No 1394/2007, mandating Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP) compliance.

Regulatory approval requires clearing extensive hurdles:

Complex Characterization: Manufacturers must fully characterize both the vesicle carrier and its active molecular payload, defining precise mechanism(s) of action for all active components.

Sourcing Validation: Detailed documentation must trace the origin, viral screening profile, and raw material purity of all cell banks used in production.

Pharmacokinetic Profiling: Standard small-molecule pharmacokinetic models are often inadequate for multi-component

biological vesicles, necessitating the development of novel tracking methodologies to establish absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion (ADME) profiles.

The Clinical Trial Landscape

As of 2026, no exosome-based product has received full FDA approval for any indication; several dozen exosome products have entered Phase I/II clinical investigation across oncology, wound healing, cardiovascular, and neurological applications under Investigational New Drug (IND) authorization, but none has yet advanced to an approved biologic [65]. Reported failure and attrition rates among registered exosome trials remain high relative to more established biologic modalities. Early-phase exploratory work in AD-directed exosome therapeutics is beginning to emerge—for example, small autologous cell-derived exosome platforms engineered with neuron-targeting peptides and candidate mRNA payloads have been described in early registered trials—but such programs remain at a very preliminary stage, and readers should consult current clinical trial registries (e.g., ClinicalTrials.gov) directly for up-to-date status, as this area is evolving rapidly. The extraordinary failure rate of exosome-based therapeutics in clinical development more broadly underscores the need for cautious optimism specifically with respect to AD applications, where no exosome product has yet entered late-stage human efficacy testing.

7.3 Safety, Immunogenicity, and Toxicity Profiles

Although exosomes are inherently more biocompatible than synthetic nanoparticles, they are not entirely free of safety risks. Their immunogenic profile depends heavily on the donor cell source and surface composition.

Immunogenicity Risks

Allogeneic Incompatibility: Exosomes derived from allogeneic (non-self) donors can carry human leukocyte antigens (HLA Class I and II molecules) on their surface, potentially triggering an adaptive immune response in the recipient that leads to rapid neutralization and systemic inflammation upon repeated dosing.

Alternative Cell Sources: Utilizing cells with low immunogenic profiles, such as mesenchymal stem cells (which naturally exhibit immunosuppressive properties and express minimal HLA markers), helps mitigate these immune responses.

Long-Term Safety and On-Target/Off-Target Toxicity

Off-Target Sequestration: Because the majority of systemically administered exosomes accumulate in the liver and spleen, researchers must carefully evaluate the risk of chronic hepato-

toxicity, splenomegaly, or disruption of homeostatic macrophage functions.

Unintended Molecular Cargo: Co-isolated, non-therapeutic microRNAs or growth factors from the donor cells could theoretically stimulate unintended cellular signaling pathways in peripheral tissues, underscoring the need for thorough long-term safety evaluations in preclinical models.

8. Future Perspectives and Therapeutic Opportunities

8.1 Next-Generation Approaches

Artificial and Hybrid Exosomes

To combine the high payload capacity of synthetic carriers with the superior biocompatibility of natural extracellular vesicles, researchers are developing hybrid exosomes. These are generated by the controlled physical fusion of purified natural exosomes with synthetic liposomes using lipid film hydration or repeated co-extrusion techniques. The resulting hybrid vesicles feature an expanded internal aqueous volume capable of carrying large macromolecular payloads while retaining essential native exosomal surface proteins (such as CD47) that enable immune evasion and BBB penetration. Fully artificial exosome mimetics are also being synthesized by self-assembling defined mixtures of purified lipids, cholesterol, and recombinant targeting proteins around synthetic core matrices, offering improved structural uniformity and simplified manufacturing scalability.

Multi-Targeting Platforms

Given the multi-factorial etiology of Alzheimer's disease, single-target interventions often yield limited clinical efficacy. Next-generation nanobiotechnology aims to develop multi-functional exosomal platforms capable of addressing multiple disease pathways simultaneously. For example, a single engineered exosome can be designed to carry an asymmetric therapeutic payload:

On the Surface: Displaying neprilysin enzymes to degrade extracellular A β aggregates alongside LRP1 decoy domains to bind and neutralize circulating toxic oligomers.

Within the Core: Enclosing an anti-tau siRNA payload to inhibit intracellular tangle formation, combined with a small-molecule antioxidant (such as curcumin) to scavenge reactive oxygen species.

By targeting multiple pathological nodes concurrently, these multi-functional nanomedicines seek to disrupt the self-sustaining cycles of amyloid deposition, tau aggregation, and neuroinflammation that drive AD progression.

8.2 Personalized Medicine and Combination Therapies

Exosomes are uniquely suited for personalized medicine applications. In the future, patient-specific therapies could be realized by isolating autologous mesenchymal stem cells from a patient's own bone marrow or adipose tissue, expanding them in cGMP-compliant 3D bioreactors, and engineering them with customized genetic or chemical payloads tailored to the patient's specific disease stage and biomarker profile [60]. Because these vesicles are derived from the patient's own cells, they present virtually zero risk of immunological rejection or allogeneic neutralization, optimizing safety and therapeutic durability. Furthermore, autologous approaches eliminate the APOE genotype mismatch between donor and recipient that could otherwise affect exosome properties and therapeutic response.

Furthermore, exosome therapies can be integrated into broader combination regimens alongside established and emerging AD treatments. They can serve as targeted delivery vehicles for low-dose monoclonal antibodies or be co-administered with small-molecule secretase inhibitors to achieve synergistic therapeutic effects, potentially allowing for lower systemic drug doses and reduced adverse side effects.

8.3 Critical Research Gaps and a Roadmap to Clinical Realization

Despite significant technological progress, several critical research gaps must be resolved to successfully translate exosome therapies from preclinical models to human clinical applications:

Standardized Nomenclature and Isolation: The field requires uniform, industry-wide standards for isolating and characterizing exosome batches to ensure reproducibility across different research laboratories and manufacturing facilities. The MISEV2023 guidelines provide a framework [20], but their adoption remains inconsistent.

In Vivo Tracking and Pharmacokinetics: Developing high-resolution, non-invasive imaging modalities (such as positron emission tomography [PET] or magnetic resonance imaging [MRI] using core-encapsulated contrast agents) is essential for accurately tracking the real-time biodistribution, BBB penetration efficiency, and long-term clearance kinetics of engineered exosomes in human subjects.

Long-Term Chronic Toxicity Studies: Comprehensive evaluations are needed in large non-human primate models to rigorously characterize the long-term safety, immunogenicity, and potential toxicity profiles of repeated exosome administrations over extended timelines.

Genetically Stratified Preclinical Models: As detailed in Section 5, studies must incorporate genetically diverse models that reflect the APOE genotype distribution of the human population, and must directly test — rather than assume — whether APOE genotype alters therapeutic exosome pharmacokinetics. Humanized APOE knock-in mice should become the standard for preclinical efficacy testing.

Standardized Loading-Efficiency Reporting: Head-to-head, standardized comparisons of cargo-loading efficiency across methods (Section 3.2) are needed, using consistent quantification methods that distinguish true vesicle encapsulation from co-precipitated or aggregated cargo.

Standardized Stability Protocols: Robust, commercially viable storage solutions (such as lyophilization) must be validated and adopted to enable practical distribution and long-term shelf-life.

Addressing these research gaps requires a coordinated, multidisciplinary effort combining advanced materials engineering, cellular biology, clinical neurology, and genetic medicine to establish reliable protocols and advance these nanobiotechnology platforms into human clinical trials.

9. Conclusion

Exosome-based nanobiotechnology represents a promising frontier in the development of disease-modifying therapies for Alzheimer's disease. By leveraging nature's own intercellular delivery systems, these nanovesicles overcome the critical biophysical limitations that have long hindered conventional CNS pharmacology, notably the challenge of traversing the highly restrictive blood-brain barrier. Through precise surface functionalization and versatile cargo loading strategies, engineered exosomes can be tailored to target multiple core pathways of AD pathology simultaneously, enabling efficient amyloid degradation, the disruption of tau aggregation cascades, and the reprogramming of chronic neuroinflammatory environments.

However, the field must confront the profound influence of genetic variation particularly APOE genotype on every aspect of exosome biology, from BBB permeability and biodistribution to cellular uptake and therapeutic response, while also acknowledging that this influence is, for now, substantially inferred from endogenous EV biology rather than directly demonstrated for engineered therapeutics. Future research must move beyond the one-size-fits-all paradigm and embrace genetically stratified approaches that account for the heterogeneous genetic landscape of Alzheimer's disease, while generating the direct pharmacokinetic evidence needed to justify that stratification.

While formidable challenges remain regarding scalable manufacturing, quality control standardization, regulatory classification, cost-of-goods, and long-term stability, the transition from basic laboratory research toward industrial production is steadily accelerating. Continued interdisciplinary innovation across nanobiotechnology, pharmaceutical engineering, clinical medicine, and genetic medicine will be essential to fully realize the potential of these platforms, offering a sophisticated, targeted approach to mitigate the global burden of Alzheimer's disease.

References

- [1] World Health Organization. Dementia. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2023.
- [2] Scheltens P, De Strooper B, Kivipelto M, Holstege H, Chételat G, Teunissen CE, et al. Alzheimer's disease. *Lancet* 2021;397(10284):1577-90. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)32205-4.
- [3] Cummings J, Lee G, Nahed P, Kambar MEZN, Zhong K, Fonseca J, et al. Alzheimer's disease drug development pipeline: 2023. *Alzheimers Dement (N Y)* 2023;9(2):e12385. doi:10.1002/trc2.12385.
- [4] van Dyck CH, Swanson CJ, Aisen P, Bateman RJ, Chen C, Gee M, et al. Lecanemab in early Alzheimer's disease. *N Engl J Med* 2023;388(1):9-21. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2212948.
- [5] Reish NJ, Jamshidi P, Hajighasemi-Ossareh M, Aggarwal NT, Purvin V, Kruer MC, et al. Autopsy findings in a patient who died after lecanemab infusion. *N Engl J Med* 2023;388(5):473-5. doi:10.1056/NEJMc2215148.
- [6] Profaci CP, Munji RN, Pulido RS, Agalliu D. Structural and functional aspects of the blood-brain barrier in health and disease. *Cell Tissue Res* 2020;381(3):355-87. doi:10.1007/s00441-020-03201-6.
- [7] Teleanu DM, Chircov C, Grumezescu AM, Teleanu RI. Impact of nanoparticles on brain delivery for central nervous system diseases. *Pharmaceutics* 2022;14(4):720. doi:10.3390/pharmaceutics14040720.
- [8] Mitchell MJ, Billingsley MM, Haley RM, Wechsler ME, Peppas NA, Langer R. Engineering precision nanoparticles for drug delivery. *Nat Rev Drug Discov* 2021;20(2):101-24. doi:10.1038/s41573-020-0090-8.
- [9] Kalluri R, LeBleu VS. The biology, function, and biomedical applications of exosomes. *Science* 2020;367(6478):eaau6977. doi:10.1126/science.aau6977.
- [10] Murphy DE, de Jong OG, Brouwer M, Coenen MJ, Pluijms SM, Jakobs ME, et al. Extracellular vesicle-based therapeutics: natural versus engineered targeting and its clearance. *Exp Mol Med* 2021;53(3):345-54. doi:10.1038/s12276-021-00579-z.
- [11] Banks WA, Sharma P, Erickson MA, Hansen KM. Passage of exosomal vesicles across the blood-brain barrier. *Int J Mol Sci* 2020;21(23):9085. doi:10.3390/ijms21239085.
- [12] Théry C, Witwer KW, Aikawa E, Alcaraz MJ, Anderson JD, Andriantsitohaina R, et al. Minimal information for studies of extracellular vesicles 2018 (MISEV2018): a position statement of the International Society for Extracellular Vesicles and update of the MISEV2014 guidelines. *J Extracell Vesicles* 2018;7(1):1535750. doi:10.1080/20013078.2018.1535750.
- [13] Vietri M, Radulovic M, Stenmark H. The many functions of ESCRT proteins. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 2020;21(1):25-42. doi:10.1038/s41580-019-0177-4.
- [14] Trajkovic K, Hsu C, Chiantia S, Rajendran L, Wenzel D, Wieland F, et al. Ceramide triggers budding of exosome vesicles into multivesicular endosomes. *Science* 2008;319(5867):1244-7. doi:10.1126/science.1153124.
- [15] Blanc L, Vidal M. New insights into the function of Rab GTPases in the biogenesis and secretion of extracellular vesicles. *Small GTPases* 2018;9(5):366-73. doi:10.1080/21541248.2016.1241198.
- [16] Jeppesen DK, Fenix AM, Franklin JL, Higginbotham JN, Zhang Q, Zimmerman LJ, et al. Reassessment of exosome composition. *Cell* 2019;177(2):428-45. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2019.02.029.
- [17] Skotland T, Sagini K, Sandvig K, Llorente A. An emerging focus on lipids in extracellular vesicles. *Adv Drug Deliv Rev* 2020;159:308-21. doi:10.1016/j.addr.2020.03.002.
- [18] van Niel G, D'Angelo G, Raposo G. Regulation of extracellular vesicle production: an interplay between autophagy and endosomal pathways. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 2018;19(4):213-28. doi:10.1038/nrm.2017.125.
- [19] O'Brien K, Breyne K, Ughetto S, Laurent LC, Breakefield XO. RNA delivery by extracellular vesicles in mammalian cells and its applications. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 2020;21(10):585-606. doi:10.1038/s41580-020-0251-y.
- [20] Welsh JA, Goberdhan DCI, O'Driscoll L, Buzas EI, Blenkiron C, Bussolati B, et al. Minimal information for studies of extracellular vesicles (MISEV2023): From basic to advanced approaches. *J Extracell Vesicles* 2024;13(2):e12404. doi:10.1002/jev2.12404.
- [21] Momen-Heravi F. Isolation of extracellular vesicles by differential ultracentrifugation. *Methods Mol Biol* 2017;1660:25-32. doi:10.1007/978-1-4939-7253-1_3.
- [22] Onódi Z, Pelyhe C, Nagy CT, Brenner GB, Almási L, Kittel Á, et al. Isolation of high-purity extracellular vesicles by the combi-