



Cite this: DOI: 10.1039/d5lc01060h

Engineering perfusion to meet tumor biology: are vascularized tumor-on-a-chip models ready to drive therapy innovation?

Ines Poljak,^{ab}  ^{ac} and Giulia Adriani  ^{*bde}

The development of effective cancer therapies remains constrained by the complex and dynamic nature of the tumor microenvironment (TME), with tumor vasculature representing a critical barrier and modulator of treatment response. This review critically examines recent advances in the generation of vascularized tumor models using organ-on-a-chip (OoC) microfluidic technologies, emphasizing their capacity to recapitulate key interactions between tumor cells, stroma, and vasculature *in vitro*. We outline the mechanistic roles of tumor vasculature in therapy resistance, metastatic dissemination, and immune modulation, and highlight current strategies targeting vasculature for improved therapeutic outcomes. State-of-the-art biomaterials and engineering approaches, including template-based fabrication, self-organization, and the integration of patient-derived organoids, are discussed regarding their efficacy in constructing physiologically relevant vasculature. The review critically assesses findings from drug testing studies and discusses the translational potential of microfluidic platform capabilities, such as real-time monitoring, precise flow control, and functional assessment of vessel permeability and drug delivery, while identifying key limitations for clinical implementation. Challenges in standardization, scalability, and clinical translation are discussed, and recommendations are proposed to enhance the human-relevance and impact of vascularized OoC models in preclinical oncology research. These advanced platforms represent a transformative approach for bridging the translational gap between preclinical research and clinical oncology, offering opportunities to advance personalized cancer therapeutics and improve patient outcomes.

Received 18th November 2025,
Accepted 5th January 2026

DOI: 10.1039/d5lc01060h

rsc.li/loc

Introduction

Cancer remains a leading cause of mortality worldwide, driving continued efforts to develop more effective treatments that can overcome intrinsic and acquired resistance mechanisms.¹ Remarkable therapeutic advances have transformed cancer treatment, including multimodal approaches combining surgery, radiotherapy, chemotherapy, and immunotherapy.² Breakthrough immune checkpoint therapies demonstrated survival improvements in some types of cancers, such as advanced melanoma,³ metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer,⁴ and renal cancer,⁵ while ongoing challenges persist in immunotherapy-resistant malignancies

like pancreatic cancer, advanced ovarian cancer, glioblastoma (GBM) and microsatellite stable (MSS) colorectal cancer (CRC). Cell therapy approaches, particularly chimeric antigen receptor (CAR) T cells, tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes (TILs), and T cell receptor (TCR) engineered T cells, have also demonstrated significant clinical benefits across multiple cancer types. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved CAR-T cell therapy has achieved improved survival in hematological malignancies, such as multiple myeloma, and large B-cell lymphoma as recently reviewed.⁶ Notably, both TIL and TCR-engineered T cell therapies have also achieved FDA approval for unresectable or metastatic melanoma and synovial sarcoma. However, translation of T cell therapy to solid tumors remains challenging due to adverse effects, antigen heterogeneity and limited efficacy.^{7,8}

Central to these therapeutic challenges is the tumor microenvironment (TME), a complex network of cellular, molecular, and structural components. It comprises cancer cells, immune cells, stromal cells, blood and lymphatic vasculature, extracellular matrix (ECM), and various soluble factors, that collectively promote therapy resistance.⁹ While each TME component contributes to therapeutic resistance,

^a Centre for Craniofacial and Regenerative Biology, King's College London, London, UK

^b Singapore Immunology Network (SIGN), Agency for Science, Technology and Research (A*STAR), 8A Biomedical Grove, Immunos, Singapore 138648, Republic of Singapore. E-mail: giulia_adriani@a-star.edu.sg

^c London Centre for Nanotechnology, King's College London, London, UK

^d Department of Biomedical Engineering, National University of Singapore (NUS), 4 Engineering Drive 3, Singapore 117583, Republic of Singapore

^e Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore



the tumor vasculature, as both a structural TME component and functional gatekeeper, determines treatment outcomes through multiple interconnected mechanisms. Abnormal vessel structure represents the primary barrier to effective therapy delivery, as tumor vessels exhibit chaotic organization, irregular branching, heterogeneous diameters, leaky endothelium and aberrant basement membrane that create regions of poor perfusion and elevated interstitial fluid pressure.¹⁰ This abnormal architecture impedes uniform drug distribution, resulting in subtherapeutic concentrations and impedes therapeutic cell infiltration, limiting their trafficking to tumor sites.¹¹ Endothelial cells (ECs) further promote resistance through angiocrine signaling: they produce inhibitory mediators, including Interleukin-10 (IL-10) and Transforming growth factor- β (TGF- β), and upregulate checkpoint ligands that actively suppress immune effector cells, whilst simultaneously secreting factors such as Angiopoietin-1 (Ang-1) that can maintain cancer stem cell niches and promote tumor dormancy, enabling relapse at distant sites.¹² Additionally, the poor perfusion creates hypoxic conditions that induce cellular adaptations reducing chemotherapy, radiotherapy and immunotherapy efficacy.^{13–15} Cancer cells also exploit the vasculature for metastatic dissemination through multiple mechanisms, forming new vessels *via* vasculogenesis or angiogenesis, hijacking existing vessels through vascular co-option, or creating vessel-like channels *via* vasculogenic mimicry, enabling therapy escape and colonization in distant organs.¹⁶

Current preclinical models fail to adequately capture these complex biological features that drives vascular-mediated resistance mechanisms. Conventional two-dimensional (2D) cell cultures cannot sustain the oxygen gradients, perfusion or matrix-mediated mechanical cues that drive hypoxic signaling and vascular dysfunction, creating significant translational gaps in preclinical-to-clinical cancer therapy. On the other hand, animal models, while informative for systemic safety and multi-organ interactions, demonstrate limitations in precisely control and measure specific human vascular defects, such as poor perfusion, leakiness, tortuous architecture and pericyte loss, that directly influence therapeutic outcomes.¹⁷ Although humanized mouse models have advanced significantly, limitation persists in replicating the human vascular system, often focusing on small and/or fast-growing tumors that lack the complexity, heterogeneity and maturity of human tumor vasculature.¹⁸ These limitations, combined with time, cost, and ethical considerations, have prompted regulatory agencies to actively promote alternative methodologies for therapy assessment, including microphysiological systems (MPSS).^{19,20} To address this fundamental engineering challenge, MPSS must recreate the pathological vascular features and resulting microenvironmental heterogeneity described above: abnormal vessel geometry, hypoxic cores, elevated interstitial pressure, and the angiocrine signaling that lead to a therapy-resistant state.

MPSS integrate engineering with cell biology to create three-dimensional (3D) models featuring cell-cell and cell-

ECM interactions, fluid flow, and mechanical cues.²¹ These microfluidic systems replicate human-relevant tissue functions more accurately than conventional 2D or even 3D cell culture methods while overcoming main challenges of animal models such as time, cost, and ethical concerns.²² By incorporating perfusable vascular networks adjacent to tumor organoids or spheroids, vascularized MPSS enable the establishment of signaling gradients of angiogenic factors, including Vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), Platelet derived growth factor (PDGF) and Ang-1, that govern vessel maturation and dysfunction. These platforms can reproduce the pathological vascular features described above, such as leaky endothelium, tortuous architecture, poor perfusion, elevated interstitial pressure and hypoxic cores, permitting functional assessment of therapy delivery, immune cell trafficking, and vascular-mediated resistance mechanisms for functional oncology screening.^{23–27} A comprehensive overview of cancer-on-chip platforms for TME modelling with emphasis on integration of patient-derived components and advanced sensors has been reviewed in this same collection.²⁸ This review takes instead a vascular-focused approach, discussing how vascularized MPSS are addressing the fundamental engineering challenge of recapitulating tumor vascular biology, the latest advancements in vascularized tumor-on-chip models and their translational potential to transform preclinical cancer research. We introduce tumor vasculature biology to understand the multifaceted role of vasculature in therapy resistance, and how microfluidic approaches are enabling tumor vascularization strategies. We discuss clinical evidence of vascular-targeting therapies and comment on current challenges, providing recommendations for enhancing model clinical relevance and integration into therapeutic development pipelines.

Integrated barriers to therapy: the TME–vasculature axis

The complex TME creates a protective niche for cancer cells and comprises multiple interdependent barriers to therapy. Immunosuppressive stromal cells, particularly tumor-associated macrophages (TAMs) and cancer-associated fibroblasts (CAFs), secrete cytokines (*e.g.*, IL-10, TGF- β , VEGF) and remodel the ECM, creating physical obstacles to drug and immune cell penetration while promoting tumor cell survival and stemness.^{29–32} In addition to TAMs and CAFs as players in therapy resistance, other immunosuppressive cells in TME like regulatory T cells and myeloid-derived suppressor cells (MDSCs) have shown overproduction of molecular factors, such as IL-6, TGF- β and VEGFA, promoting tumor immune evasion, metastasis and therapy resistance.⁹ Furthermore, enhanced glycolysis in tumor cells drives lactate accumulation and acidification, thereby reducing the efficacy of weakly basic chemotherapeutics, such as cisplatin.^{33,34} Tumor-derived reactive oxygen species (ROS) induce oxidative stress and mitochondrial dysfunction in neighboring cells like CAFs



and TAMs, further promoting the lactate buildup in the TME.³⁵ While an acidic microenvironment can initially trigger cancer cell apoptosis, persistent acidity leads to tumor-cell adaptation and the development of more aggressive tumor phenotypes reducing treatment response.³⁶ Additionally, acidic TME facilitates activation of TAMs and pro-tumorigenic neutrophils and dendritic cells (DCs) while simultaneously inhibiting TILs cytotoxic activity.³⁷ Importantly, extracellular acidification is tightly linked to another defining hallmark of the TME, chronic hypoxia, which arises from poor vascular perfusion and increased metabolic demand. Hypoxia activates Hypoxia-inducible factor 1- α (HIF-1 α) signaling, which drives drug resistance gene expression, upregulates immune-suppressive checkpoint proteins, *i.e.*, Programmed death-1(PD-1)/Programmed death-ligand 1 (PD-L1), and triggers ECM remodeling that further limits drug diffusion and immune infiltration.^{38–40} These microenvironmental features, including stromal activation, acidosis and hypoxia, are not independent; rather, they converge on a central regulator: the tumor vasculature. Tumor endothelial cells (TECs) display abnormal behavior due to the influence of the TME, generating vessels that are not passive conduits for blood flow but active orchestrators of therapy resistance, operating through both structural abnormalities and dynamic signaling. Structurally, tumor vessels exhibiting chaotic organization, irregular diameters, incomplete basement membrane, gaps between ECs, and deficient pericyte coverage, resulting in critically reduced perfusion.^{41–44} This perfusion failure directly drives hypoxia, limits convective drug transport, and impairs immune cell extravasation, while simultaneously enabling the leakiness and instability that promote metastatic dissemination.^{45–48} Beyond their structural role, TECs actively shape the TME through angiocrine signaling, the secretion of bioactive factors, including Ang-1, Ang-2, Neurogenic locus notch homolog (Notch) ligands such as Jagged1 (JAG1) and Delta-like ligand 4 (DLL4), Hepatocyte growth factor (HGF), and periostin, that shape the behavior of neighboring cancer, stromal and immune cells.¹² Notably, Notch1 receptor activation on tumor endothelium promotes endothelial senescence and tumor cell intravasation in primary tumors, simultaneously priming the pre-metastatic niche endothelium to enhance disseminated tumor cell homing at secondary sites.¹² In solid tumors, such as breast cancer, TECs secrete Tumor necrosis factor- α (TNF- α) that amplifies the CXCL1-mediated myeloid recruiting loop, driving chemoresistance through enhanced myeloid-derived immunosuppression.⁴⁹ These cell-intrinsic effects are amplified by stromal crosstalk: CAF-derived extracellular vesicles enriched with VEGF promote angiogenesis, contributing to resistance to bevacizumab in colon cancer,⁵⁰ while CAF-derived HGF sustained angiogenesis through endothelial c-MET activation despite anti-VEGF blockade.⁵¹ Collectively, these findings highlight that TECs are dynamic regulators of tumor progression, microenvironmental remodeling and therapy response, supporting the importance

of studying tumor vasculature as an integrated, functional compartment in preclinical studies.

Because these resistance mechanisms, *i.e.*, stromal activation, metabolic stress, hypoxia, and vascular dysfunction, are tightly integrated and spatially organized, faithful *in vitro* recapitulation requires vascular model systems that capture their interdependence. Conventional 2D endothelial monolayers do not sustain oxygen or nutrient gradients, while non-vascularized 3D spheroids develop hypoxia in their cores due to limited oxygen diffusion but lack perfusion control, preventing dissection of how vascular function specifically drives resistance. This is where MPS offer a distinct engineering advantage: by combining perfused vascular networks with 3D tumor spheroids and defined stromal populations, these platforms enable recapitulation and perturbation of oxygen gradients, drug diffusion, mechanical cues and angiocrine signaling, permitting to analyze the bidirectional molecular exchange and potentially predict clinical endpoints like dormancy, metastatic risk and vascular-mediated therapy resistance.

Formation of the tumor vasculature *in vivo*

Although tumor cells were recognized early to secrete factors supporting vascular growth⁵² it was Judah Folkman's seminal work in the 1970s that established angiogenesis as a critical step in malignant progression.⁵³ Nowadays we know that tumor vascularization may occur through mechanistically distinct pathways associated with angiogenesis, vasculogenesis or non-angiogenic strategies. Angiogenesis is the growth of new vessels from pre-existing capillaries *via* sprouting, where endothelial cells migrate and proliferate to form branches, and *via* intussusception, a splitting mechanism where existing vessels partition into daughter vessels.⁵⁴ Vasculogenesis involves *de novo* vessel formation from bone marrow-derived progenitor cells or cancer stem cell differentiation. Non-angiogenic strategies, including vascular co-option by exploiting pre-existing vasculature and vasculogenic mimicry of tumor cells forming vascular channels without ECs, represent fundamentally different mechanisms insensitive to anti-angiogenic drugs.⁵⁴ Because these pathways are tumor-type dependent and distinct mechanisms often emerge as resistance following therapy, understanding which vascularization strategy a tumor employs is critical for rational design of vascularized MPS and therapy development. However, angiogenesis is currently the most targeted vascularization mechanism, as the “angiogenic switch” occurs early in tumorigenesis and marks the initiation of new vessel formation, representing an important hallmark of cancer progression.^{55,56} Multiple factors contribute to this switch, including well-known players, such as VEGFA, a potent pro-angiogenic factor, and its endogenous inhibitor thrombospondin-1 (TSP-1).⁵² Hypoxic and acidic TME promotes the release of VEGFA and other pro-angiogenic signals, activating ECs and stromal



populations to remodel the ECM and support tumor vascularization.^{38,57–61} The dysfunctional architecture of tumor vasculature reflects the molecular imbalance between pro-angiogenic and vessel-maturation signals, such as PDGF and Ang-1 (ref. 62) that are essential for pericyte recruitment and stabilization of the endothelial monolayer during physiological angiogenesis.⁶³ The resulting VEGFA-high/PDGF-low/Ang-1-low signaling imbalance leads to: (i) EC hyperproliferation and migration without vessel stabilization, (ii) failure of pericyte recruitment and coverage, (iii) loss of VE-cadherin junctional integrity, and (iv) excessive vascular permeability. This molecular imbalance is the primary driver of the characteristic tortuous, leaky, and poorly perfused vasculature observed in tumors.^{64–66} The abnormal tumor vasculature perpetuates a vicious cycle: hypoxia promotes VEGFA secretion, but the resulting vessels are functionally deficient due to impaired maturation signaling, leading to further hypoxia and a hostile tumor microenvironment.³⁹ Faithfully replicating these aberrant vascular features *in vitro* is essential for understanding the key cellular and molecular contributors, whose interactions govern vessel formation, remodeling, and function, providing the basis for physiologically relevant *in vitro* models.

Stromal and immune cells as drivers of vascular dysfunction

TAMs and CAFs are the dominant stromal populations driving abnormal tumor vascularization. TAMs, derived from circulating monocytes and tissue-resident macrophages,⁶⁷ respond to hypoxia by secreting VEGFA, Placental growth factor (PlGF), IL-6, TNF- α and Fibroblast growth factor 2 (FGF2), which collectively promote rapid but disorganized angiogenesis, affecting the response to cytotoxic treatment.^{45,68–72} In hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC), TECs induce CD163⁺ TAM polarization through IL-4 secretion, promoting immune suppression and cancer progression⁷¹ contrary to pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma, where TAM-derived exosomes stimulate TEC proliferation and increase vascular density of the tumors.⁷² Perivascular TAMs further destabilize vessels by secreting microvesicles and exosomes that disrupt endothelial barrier function.⁷³ These inter-tumoral signaling loops between TAMs and TECs are absent in monocellular tumor spheroids or not fully replicated when using blood-derived monocytes as TAM models *in vitro*, lacking the tissue resident population. Furthermore, CAFs contribute to vascular dysfunction through both paracrine and mechanical mechanisms, playing a key role in vascular remodeling in cancer. CAFs are plastic cells primarily derived from activated resident fibroblasts,⁷⁴ such as pancreatic⁷⁵ and hepatic stellate cells,⁷⁶ pericytes,⁷⁷ and mesenchymal stem cells^{78,79} or even from ECs through endothelial-to-mesenchymal transition,⁸⁰ and macrophages *via* macrophage-myofibroblast transition.^{81,82} Once formed, CAFs are commonly divided into three subsets: 1) myofibroblast-like CAFs (myCAF) with SMA^{high}, IL6^{low}, MHCII⁺; 2) inflammatory CAFs (iCAF) with SMA^{low}, IL6^{high}, MHCII⁺; and 3) antigen

presenting CAFs (apCAF) specifically MHCII⁺. MyCAF) are mostly associated with vascular remodeling: they upregulate VEGFA whilst downregulating VE-cadherin, destabilizing endothelial junctions and promoting leakiness.^{76,83} CAFs also promote angiogenesis independently of VEGFA through PDGF-C, HGF, FGF2 and CXCL12/CXCR4 signaling, and mechanically compress vessels *via* ECM contraction and proteolytic remodeling.^{84,85} This CAF-driven desmoplasia increases solid stress, collapses fragile capillaries and impairs perfusion, a key mechanism in pancreatic and breast tumors. CAFs also attract ECs and myeloid cells from bone marrow *via* the CXCL12/CXCR4 axis.⁸⁶ Despite their functional heterogeneity, CAFs subtype identity is often neglected in vascularized tumor MPSs, as detailed in Table 2.

Beyond TAMs and CAFs, other TME cells modulate tumor vascular remodeling: neutrophils rapidly release VEGF, immature myeloid cells degrade ECM to create physical space for sprouting, while lymphocytes can suppress angiogenesis *via* IFN- γ , and decidual-like NK cells secrete pro-angiogenic VEGF and PlGF.^{87–91} Pericytes contribute through PDGF-B/PDGF β signaling, adipocytes enhance EC proliferation and tube formation synergistically with tumor-derived factors,^{92–94} and platelets have the potential to secrete either pro- or anti-angiogenic factors.⁹⁵ This intricate stromal interplay generates the heterogeneous, leaky, poorly perfused vasculature that supports tumor growth, facilitates metastasis and reinforces therapy resistance, all features that vascularized MPSs must recapitulate through inclusion of multiple, appropriately activated stromal populations.

Heterogeneity of tumor endothelial cells (TECs)

ECs are the main component of tumor vasculature and, during angiogenesis, they are commonly divided in “tip cells” responsible for vascular expansion by migrating towards VEGF signal, and “stalk cells” responsible for proliferation.^{41,96} ECs from different tissues and anatomical locations in the vascular hierarchy express unique molecular signatures that reflect their specialized functions. For example, high endothelial venules in lymphoid tissues express lymphocyte-recruiting adhesion molecules, while brain endothelium expresses tight junction proteins essential for the blood–brain barrier (BBB) function.^{43,97} Similarly, tumor vasculature is not uniform but profoundly shaped by organ context. Brain tumors encounter the restrictive BBB, which limits drug penetration and immune infiltration⁹⁸ while liver and bone tumors develop within a highly fenestrated or permeable vasculature that supports distinct angiogenic programs and facilitates circulating tumor cell seeding.⁸³ These organ-specific vascular phenotypes determine drug accessibility, immune cell trafficking, and metastatic colonization, emphasizing why vascularized MPSs must incorporate tissue-specific endothelial characteristics to accurately predict therapy responses in organ-specific contexts. However, among many tumor types, universal



markers specific for TECs have been identified: ACKR1, PLVAP and IGFBP3.⁹⁷ A comprehensive single-cell transcriptomic study analyzing 437 tumor samples representing 31 cancer types identified 5 different EC subtypes: lymphatic ECs (LECs) (LYVE1⁺ and PROX1⁺), vascular ECs (VECs), arterial ECs (SEMA3G⁺), venous ECs (ACKR1⁺) and capillary-like ECs (RGCC⁺), and 2 subtypes of mural cells (MCs): pericytes (RGS5⁺ and PDGFRB⁺) and smooth muscle cells (ACTA2⁺ and TAGLN⁺), revealing substantial heterogeneity within tumor endothelial populations and demonstrating the presence various stromal cells surrounding tumor vasculature.⁹⁹ A similar bioinformatic analysis in CRC samples from 97 patients identified 5 subsets of ECs, with some overlapping: venous ECs (ACKR⁺), ESM1⁺, IGFBP3⁺, STMN1⁺, and lymphatic ECs (TFF3⁺, PROX1⁺).¹⁰⁰ Interestingly, the venous ECs and IGFBP3⁺ subclusters were identified as immune modulating ECs (IMECs) with potential to recruit mature CD4⁺ T cells, reinforcing the importance of ECs in shaping the immune landscape in tumors.¹⁰⁰ Furthermore, analysis of renal cell carcinoma (RCC) revealed 5 subclusters of ECs, with a slight difference than previous studies: 1) afferent/efferent arterioles/descending vasa recta (CLDN5⁺/AQP1⁺), 2) ascending vasa recta (PLVAP⁺), 3) pericytes (PDGFB⁺, RGS5⁺), 4) glomerular capillaries (ITGA8⁺) and 5) unidentified cluster with general EC markers like PECAM1⁺.¹⁰¹ A single cell study from two different regions of GBM tissue of 4 patients also revealed 5 clusters of ECs with distinct spatial organization: 1) peripheral EC type I (KLF2⁺, SLC2A1⁺), 2) tumor core EC type I (COL4A1⁺, CD93⁺, KDR⁺), 3) tumor core EC type II (FABP1A⁺), 4) peripheral EC type II (CCL4⁺, HLA-DR⁺) and 5) tumor core EC type III (ACKR1⁺), suggesting that anatomical position, not just intrinsic EC identity, drives functional specialization.¹⁰² Altogether these single-cell studies revealed the existence of both intra- and intertumoral heterogeneity of TECs, reflecting diverse functional roles and phenotypes across tumor types and regions that must be taken in account within engineered tumor models. Yet most MPSs lack EC subtype specification and spatial characterization of phenotypic diversity. Achieving physiological vascular architecture requires two complementary approaches. First, establishing appropriate TEC subtypes and cell ratio ranges for different tumor types, originated from transcriptomic data. Second, develop *ad hoc* differentiation protocols necessary to sustain TEC phenotype heterogeneity within engineered tissues. Advanced spatial biology methods including nanoneedle-based spatiotemporal lipidomics offer non-destructive approaches to validate whether engineered tissues recapitulate native EC subpopulation architecture and to monitor phenotypic stability during culture and therapeutic intervention.¹⁰³

Targeting tumor vasculature as therapeutic approach

Several strategies have been developed to target tumor vasculature to indirect inhibiting tumors growth and

progression,^{42,104} each with its own mechanisms and potential benefits. Many of these therapies, as summarized in Table 1 have reached clinics, opening a new avenue for cancer patients.

Anti-angiogenic therapies

The concept of anti-angiogenic therapy was first introduced in 1970s when Folkman discussed “starving tumors by eliminating the blood vessels”.⁵³ Since then many angiogenic factors have been identified as indirect tumor targets, including VEGF and its receptor (VEGFR), FGF and its receptor (FGFR), DLL4 and its Notch receptors, and PDGF and its receptor (PDGFR).⁵⁴ Additionally, several anti-angiogenic therapies have received FDA approval for the treatment of advanced cancers. Bevacizumab (humanized anti-VEGF antibody), under the name AVASTIN®, was the first angiogenesis inhibitor approved by FDA in 2004.¹⁰⁵ As a single agent bevacizumab demonstrated anti-cancer activity in GBM^{106,107} and metastatic RCC.¹⁰⁸ Following the bevacizumab patent expiration in 2017, FDA approved bevacizumab-awwb, a biosimilar to AVASTIN® for treatment of multiple cancers including metastatic CRC.¹⁰⁹ Furthermore, ramucirumab (human monoclonal VEGFR-2 antibody) also showed clinical benefits, including improved objective response rate (ORR) and overall survival (OS), leading to FDA approval for CRC,¹¹⁰ HCC,¹¹¹ non-small cell lung cancer¹¹² and gastric cancer.¹¹³ Lastly, lenvatinib (VEGF-2 inhibitor) was initially approved by FDA for treating radioactive iodine refractory, locally advanced, or metastatic differentiated thyroid carcinoma as it had significantly increased ORR compared to placebo.¹¹⁴ This was followed by the additional FDA approval of the treatment for HCC¹¹⁵ and RCC¹¹⁶ based on its ability to improve ORR and OS in these cancers. These anti-angiogenic drugs have shown efficacy when used alone or in combination with other chemotherapeutic or immunotherapeutic treatments. However, although several of these therapies have received FDA approval for specific cancers, their efficacy in other tumor types remains largely unexplored. For example, ramucirumab is approved for the treatment of several cancers, but not for RCC. However, a vascularized RCC MPS was developed to test anti-VEGFR-2 therapy and demonstrated that ramucirumab could potentially be used for RCC treatment.¹¹⁷ A more in-depth discussion of MPS applications for evaluating vascular-targeting agents will be presented in later sections. Some other rising anti-angiogenic therapies that are gaining recognition in preclinical environment include extracellular vesicles that exhibited the potential to suppress angiogenesis through the transfer of anti-angiogenic molecules,¹¹⁸ nanoparticle-based delivery systems for anti-angiogenic agents¹¹⁹ and targeting TAMs.¹²⁰ However, as previously described, some tumors rely on alternative ways of vascularization, such as



Table 1 Combination therapies and single agents targeting vasculature FDA approved. This table summarizes the therapies, types of cancer, and clinical trial numbers

Trial	Drug	Cancer	Date of the FDA approval
NCT02684006	Avelumab + axitinib	Renal cell carcinoma	14.05.2019
NCT03434379	Atezolizumab + bevacizumab	Hepatocellular carcinoma	29.05.2020
NCT02366143	Atezolizumab with chemotherapy and bevacizumab	Metastatic non-squamous, non-small cell lung cancer (NSq NSCLC)	06.12.2018
NCT03141177	Nivolumab and cabozantinib	Advanced renal cell carcinoma	22.01.2021
NCT02702388	Lenvatinib	Radioactive iodine refractory differentiated thyroid cancer	13.02.2015
NCT03517449	Pembrolizumab and lenvatinib	Endometrial carcinoma	21.07.2021
NCT02853331	Pembrolizumab and axitinib	Advanced renal cell carcinoma	19.04.2019
NCT00262847	Bevacizumab with chemotherapy	Epithelial ovarian, fallopian tube, or primary peritoneal cancer	13.06.2018
NCT02141295/E3200	Bevacizumab with FOLFOX4 (5-fluorouracil, leucovorin, and oxaliplatin)	Colorectal carcinoma	20.06.2006
BO17705E	Bevacizumab and INF alpha2a	Metastatic renal cell carcinoma	31.07.2009
NCT04737187	Trifluridine and tipiracil with bevacizumab	Previously treated metastatic colorectal cancer	02.08.2023
NCT03737643	Olaparib with bevacizumab	Epithelial ovarian, fallopian tube, or primary peritoneal cancer	08.05.2020
Multiple	Bevacizumab-awwb (biosimilar) + 5-fluorouracil-based chemotherapy/ fluoropyrimidine-irinotecan- or fluoropyrimidine-oxaliplatin based chemotherapy/ carboplatin or paclitaxel/ interferon alpha/paclitaxel and cisplatin or paclitaxel and topotecan	Metastatic colorectal cancer, non-squamous non-small cell lung cancer, glioblastoma, renal cell carcinoma, cervical cancer	14.09.2017
NCT02435433	Ramucirumab	Hepatocellular carcinoma	20.05.2019
NCT00917384		Advanced gastric cancer or gastro-esophageal junction adenocarcinoma	21.04.2014
NCT02411448	Ramucirumab with erlotinib	Metastatic non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC)	29.05.2020
NCT01183780	Ramucirumab with FOLFIRI (irinotecan, folinic acid, and 5-fluorouracil)	Metastatic colon cancer	24.04.2015
NCT01103323	Regorafenib	Advanced colorectal cancer	27.09.2012
NCT01271712		Advanced gastrointestinal stromal tumors	25.02.2013
NCT01774344		Hepatocellular carcinoma	27.04.2017
NCT00073307	Sorafenib	Advanced renal cell carcinoma	20.12.2005
NCT00105443		Unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma	19.11.2007
NCT00984282		Metastatic differentiated thyroid cancer	22.11.2013
NCT00410761	Vandetanib	Symptomatic or progressive medullary thyroid cancer	04.06.2011
NCT00561470	Ziv-Aflibercept with 5-fluorouracil, leucovorin, irinotecan-(FOLFIRI)	Metastatic colorectal cancer	04.08.2012
NCT00075218	Sunitinib malate	Gastrointestinal stromal tumors and advanced renal cell carcinoma	26.01.2006
NCT00428597		Rare type of pancreatic cancer	20.05.2011
NCT00375674		Recurrent renal cell carcinoma	16.11.2017
VEG113387	Pazopanib	Advanced renal cell carcinoma	19.10.2009
NCT00753688		Advanced soft tissue sarcoma	26.04.2012
NCT04322539/NCT02314819/NCT04322539	Fruquintinib	Metastatic colorectal cancer	08.11.2023
NCT02627963	Tivozanib	Advanced renal cell carcinoma	10.03.2021

vascular mimicry, making them unresponsive to anti-angiogenic treatments.¹⁰⁴ Screening patients for specific angiogenic markers before initiating therapy could help to stratify those who are most likely to benefit from treatment, ultimately enhancing therapeutic outcomes and informing the development of drugs targeting alternative methods of tumor vascularization.

Vascular disrupting agents (VDAs) and targeting vascular mimicry

Other ways to effectively target tumor vasculature, such as vascular disrupting agents (VDAs) or targeting vascular mimicry are currently being studied, either alone or in combination therapy. VDAs are small molecular agents such



as tubulin-binding agents (*e.g.*, combrestatins) or flavonoids which have shown anti-cancer effects by inducing selective vascular disruption in tumor vessels.¹⁰⁴ Several VDAs have reached clinical trials, the most recent one being crolibulin that showed decreased tumor perfusion 2–3 days post treatment in phase I.¹²¹ While VDAs have demonstrated promising results in preclinical models, their effectiveness in clinical settings has been variable,¹²² indicating a need for further research to refine these strategies and overcome potential resistance mechanisms. Furthermore, recent identification of the role of the transmembrane glycoprotein receptor CD44 in vascular mimicry has enabled the targeting of this non-angiogenic mechanism of tumor vascularization.¹²³ This led to a phase I clinical study using anti-CD44 monoclonal antibody RG7356 (NCT01358903) which demonstrated modest efficacy where 21% of the patients experienced disease stabilization over 6–35 weeks.¹²⁴ The variable clinical outcomes of VDAs highlight the need to better understand their effects. However, whether MPSs can serve as a suitable platform to study VDAs is uncertain, since most current models primarily recapitulate angiogenesis-driven mechanisms. In contrast, MPSs are particularly well-suited for investigating vascular normalization strategies, offering a controlled and physiologically relevant environment to evaluate interventions aimed at restoring vessel structure and function.

Vascular normalization

Proposed by Jain *et al.* vascular normalization aims to restore the structure and function of tumor blood vessels to improve the delivery of therapeutic agents and enhance treatment efficacy.¹²⁵ This approach works by restoring the balance between pro-angiogenic signals, like VEGF, and anti-angiogenic factors in the TME, helping to stabilize the existing blood vessels rather than completely depleting them. It is important to clarify that the normalized vasculature does not function completely as a normal vasculature, but the tumor-associated disrupted signaling are partially restored. A clinical study based on vascular normalization used a pan-VEGF receptor tyrosine kinase inhibitor in 30 GBM patients and reported increased tumor perfusion and patient survival.¹²⁶ Although all patients who responded to therapy had an increased survival, only seven patients responded to therapy.¹²⁶ In MPSs, vasculature is typically in the presence of tumor spheroids, making it responsive to tumor-derived signaling, leading to elevated VEGF levels that provide a physiologically relevant context for studying vascular normalization strategies. Additionally, these platforms allow the evaluation of combinatorial therapies and the investigation of potential synergistic effects on both the vasculature and tumor tissue.

Combination therapies

Currently, many clinical trials are assessing the efficacy of combinatorial approach, including anti-angiogenic

therapies with either chemotherapy or immunotherapy. For example, combining bevacizumab with chemotherapy has improved ORR and OS in CRC patients compared to chemotherapy alone.¹²⁷ Similar observations were seen with bevacizumab in ovarian cancer.^{128,129} However, combining bevacizumab with chemotherapy agent anthracycline and/or taxane in phase III for triple negative breast carcinoma showed no difference in OS (NCT00528567).^{130,131} Ziv-aflibercept, a fusion protein used as a decoy for VEGFA and VEGFB has been used for patients with metastatic CRC in combination with FOLFIRI (5-fluorouracil, leucovorin, and irinotecan).¹³² In a phase III clinical trial, it demonstrated significant improvements in ORR and OS for metastatic CRC (NCT00561470).¹³³ These results led to FDA approval for its use in patients with metastatic CRC resistant to oxaliplatin-containing regimen.¹³³ Furthermore, combination of anti-angiogenic drugs with immunotherapy has also reached clinical studies. A notable example is the combination of Pexa-vec, an oncolytic virus, and sorafenib, a multi-kinase inhibitor tested in a phase III clinical trial for HCC. However, this combination did not significantly improve the ORR (19.2%) or median OS (12.7 months) compared to sorafenib alone (ORR: 20.9%; OS: 14 months) (NCT02562755).¹³⁴ Dual blockade of VEGF and immune checkpoints has reached clinical trials for several solid tumors with bevacizumab being used as the anti-angiogenic agent in 50% of these studies.⁵⁴ A significant patient improvement in ORR and OS led to FDA approval of combination of anti-VEGF/VEGFR with anti-PD-1/PD-L1 for treating HCC and RCC.¹³⁵ Recently, promising clinical evidence in ORR and OS has been demonstrated in patients with advanced gastric cancer and gastroesophageal junction adenocarcinoma using anti-VEGF/VEGFR with anti-PD-1/PD-L1 combination therapy in phase I/II trials.¹³⁵ Phase III clinical trial (NCT02853331) use of anti-PD-1 pembrolizumab with receptor tyrosine kinase inhibitor axitinib showed enhanced ORR in RCC patients.¹³⁶ In the field of adaptive cell therapy, a phase II study combining sunitinib, a tyrosine kinase inhibitor, and autologous dendritic cell immunotherapy reported significant anti-cancer activity in 13 out of 21 patient with RCC.¹³⁷ However, a subsequent phase III clinical trial for the same combination was terminated due to lack of efficacy (NCT01582672). A phase II clinical trial combining bevacizumab and allogenic NK immunotherapy for recurrent solid tumors has been completed, but results are still pending (NCT02857920). Bevacizumab has also been combined with interferon alpha IFN- α or IFN- α -2a in two phase III clinical trials for RCC.¹³⁸ The study showed improvements in progression-free survival, and the combination with IFN- α also improved OS,¹³⁸ however, without statistical significance. Combinations of VDAs with anti-angiogenic or chemotherapy/immunotherapies have also shown potential in preclinical models,^{139–141} but these effects have not been consistently translated to clinical



settings. The combination of bevacizumab and paclitaxel was shown in an MPS to produce better outcomes than either agent alone.²⁵

Current therapeutic strategies, combining conventional and immune approaches with anti-angiogenic agents show promise but exhibit a high level of discrepancy between patients, highlighting the need for more refined models that accurately replicate the *in vivo* environment.¹⁴² An important factor in these studies is the dosage of anti-angiogenic agents. High doses can lead to unintended consequences, including increased ECM deposition, enhanced infiltration of pro-tumorigenic immune cells (e.g. MDSCs, TAMs or Tregs), elevated hypoxia and metabolic stress, and increased immunosuppression.¹⁴² Preclinical platforms such as MPSs could help address this challenge. By enabling the testing of multiple drug combinations and concentrations

in a human-relevant, architecturally accurate *in vitro* model, MPSs could reduce the variability in clinical responses currently observed. Furthermore, using patient-derived cells within these systems may help tailor treatments to individual patients, paving the way for more personalized therapeutic approaches.

Additional clinical challenges persist, such as insufficient routine monitoring of the TME, inadequate assessment of vessel status and oxygenation, and the absence of predictive markers for vascular remodeling.¹⁴³ To address these issues, vascularized microfluidic tumor models mimicking human biology could bridge the gap in preclinical testing by recapitulating key TME features including perfused vessels, enabling real-time analysis of drug delivery, immune cell trafficking, and metastatic processes that cannot be adequately studied in conventional systems (Fig. 1).




Fig. 1 Schematic overview of the advantages offered by vascularized 3D *in vitro* tumor models. These models closely recapitulate *in vivo* tumor physiology by supporting hypoxia-driven angiogenesis, which stimulates vessel growth through gradients of oxygen and pro-angiogenic factors. The presence of functional vasculature ensures direct delivery of nutrients and oxygen, enabling realistic modeling of tumor–stroma and tumor–immune interactions. Vascularized 3D models facilitate the study of key metastatic processes, including tumor cell intravasation and extravasation, and provide a robust platform for evaluating anti-angiogenic therapies, vascular normalization strategies, and the efficacy of immunotherapies and nanomedicine. Compared to non-vascularized spheroids, which suffer from limited nutrient diffusion, necrotic core formation, and altered drug penetration, vascularized models improve physiological relevance and predictive power for drug screening. The central 3D tumor image was created with NomadSculpt; surrounding annotations were created using BioRender. <https://BioRender.com/wfw9oxb>



Evolution of 3D *in vitro* tumor vascularization models

Understanding the biology of tumor vasculature, including its development, heterogeneity, and the influence of stromal and immune populations, is critical for evaluating therapeutic strategies. However, translating this knowledge into effective cancer treatments remains constrained by the inability of current preclinical systems to recapitulate the vascular barrier and microenvironmental molecular features that drive therapy resistance. 3D *in vitro* MPSs offer a controlled platform to recreate key aspects of tumor vascularization. By integrating engineered vascular networks with defined stromal and immune populations within controlled biochemical and biophysical microenvironments, these evolved platforms enable investigation of the tumor vasculature as a functional component of the TME rather than a static structural element. To achieve physiological relevance, vascularized MPS must integrate multiple components: an ECM that support the architecture of functional endothelial vessels, stromal cells that actively remodel vascular architecture, immune cells that modulate vascular function and spatially organized gradients of oxygen, nutrients, and molecular factors that reflect the interconnected therapeutic barriers discussed in the previous sections.

This section reviews the evolution of 3D *in vitro* tumor vascularization models, examining how engineering innovations progressively address the biological requirements established in our discussion of TME complexity. We focus on the selection and integration of cellular components, biomaterial strategies, and technological approaches that collectively enable the recapitulation of tumor vascular biology, bridging the gap between our understanding of vascular mechanisms and the engineered systems available for predictive preclinical testing.

Endothelial cell sources for *in vitro* vascularization

In vitro vascularization models have evolved significantly since 1988, when the first tube formation assay was established using human umbilical vein endothelial cells (HUVECs),¹⁴⁴ becoming one of the most widely utilized *in vitro* methods for studying angiogenesis due to its accessibility and ease of implementation. While HUVECs remain the predominant cell source of ECs in research, alternative options include endothelial progenitor cells (EPCs) and human pluripotent stem cell-derived endothelial cells (hPSC-ECs). HUVECs continue to be preferred for their availability, straightforward isolation procedures and well-established culture protocols. They have consistently demonstrated their ability to form vascular structures both *in vivo* and *in vitro*. While HUVECs are a reliable tool for vascularization studies, it is important to acknowledge that variation in genotype and phenotype may arise depending on the donor source and, being primary cells, they can exhibit

senescence at higher passage numbers. HUVECs may also express inflammatory markers under specific environmental conditions, and they may not fully capture patient-specific or organ-specific endothelial characteristics.^{145,146} EPCs are typically isolated from peripheral blood and bone marrow and have gained significant attention in vascularization research for their ability to rapidly proliferate and differentiate into ECs. Nevertheless, they face limitations as lack of unambiguous characterization, due to overlapping marker expression and challenges in optimizing culture conditions to promote robust microvessel formation.¹⁴⁷ Patient-derived induced pluripotent stem cells (iPSCs) offer a distinct advantage for generating personalized vascularized models: they can be differentiated into patient-matched endothelial cells, eliminating immune rejection and enabling personalized therapeutic testing.⁴⁹ Alongside ECs, hPSCs can differentiate into different cell populations, including perivascular cells¹⁴⁸ and smooth muscle cells,¹⁴⁹ they are renewable,¹⁵⁰ and offer the potential for precise genetic modification.¹⁵¹ However, achieving high yields of hPSCs remains challenging, and there are concerns regarding the development of genetic and epigenetic changes during *in vitro* culture.¹⁵² Indeed, the choice of EC source influences the physiological relevance and translational potential of vascularized MPS. While HUVECs offer practical advantages for standardized angiogenesis assays, their limited ability to capture patient-specific or organ-specific vascular phenotypes restricts their utility for personalized medicine applications. In contrast, patient-derived iPSC-ECs present significant promise for recapitulating individual vascular heterogeneity, yet their optimization and scalability remain ongoing challenges. Beyond the cellular components themselves, the success of *in vitro* vascularization critically depends on the biomaterial microenvironment in which endothelial cells reside. The ECM composition, mechanical properties, and biochemical cues provided by hydrogels directly determine whether endothelial cells can assemble into functional, perfusable vessel networks that recapitulate the structural and functional characteristics of native tumor vasculature.

Biomaterials for engineering vascular structures

Biomaterials for vascularization models include both natural and synthetic options, each with distinct advantages and limitations. Natural biomaterials like collagen, fibrin, gelatin, alginate, and hyaluronic acid (HA) closely mimic the native ECM, offering excellent biocompatibility and bioactivity. These materials offer ECM-like spatial guidance and structure by providing cell-adhesion sites, native signaling capabilities and allow for hydrogel remodeling and capillary-like network formation. However, they may exhibit batch-to-batch variation, which arise from differences in animal or tissue sources, variations in extraction and purification protocols, and inconsistencies in processing parameters such as temperature, pH, and enzymatic treatments. Synthetic biomaterials instead, such as polyethylene glycol (PEG),



polycaprolactone (PCL), and poly(lactic-co-glycolic acid) (PLGA) provide greater control over mechanical properties and degradation rates but may lack essential biological cues.¹⁵³ In vascularization-on-a-chip applications, fibrin-based hydrogels have demonstrated superior angiogenic properties compared to Matrigel, a tumor-derived basement membrane extract, or collagen type I alone, which can inhibit the development of perfusable vessel-like structures.^{154,155} To address the limitations of individual materials, researchers are increasingly focusing on composite materials that combine the advantages of both natural and synthetic biomaterials, as well as developing bioactive materials that better mimic the complex native vascular environment.^{156–158} Human platelet lysate has emerged as a bioactive matrix component to significantly enhance angiogenesis when combined with structural biomaterials such as fibrin or collagen.¹⁵⁹ Furthermore, techniques such as adjusting crosslinking density, protein and polymer concentrations have been developed to fine-tune the mechanical and structural properties of these hydrogels and better mimic the target tissue environment, influencing cell behavior and vascular morphogenesis.¹⁶⁰ Recently covalently crosslinked viscoelastic hydrogels with reversible physical interactions or dynamic covalent bonds, commonly known as dynamic hydrogels, have become of interest. They can undergo stress relaxation, allowing them to recover their structure after deformation, a property that closely resembles the mechanical properties of soft tissues and the natural ECM, making them ideal for mimicking native cellular microenvironments.¹⁶¹ Interestingly, dynamic hydrogels have shown enhanced endothelial colony-forming cell-derived endothelial cells (ECFC-EC) contractility, integrin $\beta 1$ clustering, and vinculin recruitment, activating FAK and metalloproteinase expression.¹⁶¹ This resulted with support for vascular assembly and basement membrane deposition.¹⁶¹ For a more comprehensive review of hydrogels used in 3D culture and vascularization, we refer the readers to the work in¹⁶² and,¹⁵⁶ respectively. Altogether, selecting and tuning biomimetic hydrogels is central to engineering vascularized 3D spheroid-based MPS architectures, enabling to more faithfully recapitulate the tumor microenvironment and its therapy-resistant vascular niches.

3D spheroid architecture as a fundamental structural requirement for TME modeling

The predominant use of spheroids in vascularized MPS models is not arbitrary; rather, the 3D architecture is essential for recapitulating key TME features that drive therapy resistance. Unlike monolayer cultures, spheroids establish oxygen and nutrient gradients that simulate the microenvironmental heterogeneity of *in vivo* tumors. As spheroid grow (typically >400–500 μm in diameter), oxygen diffusion becomes limiting, creating a distinct hypoxic core that triggers HIF-1 α signaling and pro-angiogenic factor secretion.¹⁶³ This diffusion-dependent hypoxia cannot be

accurately modeled in 2D cultures. Furthermore, the 3D geometry enables cell–cell and cell–matrix interactions across multiple axes, rather than the single-plane interactions observed in 2D systems. In co-culture conditions, these 3D interactions govern mechanotransduction and signaling between tumor cells, fibroblasts, immune cells, and the developing vasculature. The necrotic core formation observed in larger spheroids also replicates the pathological architecture of poorly vascularized tumors and drives the selection of chemotherapy-resistant populations. Therefore, the use of spheroid is not merely a convenient culture format but a fundamental structural requirement for physiologically relevant modeling of tumor–vascular interactions and therapy resistance mechanisms.

Vascularization strategies: template-based and self-organized approaches

Replicating the complexity of tumor vasculature *in vitro* presents significant challenges, necessitating precise biological and mechanical conditions. Distinct methods have been developed to vascularize tumor organoids and spheroids, categorized broadly into template-based and self-organized approaches. Template-based methods rely on predefined structures or patterns to guide vascular network formation, offering precise spatial control over the organization of cells and materials. Key techniques include molding and bioprinting. Molding generates perfusable conduits by organizing cells and biomaterials within a thin molding plane, allowing for intricate vascular architectures.^{152,156} Bioprinting provides precise deposition of cells and biomaterials, enabling the creation of organoids with pre-formed vascular channels and high experimental flexibility.^{152,156} Other engineering-driven approaches, are microfabrication and laser degradation that allow for the creation of defined vascular structures through precise biomaterial manipulation.^{164,165} While template-based methods provide precise spatial control over vascular network formation, they often fail to capture the dynamic heterogeneity, structural abnormality, and adaptive remodeling characteristic of tumor vasculature. In contrast, self-organized vessels allow endothelial and supporting cells to autonomously form networks that can dynamically rearrange in response to the tumor microenvironmental cues. These considerations are critical when designing MPSs, where replicating physiologically relevant vessel architecture, perfusion, and cell–cell interactions is essential to study tumor progression, drug delivery, and therapeutic responses *in vitro*. These self-organized approaches rely on the intrinsic ability of cells to interact, remodel, and self-organize, making the careful selection of cell types, supporting stromal populations, and extracellular cues critical to achieving functional vascular networks *in vitro*. A common method is the co-culture of endothelial cells with fibroblasts or mesenchymal stromal cells to support vessel formation, though other supporting populations such as pericytes,



smooth muscle cells, or immune cells can also be incorporated depending on the desired microenvironmental context.¹⁵² Other techniques include co-differentiation of iPSCs into endothelial and supporting cells or assembly of organoid and vascular constructs, enabling the formation of physiologically relevant vascular networks.¹⁶⁶ For a comprehensive overview on vascularization strategies, we refer readers to another insightful review.¹⁶⁷ In contrast, our review narrows the focus on the application of vascularized models in enabling anti-tumor therapeutic development, highlighting their translational potential in advancing therapeutic strategies for cancer treatment. Therefore, we specifically discuss the distinct strategies used to build vascularized tumor spheroids and organoids *in vitro*, implemented both with and without microfluidic devices.

Non-microfluidic vascularization: morphogenesis and *in vivo* engraftment

Significant advancements have been achieved in *in vitro* vascularization techniques without microfluidic devices, primarily focused on mimicking structural morphogenesis and tissue integration for transplantation, rather than functional perfusion for tumor biology studies. Successful generation of vascular-like network has been achieved in hydrogels outside microfluidic devices.^{168,169} Vascularization of organoids without microfluidic support is usually established *via* intra-organoid vascularization, as observed during the development of cerebral organoids following a co-differentiation methods, adding VEGF to human embryonic stem cells (hESCs) promoted vascularization without inhibiting neural differentiation.¹⁷⁰ In another study, overexpression of human E26 transformation-specific variant transcription factor 2 in hESC subpopulations contributed to the development of a complex vasculature in human cortical organoids.¹⁷¹ Beyond morphogenesis, these models have demonstrated functional anastomosis upon transplantation. Co-differentiation method led to successful intravascular perfusion of *in vitro* generated vascularized iPSC-derived liver organoid following transplantation into an *in vivo* mouse model.¹⁷² Assembly methods have also been used, where vascular organoids established independently were subsequently fused with specific tissue organoids to form vascularized constructs but where vasculature is not perfusable.^{173,174} In the context of cancer, co-cultures of cancer cells with ECs have reported development of intra-tumoral vasculature that mimics the structural presence of vessels within the tumor mass.^{175–177} Lastly, advances in bioprinting have enabled the introduction of perfusable channels, lined with ECs, into organ building blocks composed of patient-derived stem cell organoids.¹⁷⁸ While bioprinting approaches enable controlled perfusion through predefined channels lined with ECs, vascularization remains largely architecturally imposed rather than arising from biological self-assembly. In contrast, MPSs support the formation of biologically

relevant self-assembled vascular networks that become perfusable under dynamic flow. Consequently, non-microfluidic vascularization strategies primarily achieve structural vascular morphogenesis, with perfusion confined to predefined engineered channels rather than dynamic microvascular networks. This structural limitation restricts their ability to capture dynamic vascular remodeling and adaptive structural changes in response to tumor microenvironmental cues, that influence drug delivery, nutrient exchange, and barrier function. By integrating perfusion into spatially organized, self-assembled vasculature within tumor spheroids, MPSs overcome these limitations, providing enhanced capabilities to model functional vascular-tumor interactions and more accurately predict therapeutic responses.

Microfluidic systems: enabling functional perfused vasculature and transport regulation

In the complex TME found *in vivo*, cells experience mechanical, biochemical and topographical cues that shape their behavior.^{179,180} Microfluidic technology has enabled the development of tumor-on-a-chip models that mimic these microenvironmental conditions providing tunable matrix stiffness, controlled biochemical gradients, and spatial cell arrangement.

The evolution of microfluidic systems to generate tumor spheroid vascularization (Fig. 2) highlights a shift from simple 2D monolayers to complex, 3D tissue-mimetic models. The journey toward these systems began as early as 1948, when researchers successfully cultured single cells within glass capillaries to study adaptation to confined environments.¹⁸¹ This concept evolved significantly with the generation of microelectromechanical systems (MEMS) in the 1980s, which integrated sensors, actuators, valves, and pumps, leveraging microscale fluid dynamics and advanced microfabrication techniques on silicon wafers. However, it was in the late 1990s that microfluidic devices become widely adopted in *in vitro* tissue culture with the introduction of soft lithography and polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS) replica molding to fabricate more accessible, biocompatible and transparent platforms for biomedical research.¹⁸² Early microfluidic endothelial monolayer models progressed from demonstrating dynamic leukocyte-endothelial adhesion under flow in PMMA systems,¹⁸³ to developing computer-controlled PDMS platforms with integrated piezoelectric pumping that revealed shear stress-dependent endothelial alignment,¹⁸⁴ to creating two-layer vasculature systems to study metastatic cancer cell adhesion.¹⁸⁵ However, it was in 2010 that the term “organ-on-a-chip” was used for describing a model integrating endothelial monolayer and lung cells, demonstrating the potential of microfluidic platforms to model organ-specific microenvironments.¹⁸⁶ Building on these foundations, tumor models were developed using EC organization in monolayer,¹⁸⁷ marking the beginning of tumor-on-a-chip technology. These tumor models with an






Fig. 2 Timeline of pivotal research advances for achieving physiologically relevant vascularized tumor-on-a-chip models. This timeline illustrates the evolution of experimental models from early cells grown in capillary tubes (1948),¹⁸¹ through the development of capillary-like tube formation on matrices (1988),¹⁴⁴ to the introduction of organ-on-chip technologies such as lung- and tumor-on-a-chip with EC monolayers and 3D angiogenic sprouting (2010–2012).^{186,187,198} Subsequent advances in organ-on-a-chip models include vascular networks with tumor cells, increased organ-specific cellular complexity and angiogenic sprouting toward tumor spheroids (2013–2017).^{189,204,213} More recent milestones have seen the formation of self-assembled vascular networks for tumor spheroid vascularization, incorporation of stromal and immune cellular components within the spheroids (2021–2022),^{205,206} and the application of immune cell interactions, such as CAR T-cells within vascularized tumor spheroids (2023),²⁰⁷ reflecting the increasing cellular complexity and physiological relevance of vascularized tumor-on-a-chip models over time. The image was created with Affinity Designer 2. Image reproduced and adapted: from a public domain source,¹⁸¹ under Creative Commons CC BY-NC-SA 4.0,¹⁴⁴ with permission through RightLink license,^{189,204} with permission from Royal Society of Chemistry,^{198,205} with permission through PNAS,¹⁸⁷ with permission through John Wiley and sons,²⁰⁶ under Creative Commons CC BY-NC.²⁰⁷

endothelial monolayer were particularly valuable for studying key biological processes including intravasation^{187,188} and extravasation,^{189–191} epithelial-mesenchymal transition (EMT),^{192,193} immune cell transendothelial migration,^{194,195} and probe nanoparticle vascular permeability.^{196,197} Organ-on-a-chip system enabled also mimicking angiogenic sprouting from an endothelial monolayer into an hydrogel,^{198,199} and to test anti-angiogenic therapies.^{200,201} Recent advances have leveraged microfluidic technology to promote the formation and maintenance of self-assembled, functional blood vessels around a tumor spheroid or organoid in an ECM-like hydrogel.^{165,167,202} In this context, functional *in vitro* vasculature refers to vessels with an open, perfusable lumen, and physiologically relevant permeability, allowing for the study of transport-dependent processes. These vascularized tumor-on-a-chip models have opened new avenues for studying tumor vascular biology and therapy responses in more physiologically relevant *in vitro* settings^{24,25,27,117,203–212} with remarkable implications for cancer research, therapy discovery, and personalized medicine.

The primary advantages of using microfluidic devices for the generation of perfused vasculature *in vitro* are: (i) possibility to establish molecular gradients to mimic physio/pathological conditions; (ii) real-time observation of functional responses and transport phenomena; 3) modeling the physiological barriers to drug/cell delivery with quantitative assessment of vessel permeability; (iii) mathematically predict flow patterns, (iv) possibility to integrate automated flow pumps to mimic shear stresses and vascular perfusion, (v) cost-efficiency with use of smaller amount of reagents and occupying much smaller footprint compared to 2D culture and animal models, (vi) standardized

fabrication techniques or commercially-available channel layouts.²¹⁴ These devices support more physiologically relevant therapy testing by facilitating the recapitulation of cell-cell and cell-ECM interactions, the possibility of controlling multiple gradients and enabling the study of therapeutic agent effects on organ-specific cells after they have crossed the endothelial barrier.²¹³ Microfluidic devices are highly customizable and typically fabricated using soft lithography, where a pattern is first created on a silicon wafer *via* photolithography, and then replica molding is performed with a liquid polymer, commonly PDMS. PDMS is favored in microfluidic devices due to its ease of handling, low cost, gas permeability, and optical transparency for real-time imaging.²¹⁴ Microfluidic devices can be fabricated using other methods, such as micromolding, microetching, laser etching, injection molding, photopolymerization, and 3D printing.²¹⁵ Commercial options for microfluidic platforms for developing vascularized tumor models include devices from several companies, such as Ibidi, Mimetas, and AIM Biotech, which facilitate *in vitro* vascularization and support advanced therapeutic studies.

MPSS allow for the precise manipulation of the tumor microenvironment, enabling researchers to study tumor vascularization processes in controlled settings.^{167,202} Similar to the progression observed in non-microfluidic vascularization strategies, the vasculature within microfluidic device was first developed on its own followed by the addition of single cancer cells¹⁸⁹ and subsequently cancer spheroids.^{204,205} A key advantage of MPSS is their ability to recapitulate complex heterocellular interactions within the TME, integrating TECs, TAMs, CAFs, and tumor cells in controlled spatially defined architectures, allowing real-time analysis of angiocrine signaling, cell-type-specific contributions, and functional outcomes such



as vessel stabilization, immune cell trafficking, barrier integrity, and metastatic potential. By supporting diverse cell aggregate formats, from tumor-only spheroids to heterocellular assemblies, MPSs provide a translationally relevant framework to model tumor angiogenesis and vascular remodeling to evaluate therapeutic effects on both the tumor cells and the surrounding vasculature, including clinically relevant endpoints, such as tumor dormancy and metastatic risk.

Microfluidic strategies for vascularizing tumor spheroids generally fall into three design categories (Fig. 3): self-assembly (or vasculogenesis), angiogenic sprouting, and vascular bed assembly.¹⁶⁵ Three representative examples illustrate these distinct vascularization strategies. In the first approach (Fig. 3A), a tumor spheroid was co-embedded with ECs and stromal cells in a central hydrogel chamber of the microfluidic device. The ECs self-assembled into a network that surrounded




Fig. 3 Schematic representation of different vascularization approaches in 3D tumor microenvironment models. A) Co-culture system where a pre-formed tumor spheroid was embedded alongside endothelial cells and fibroblasts in a collagen–fibrin matrix within the central round chamber of the microfluidic system, allowing vascular networks to self-assemble around the tumor spheroid. Image adapted from Fig. 4 of,²⁶ showing an hepatocellular carcinoma spheroid co-cultured with HUVECs and fibroblasts in the OrganiX™ microfluidic insert, with vessels (red) forming around and penetrating tumor spheroid (green). Scale bar = 200 μm . (B) Co-culture system where a pre-formed spheroid was embedded in collagen–fibrin hydrogel and enabling vessel sprouting from both lateral fluidic channels containing endothelial cells. Image reproduced with permission from,²¹⁶ Copyright 2020, Elsevier, showing breast cancer spheroids embedded in collagen–fibrin hydrogel and vessels (red) sprouting and connecting with the tumor spheroid (yellow). Cell nuclei are in blue. Scale bar = 100 μm . (C) A five-channel microfluidic device was used to seed fibroblasts in two lateral channels, and endothelial cells in the central hydrogel channel to allow vasculature development before seeding the tumor spheroid on top of the “capillary bed”. Image reproduced with permission from,²⁴ Copyright 2022, American Chemical Society, showing the esophageal tumor spheroids (green) reached by the underlying vasculature (red). Scale bar = 150 μm . The vascularization schematics were created using Procreate and Affinity Designer 2, with the microfluidic device in (A) modeled using NomadSculpt.



and penetrated the spheroid, modeling *de novo* vessel formation and structural integration with the tumor spheroid.²⁶ In the second approach (Fig. 3B), a tumor spheroid was inserted independently in the central channel while the ECs were seeded in the two adjacent side channels. ECs sprout into the hydrogel toward the tumor, mimicking the recruitment of host vessels by a growing tumor.²¹⁶ Lastly, in the third strategy (Fig. 3C), ECs were first inserted in the central channel to form a capillary bed, followed by a tumor spheroid seeded on top of the capillary bed²⁴ to allow the underlying vasculature to reach the spheroids, modeling the interaction of a tumor with an existing vascular network. All these methods led to a generation of a perfusable vasculature for monitoring tumor cells extravasation, migration or therapy delivery, and the effect that the tumor vasculature has on the therapy efficacy.

Applications of vascularized tumor-on-a-chip models

As described above, vascularized microphysiological tumor models have rapidly advanced as versatile platforms for investigating the complex interplay between tumors and their microenvironment.

Their major advantage lies in replicating the intricate interactions among multiple cellular constituents, such as TECs, TAMs, CAFs, and tumor cells within controlled, heterocellular configurations. These models enable researchers to explore a broad spectrum of applications, from elucidating the heterogeneity and modulation of the TME, to studying angiogenesis, vascular targeting, metastatic mechanisms, and the impact of microbiota and metabolites. Additionally, they provide valuable insights into biomarker discovery and the evaluation of therapeutic efficacy. By integrating diverse cellular and extracellular components, vascularized tumor-on-a-chip systems offer translational opportunities to recapitulate human-relevant conditions and address key questions in cancer biology and drug development. In this section, we detail key applications of vascularized tumor-on-a-chip systems, summarized in Fig. 4.

EMT, migration, intravasation and extravasation studies

Vascularized tumor-on-a-chip models have emerged as powerful tools for studying cancer migration and metastasis with distinct design architectures targeting specific




Fig. 4 Key research applications of vascularized tumor-on-a-chip models. Circular diagram illustrating the six major areas of investigation enabled by microphysiological systems (MPSs): tumor microenvironment (TME) heterogeneity and modulation, angiogenesis and vascular targeting, biomarker discovery, microbiota and metabolite interactions, metastatic mechanisms, and therapy efficacy assessment. The central human silhouettes emphasize the human-relevance and translational potential of these platforms in personalized medicine and drug development. The scheme for this image was created with Procreate and images in the outskirts of the scheme in BioRender. <https://BioRender.com/i49z773>.



mechanisms of vascular–tumor pathobiology driving each step of the metastatic cascade. While numerous organ-on-a-chip platforms have been developed to model various aspects of tumor biology, we highlight here representative vascularized systems that exemplify how design choices of vascular components enable mechanistic interrogation of specific metastatic processes. Vascularized tumor-on-a-chip models of CRC and pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma were developed by using ECFC-derived ECs supported with normal human lung fibroblasts (NHLF), to investigate how TECs and stromal cells regulate tumor cell migration and invasion. The key vascular design feature was the generation of morphologically and functionally distinct EC clusters: P1, expressing genes related to cell cycle and immune pathways, and P2, expressing genes involved in tumor development and invasion, thereby recapitulating the known heterogeneity of tumor-associated vasculature observed *in vivo*.²¹⁷ The device layout featured multiple adjacent chambers that allowed sequential loading of 3D tissues at different time points, enabling control over the temporal dynamics of vasculature formation and its influence on tumor cell behaviors.²¹⁷ Complementing this focus on EMT and migration, a multi tissue-on-a-chip system was developed to specifically model tumor cell extravasation in breast and liver cancer models. The critical vascular design choice was the use of telomerase-immortalized microvascular ECs along tumor clusters, selecting an endothelial source that reflects the physiological properties of organ-specific microvasculature to study transendothelial migration. The platform demonstrated that inflammatory activation of TNF- α -stimulated endothelium in the model led to increased transendothelial tumor migration and increased vasculature porosity and leakiness, modeling the loss of endothelial barrier function that enables tumor cell extravasation during metastatic dissemination.²¹⁸ Instead, to address the contribution of mechanical cues to vascular–tumor interactions, two bioprinting-based vascularized tumor-on-a-chip systems were developed to investigate how mechanical forces and cell–matrix interactions regulate both tumor cell behavior and endothelial integrity during vascular–tumor interactions. One approach embedded patient-derived neuroblastoma tumor spheroids with ECs into bioprinted fluidic chips.²¹⁹ The key engineered design feature was the implementation of a programmable 3D-orbital shaker to standardize the endothelial cell coating within the channel, addressing a critical technical barrier to maintaining viable vasculature in tissue constructs. Mechanistically, the platform confirmed that the vessel formation requires the presence of supporting cells: fibroblasts, mesenchymal stem cells or adipose derived stem cells. Interestingly, they also reported that tumor spheroids attracted microvessels from the surrounding tissue, a vascular remodeling behavior reflecting the pro-angiogenic microenvironment during tumor progression.²¹⁹ An alternative bioprinting strategy directly bioprinted a ring-shaped endothelial compartment using a GelMA-fibrin bioink containing human cerebral microvascular endothelial cells

(hCMEC/D3) and filled the core with a GelMA-alginate bioink loaded with GBM cells, with fibrin-based matrices selected for superior support for vasculogenesis. The critical discovery was that shear stress and cell–matrix mechanical interactions were key player for vasculogenesis and tumor–vascular interactions.²²⁰ Furthermore, the model was exposed to simulated microgravity and showed a reduction in the spontaneous aggregation of cells and a significant reduction in cell junction proteins, pointing out that mechanotransduction affects not only the tumor but also vascular barrier function and integrity.²²⁰ These studies highlight that vascularized tumor-on-a-chip platforms can recapitulate the multifaceted vascular and mechanical features underlying tumor cell migration, intravasation and extravasation. This capability is now enabling that is now translating into rational evaluation of therapeutic interventions designed to target vascular-mediated metastatic vulnerabilities.

Therapy efficacy studies

Therapeutic investigation in vascularized tumor-on-a-chip models comprises direct tumor targeting, indirect vascular-directed strategies, and combinatorial approaches. These studies typically embed tumor spheroid with the ECs and their supporting stromal cells within 3D hydrogel matrices made of fibrin²⁰³ or collagen–fibrin combination^{26,210} within microfluidic devices, as shown in Fig. 3. Critically, different MPS designs emphasize distinct vascular properties, some prioritize angiogenic morphogenesis and vessel maturation, others model functional barrier defects and leakiness, and others reconstruct oxygen gradients and metabolic heterogeneity, each capturing specific aspects of the tumor–vasculature interface relevant to drug delivery and resistance. Once the model is established, it is possible to proceed with the therapeutic intervention at different timepoints and assess how vascular barrier functions, and oxygen/nutrient gradients modulate drug penetration and efficacy.

Direct tumor targeting

Direct tumor targeting traditionally relies on chemotherapeutic compounds, however, other methods include using small-molecule therapies targeting specific molecular pathways (*e.g.*, tyrosine-kinase inhibitors), and immunotherapies, such as immune check-point inhibitors, TILs or CAR/TCR engineered T cells.²²¹ Therefore, implementing vasculature in *in vitro* tumor models is essential for studying direct targeting for a better understanding of therapy delivery dynamics, vascular interactions, and therapeutic efficacy in a more physiologically relevant context. Importance of vasculature for drug efficacy in spheroids has been described by several research groups. A CRC spheroid model in microfluidic device called “vascularized micro-tumor” (VMT) was developed to compare standard-of-care chemotherapy in VMT, 2D cell monolayer, 3D cell culture and a xenograft



model.²⁰³ The study reported that vessels in the VMT mirror hallmarks of *in vivo* tumor-associated vasculature, with vessel leakiness and compression becoming more pronounced as tumor progresses over time. Importantly, these VMT better predicted tumor growth and response to chemotherapeutic drugs observed in preclinical *in vivo* murine xenograft models than 2D and 3D monocultures. However, this model exhibited upregulation only in hypoxia- and glycolysis-associated gene programs, with no significant enrichment in other pathways, suggesting a limited ability to fully recapitulate the complexity of *in vivo* tumor biology. Furthermore, Nashimoto *et al.* generated angiogenic sprouting from adjacent channels towards tumor spheroids, generating perfusable vasculature within several types of spheroids.²¹⁶ The platform demonstrated that vascular presence increased proliferation activities of tumor cells and decreased cell death in the spheroid. Moreover, by comparing the drug distribution under vascularized perfusion and in static conditions the drug had no dose-dependent response under perfusion conditions highlighting the impact of vascular transport dynamics on therapeutic response. A 3D vascularized lung cancer-on-a-chip (VLCC) was developed to model vessel maturation stages, featuring: (i) a lung decellularized ECM-based pro-angiogenic tissue-mimetic hydrogel, (ii) heterocellular tumor spheroids modeling solid lung cancer, and (iii) perfusable, large-diameter vessel-like structures recapitulating arterial, venous, and capillary functions.²²² In this model capillaries originated from the spheroid vasculature and demonstrated greater sensitivity to dose-dependent anti-cancer therapy compared with non-vascularized spheroids and 2D tumor models. Aside from chemotherapy, Dey *et al.* delivered both chemotherapy and anti-HER2 CAR T cells in a vascularized breast cancer model.²⁰⁸ By using aspiration-assisted bioprinting, tumor spheroids were positioned at predefined distances from the perfusable vasculature that allowed assessment of the impact of spatial proximity on tumor angiogenesis and invasion.²⁰⁸ Devices with tumors bioprinted proximal to the perfused vasculature exhibited higher diffusional permeability compared with distally bioprinted tumors and tumor-free controls.²⁰⁸ They further conclude that tumors exhibited dose-dependent therapeutic responses and drug resistance, and that vascular delivery of HER2-targeted CAR-T cells induces endothelial recruitment, inflammatory cytokine and chemokine secretion, and effective antitumor activity, highlighting the platform utility for dissecting tumor-stroma crosstalk and evaluating targeted therapies.²⁰⁸ Furthermore, the sequential addition of fibroblasts or patient-derived thyroid CAFs during tumor spheroid formation enhanced vascularization in several tumor cell lines and better CAR-T cell homing and killing efficiency under perfused conditions.²⁰⁷ Interestingly, a vascularized human liver tumor spheroid model recapitulated hypoxic regions within the tumor and demonstrated how the presence of tumor vasculature limited the infiltration of engineered T-cells, without diminishing their cytotoxic capabilities.²⁶

Additionally, high-content multiplex imaging and spatial profiling of the TME allowed to characterize the immune context around the tumor and identify distinct vascular-mediated exhaustion patterns in the engineered T-cells. When it comes to brain, one of the significant obstacles in treating GBM is the BBB, which hinders the effective delivery of therapeutic agents to the tumor site. A BBB-tumor model was developed combining primary brain endothelial cells (BECs), astrocytes, and pericytes in a fibrin gel alongside a GBM spheroid from U87 cell line.²⁷ BBB presence reduced the U87 spheroid sensitivity to temozolomide in 3D microenvironment settings compared to 2D, potentially due to low pH supported by TME. This indicated that the 3D microenvironment and vasculature presence are sufficient to alter tumor behavior and drug sensitivity, allowing for a more accurate early-stage therapy validation. Proteomic analysis of the temozolomide-treated vascularized GBM model revealed several pathways involved in chemoresistance, with proteins overlapping with recurrent glioma patients, supporting the clinical relevance of this model. Furthermore, a vascularized lung spheroid model with perfusable vessels sprouting towards the tumor²⁵ was developed to assess flow-directed sprouting and doxycycline treatment. By adjusting reservoir volumes, flow was directed from the human lung fibroblasts (hLF) channel to the hollow channel and sprouting consistently occurred opposite to flow, whereas without flow, HUVECs showed no directional preference, confirming that interstitial flow directs capillary sprouting orientation.²⁵ Notably, the degree of vascularization correlated with tumor aggressiveness. Another study, showed in 3D vascularized spheroid model that tumor spheroids from two cancer cell lines induced localized endothelial barrier disruption, resulting in leakier vessels within ≈ 1 mm of the spheroids,²⁰⁶ while taxol treatment resulted in a reduced endothelial function and viability, alongside leakier and non-perfusable vessels at high concentrations of the drug (10×10^{-6} M), highlighting how chemotherapy also affects the vasculature functions. This vascular toxicity, often overlooked in efficacy studies, can be addressed in MPSs that uniquely enable this bidirectional interrogation, capturing both tumor killing and vascular disruption. This realization motivates investigation of vascular-directed strategies that intentionally modulate tumor angiogenesis and barrier function, an approach with a long clinical precedent, as discussed in the 'Targeting tumor vasculature as a therapeutic approach' section, but incompletely understood at the mechanistic level, now accessible through MPS interrogation.

Indirect tumor targeting *via* vasculature

The presence of vasculature within *in vitro* tumor models provides a key advantage for studying indirect tumor targeting using vascular disrupting or vasculature



normalizing agents. In MPSs, the self-assembly method allows targeting of vasculature at different stages of its development, enabling to elucidate the specific mechanisms by which these drugs influence vascular development, permeability, and tumor growth. Understanding these mechanisms will provide valuable insights into their efficacy and potential side effects. For example, an arterio-venous microfluidic platform was developed to model vascular permeability and maturation across two tumor types, consisting of two outer microfluidic channels, an arteriole (high pressure) and a venule (low pressure), connected by three tissue chambers filled with an ECM-cell mixture.²⁰⁹ In this system, in 5–7 days, ECs self-assembled into a network that anastomosed with the channels, forming tight seals and establishing intraluminal flow while maintaining their leakiness, thereby providing a suitable platform for studying anti-angiogenic therapies. However, anti-VEGFR therapy (Apatinib and Vandetanib) was not effective in either breast or CRC whereas multi-targeted inhibitors (Linifanib, Cabozantinib targeting VEGFR/PDGFR/Tie2) induced vascular regression, demonstrating the possibility of testing indirect tumor targeting. This finding also demonstrates the platform capacity to predict clinical efficacy: as a similar combination of cabozantinib and nivolumab subsequently succeeded in RCC Phase III trials (NCT03141177),²²³ validating the MPS-based predictions. The same model was used to study the metabolic changes in tumor post drug treatment with observation of a glycolytic hierarchy from tumor (highest) across ECs to stroma (lowest), highlighting the possibility of targeting the tumor metabolism with potentially low toxicity on vasculature. Furthermore, another study used primary RCC cells and normal-adjacent renal cortex cells to compare the effect of anti-angiogenic drugs. Microfluidic devices were fabricated by polymerizing collagen containing embedded tumor spheroids and sacrificial mandrel rods. After polymerisation, the rods were removed to create lumens within the matrix, which were subsequently seeded with HUVECs. Controlled, directional flow was then established through the lumens. This setup increased angiogenic factors, including ANGPTL4,¹¹⁷ showing that tumor spheroid, but not healthy tissue, induced EC sprouting in a flow-directed microfluidic system, and VEGFR2-Fc blockade successfully suppressed sprouting.¹¹⁷ A well known anti VEGFR2 therapy, ramucirumab, has been approved by FDA for treatment of several cancers, but not for RCC.^{110–113} Vandetanib, also a VEGFR2 inhibitor²²⁴ similarly lacks clinical validation in RCC, suggesting a potential new avenue to explore these drugs for RCC, evaluating their therapeutic efficacy within a vascularized tumor model. Interestingly, rather than using conventional inhibitors, in one study of vascularized HCC spheroids, VEGF or VEGFR RNAi-bound mesoporous silica nanoparticles (MSN) were delivered.²¹¹ The device consisted of multiple channels: fibroblast, media 1, tumor, central, and EC channels. Angiogenic sprouting originated from the EC channel, traversing the central channel toward the tumor channel.

Nanomedicine treatment was distributed through the central channel and did not affect EC viability or proliferation. A pronounced anti-angiogenic effect was observed when VEGFR RNAi MSN were applied, whereas VEGF RNAi MSN had no significant impact on angiogenic sprouting. Multiple control treatments, including MSN alone and free siRNA, showed no inhibitory effects, while sunitinib served as a positive control and significantly reduced sprouting. Overall, this platform effectively demonstrated VEGFR-targeted inhibition of angiogenesis, consistent with the central role of VEGF/VEGFR signaling in endothelial-driven sprouting, opening opportunities to translate this strategy into clinical applications.

While indirect targeting through the vasculature can modulate tumor growth, the success of vascular inhibition remains modest clinically, suggesting that isolated vascular targeting, like isolated tumor targeting, inadequately addresses the complexity of TME-mediated resistance and tumor-endothelial crosstalk, a limitation addressable through combinatorial strategies that simultaneously target both tumor cells and their vascular microenvironment.

Combinatorial strategies

Combinatorial strategies that target both tumor cells and vasculature have been successfully implemented in vascularized tumor-on-a-chip models. A vascularized GBM spheroid model in a microfluidic device achieved barrier-function mimicry incorporating human patient-derived xenograft GBM cells, embedded in a triculture BBB microvascular network formed by iPSC-derived ECs, pericytes, and astrocytes self-assembled in fibrin at defined ratios to generate perfusable vessels.²²⁵ This platform demonstrated enhanced targeting and efficacy of AP2-functionalized, cisplatin-encapsulated nanoparticles that exploit low-density lipoprotein receptor-related protein 1 (LRP1) overexpression in GBM vessels to preferentially target tumor-proximal vasculature and improve drug delivery to the tumor. While liposomes, used in this study, are generally biocompatible and biodegradable, safety-related factors, such as particle size, surface charge, targeting ligand specificity to prevent off-target binding, and drug-payload neurotoxicity, require rigorous preclinical validation before clinical consideration for brain-targeted applications. A five-channel platform exemplifying vascular normalization, instead, demonstrated that reconstruction of perfusable esophageal tumor-on-a-chip model treated with prolyl hydroxylase (PHD) inhibitor increased vessel size while decreasing vessel permeability, leaving the normal vessels protected, enhancing cisplatin delivery and efficacy.²⁴ PHD inhibitors are primarily used as anemia-targeting drugs,²²⁶ but these findings, pairing vascular normalization with direct chemotherapy, suggest a potential repurposing for tumor therapy. Additionally, a vascularized breast cancer platform capturing stromal remodeling employed multiple invasiveness-stratified tumor cell lines integrated into microfluidic devices containing ECs



and fibroblasts within a hydrogel, and investigated targeting IL-8 or stromal HA followed by trastuzumab or cetuximab delivery.²¹⁰ This platform demonstrated that more invasive tumor cell lines (SKBR3 and MDA-MB-468) induced stronger desmoplastic responses, including increased stromal HA deposition, vascular dysfunction, elevated interstitial fluid pressure, and impaired drug delivery, effects that were reversed by targeting IL-8 or stromal HA.²¹⁰ These findings highlight the need to incorporate therapeutic strategies that combine vascular targeting with anti-tumor treatments, extending beyond direct modulation of classical vascular regulators such as VEGFR2. Most of the vascularized tumor-on-chip methods consist of using two separate devices, one for generating tumor spheroids (either by low-attachment plates or hanging-drop method) and the other to integrate them with ECs (or EC spheroid) in a microfluidic device to promote vascularization and/or drug delivery, which leads to increased inter-experimental variability. However, an integrated all-in-one platform consolidated spheroid generation and vascularization within a single device named "All-in-One-IMPACT".²¹² The platform consists of self-assembled tumor spheroids directly on the chip using the hanging drop method in the cell culture channel. Tumor spheroids were assembled either with patient-derived cells or cell lines. Next, they injected a hydrogel

containing ECs and fibroblasts, which integrates the spheroids into a 3D-patterned vascularized microenvironment along the culture channel. Treatment with bevacizumab, paclitaxel, and combination of both drugs reported highest tumor cell apoptosis with combinatorial approach. Bevacizumab with paclitaxel has already been approved as first line therapy for some cancers, including HER2⁺ breast cancer,²²⁷ highlighting potential translation for combinatorial vascular-cytotoxic strategies. For a summary of drug efficacy studies in vascularized tumor microfluidic models please refer to Table 2.

While both indirect (through vasculature) and combinatorial strategies (tumor + vasculature) have been explored in vascularized tumor-on-a-chip models, the field still has translational gaps to address. To bridge these gaps, validation efforts and comparative studies between different model strategies need to be designed following the efficacy results of therapies in the clinic. The diverse landscape of FDA-approved vascular-targeting therapies summarized in Table 1, offers a comprehensive benchmark set for such systematic evaluation. These approved regimens, spanning single-agent anti-angiogenic drugs to combinations with chemotherapy and immunotherapy across multiple cancer types, represent a clinically validated standard against which

Table 2 Therapy efficacy studies in vascularized tumoroid in microfluidic device

	Cancer model	Drug	Vascular cells	Outcome	Reference
Direct	Colorectal carcinoma	Leucovorin, oxaliplatin	ECFC-EC + NHLF	More accurate	203
	Several types ^a	Anti-TGFβ (direct/indirect)	HUVEC + NHLF	No dose dependency under perfusion	216
	Lung cancer	Doxorubicin	HUVEC	Dose-dependency	222
	Glioblastoma	Temozolomide	BEC + AC + PC	Increased sensitivity	27
	Brain tumor	Taxol	HUVEC + NHLF	Chemoresistance pathways increase	206
	Lung cancer	Doxorubicin	HUVEC + NHLF	Impact on vasculature-leakiness	25
	Several types ^b	CAR-T cells	HUVEC + hLF	Reduced tumor size	207
	Breast cancer	Anti-HER CAR-T cells	HUVEC + HDF	Increased T cell infiltration with higher dead cell density in tumor region	208
Indirect	Breast cancer, CRC	Anti-VEGFR + anti-PDGFR + anti-Tie2	ECFC-EC + NHLF	Decreased tumor growth	209
	Clear cell renal cell carcinoma	Recombinant VEGFR2-Fc	HUVEC	Multiple vascular-targeting regresses vasculature	117
	Several types ^c	SIVEGFR/MSN miRNA	HUVEC + NHLF	Blocked tumor induced vascular sprouting	211
Combinatorial	Breast cancer	Anti IL8/anti HA + trastuzumab/cetuximab	HUVEC + NHLF	Angiogenesis and tumor growth inhibition	210
	Esophageal carcinoma	PHD inhibitor + cisplatin	HUVEC + NHLF	Increased drug delivery and tumor cell death	24
	Several cell types and patient derived cells ^d	Taxol + bevacizumab	HUVEC + hLF	Increased drug delivery and tumor cell death	212

^a Hepatocellular carcinoma, colorectal adenocarcinoma, mammary gland epithelial adenocarcinoma. ^b Renal cell carcinoma, small cell lung carcinoma, ovarian carcinoma. ^c Colorectal adenocarcinoma, adenocarcinomic alveolar basal epithelial cell, hepatocellular carcinoma, glioblastoma, renal cell epithelial adenocarcinoma, and mammary gland epithelial adenocarcinoma. ^d Colorectal adenocarcinoma, hepatocellular carcinoma, glioblastoma, alveolar basal epithelial cells adenocarcinoma.



current MPS technologies must be tested. Establishing whether vascularized MPSs can faithfully reproduce the differential responses observed across these diverse therapeutic regimens would not only validate these platforms for predictive preclinical testing but also enable mechanistic interrogation of resistance mechanisms.

Current limitations and technological bottlenecks in vascularized MPSs for therapy innovation

Although engineering methods have enabled the generation of increasingly complex vascularized tumor-on-chip platforms, several technical and translational bottlenecks still limit their routine use in therapy development. Reproducibility remains a major barrier to widespread adoption. Small variations in hydrogel composition or crosslinking can substantially alter angiogenic sprouting, vessel diameter, and permeability. Commonly used ECM-like hydrogels can produce variable outcomes, as vessel diameter and network structure are directly influenced by protein concentrations, which also affects gel stiffness. Outcomes in vascularization are also strongly influenced by cell type with endothelial and stromal cells from different donors, sources, or passages differing in their propensity to form stable, perfusable networks. Tissue specificity remains another unresolved challenge. ECs retain strong contextual identities, yet many vascularized MPS platforms rely on generic or non-matched endothelial sources that fail to reproduce organotypic phenotypes, permeability, or inflammatory responses. Achieving true tissue fidelity will require integrating patient-derived cells, specifically organ-specific ECs together with supporting stromal and immune components. This integration is key for enabling personalized modeling that captures patient-specific vascular phenotypes, tumor-endothelial interactions, and individualized therapeutic responses for functional precision medicine. Another limitation is the lack in most models of mural cells, such as smooth muscle cells and pericytes, which play a role in vessel stability, barrier integrity, and the ability to model vasomotion or pathological tone,²²⁸ risking overlooking clinically relevant responses governed by mural-endothelial interactions. A material limitation, instead, is the widespread use of PDMS for device fabrication. PDMS is convenient to mold and optically clear, but it absorbs hydrophobic small molecules, including numerous chemotherapeutics and targeted agents, that may impact the actual dose experienced by cells.²²⁹ In response, several groups and commercial platforms are moving towards thermoplastics or hybrid architectures that combine channels that minimize adsorption with gas-permeable materials for effective gas exchange. Furthermore, most vascularized MPSs operate as single devices or in small arrays, making them inherently low-throughput compared with conventional multi-well screening formats. This constrains their use to

mechanistic studies and small drug panels rather than broad compound libraries or complex dosing schedules required for therapeutic screenings. However, perhaps the most pressing gap, is the lack of standardized metrics for assessing vascular generation and functionality. Ongoing efforts by experienced working groups are beginning to define metrics to characterize vessel functions (*e.g.*, permeability coefficients, perfusion rates, shear stress, and vessel maturation indices) and geometry (*e.g.* vascular diameter, vascular area coverage, branch length, and branch complexity) but these remain far from being widely implemented and standardized across vascularized tumor-on-chip studies. Standardization of experimental guidelines, detailing experimental workflows, quality-control checkpoints, and reporting criteria, will be essential for addressing the limitations in reproducibility and for accurately comparing vascularization strategies across platforms. These standardization efforts must balance the need for consistency with the flexibility required for continued innovation of these new technologies. In the context of clinical translation, there is a lack of systematic comparisons among MPSs and conventional models correlating with clinical outcomes. One study conducted a direct comparative validation showing that a vascularized microtumor model accurately recapitulated both tumor growth kinetics and chemotherapy response (FOLFOX regimen) observed in matched mouse xenografts for two CRC cell lines (HCT116 and SW480), whereas conventional 2D monolayer and 3D spheroid cultures showed significantly divergent responses.²⁰³ However, without large-scale prospective correlation, it is difficult to quantify the true predictive value of these systems or to define when they provide added benefit over existing preclinical tools. To bridge this gap, future validation efforts must prioritize systematic co-trial studies where MPSs and standard preclinical platforms are directly compared with clinical outcomes across multiple therapeutic modalities to establish the predictive accuracy of these platforms. Furthermore, the establishment of open-access databases compiling MPS characterization data alongside clinical outcomes will be also useful to identify which techniques are best suited for specific therapeutic testing, enabling continuous model refinements and the development of predictive algorithms of therapy response.

Conclusion and forward-looking perspective

In this review we have presented vascularized tumor-on-chip platforms as human-relevant tissue models for therapeutic screening. We have detailed the fundamental role of tumor vasculature in driving therapeutic resistance through multiple interconnected mechanisms, and the need to accurately predict human-specific therapeutic responses. This has driven the development of MPSs that enable the generation of perfusable vascular networks for the functional



assessment of therapy efficacy, potentially shortening the timeline for discovering effective anti-cancer therapeutics. Advanced vascularized tumor platforms have been generated by leveraging bioprinting, microfluidic technologies, and dynamic perfusion systems. Patient-derived MPSs incorporating vascular, stromal, and immune components enable screening of treatment regimens based on biomarker feedback, advancing beyond purely genomic approaches toward functional precision medicine approaches, where MPSs may serve as a critical validation of therapeutic responses in the development pipeline. However, we have also discussed major constraints, including incomplete molecular heterogeneity representation compared to human tumors, and limited standardization and validation efforts. Several engineering approaches are beginning to address the listed technical limitations and bottlenecks, starting with parallelization efforts that include plate-integrated microfluidic systems, compatible with automated handling and imaging, that increase scalability and enable simultaneous testing of multiple dosages, demonstrating that higher-density layouts are technically feasible. However, further increasing the number of units per plate may come at the expense of preserved physiological relevance, *e.g.*, too narrow gel channels cannot host cell aggregates >500 μm in diameter, which are representative of the diffusion-limited, gradient-rich tumor architecture observed *in vivo*. Emerging directions also include the integration of biomechanical and metabolic cues in the device. The use of dynamic hydrogels that can stiffen or degrade in response to cellular stimuli allows modeling of mechanotransduction-driven vascular remodeling, with implications for understanding hypoxia-mechanotransduction coupling.¹⁸⁰ Complementarily, vascularized MPSs integrated with metabolic and proteomic profiling could identify vascular-specific biomarkers to predict therapy response.

Another emerging direction regards the development of multi-organ-on-chip platforms.²¹⁸ By modeling tumor tissues together with physiologically relevant distal organs, creating multi-organ tumor-vascular models, such as liver, kidney, or bone marrow, could provide a powerful framework for evaluating systemic responses and off-target toxicities of emerging anti-tumor agents.⁸ Given that many vascular-targeting drugs exert unintended effects on healthy endothelium or non-tumor vascular beds, incorporating multi-organ architectures could substantially reduce the risk of advancing candidates that later fail due to unforeseen vascular or organ-specific toxicity, as the field moves toward regulatory acceptance and clinical translation. Indeed, the FDA's recent acceptance of organ-chip technologies into regulatory pathways²⁰ provides a clear encouragement for MPSs to become integral components of therapeutic development pipelines. Notably, on October 27, 2025, the FDA approved an investigational new drug (IND) application for a combination therapy comprising BAL0891, a dual TTK/PLK1 kinase inhibitor, and tislelizumab, an anti-PD-1 immune checkpoint inhibitor, based on efficacy data

generated using a vascularized tumor immune microenvironment model (vTIME; Qureator Inc., USA).²³⁰ This approval represents the first FDA IND decision in which efficacy data were derived exclusively from human vascularized organoid-based combination studies, without reliance on traditional animal proof-of-concept models. As regulatory bodies increasingly signal interest in MPS-based data, regulatory acceptance criteria, standardization protocols, and validation methodologies specific for MPSs are still under development since this process requires a coordinated approach, including scientists, industry partners, regulatory experts, and clinical investigators to develop and test standardized protocols.

Therefore, evaluating whether vascularized tumor-on-chip models are ready to drive therapeutic innovation reveals that we are approaching this goal. These platforms are transitioning from research tools to functionally human-relevant systems, demonstrating their emerging role in therapy development with potential to advance precision oncology through ongoing investment in technology development, standardization efforts and collaborative clinical validation studies.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: G. A. and I. P. conceptualized the review. Funding acquisition: G. A. and C. C. acquired the funding. Writing – original draft: G. A. and I. P. wrote the original draft. Writing – review & editing: G. A., I. P. and C. C. reviewed and edited the manuscript. All the authors approved the submitted manuscript.

Conflicts of interest

GA is inventor of the OrganiX™ plate, licensed to AIM Biotech Pte. Ltd.

Data availability

No primary research results, software or code have been included and no new data were generated or analyzed as part of this review.

Acknowledgements

This research is supported by Singapore Immunology Network (SiGN), Agency for Science, Technology and Research (A*STAR) and the A*GA - A*STAR Research Attachment Programme (ARAP) to IP for the joint KCL-SiGN PhD program.

References

- 1 GLOBOCAN 2020 IA for R on C. Estimated number of incident cases and deaths World, both sexes, ages 0-74, 2023, Available from: <http://gco.iarc.fr>.
- 2 T. Mee, N. F. Kirkby, N. N. Defourny, K. J. Kirkby and N. G. Burnet, The use of radiotherapy, surgery and chemotherapy



- in the curative treatment of cancer: results from the FORTY (Favourable Outcomes from RadioTherapy) project, *Br. J. Radiol.*, 2023, **96**(1152), 20230334.
- 3 J. D. Wolchok, V. Chiarion-Sileni, P. Rutkowski, C. L. Cowey, D. Schadendorf and J. Wagstaff, *et al.* Final, 10-Year Outcomes with Nivolumab plus Ipilimumab in Advanced Melanoma, *N. Engl. J. Med.*, 2025, **392**(1), 11–22.
 - 4 J. R. Brahmer, J. S. Lee, T. E. Ciuleanu, R. Bernabe Caro, M. Nishio and L. Urban, *et al.* Five-Year Survival Outcomes With Nivolumab Plus Ipilimumab Versus Chemotherapy as First-Line Treatment for Metastatic Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer in CheckMate 227, *J. Clin. Oncol.*, 2023, **41**(6), 1200–1212.
 - 5 T. K. Choueiri, P. Tomczak, S. H. Park, B. Venugopal, T. Ferguson and S. N. Symeonides, *et al.* Overall Survival with Adjuvant Pembrolizumab in Renal-Cell Carcinoma, *N. Engl. J. Med.*, 2024, **390**(15), 1359–1371.
 - 6 J. N. Brudno, M. V. Maus and C. S. Hinrichs, CAR T Cells and T-Cell Therapies for Cancer: A Translational Science Review, *JAMA*, 2024, **332**(22), 1924.
 - 7 M. Julve, Y. N. S. Wong, K. H. J. Lim and A. J. S. Furness, Solid tumour cellular therapy — principles of toxicity management, *Immuno-Oncol. Technol.*, 2025, **25**, 100737.
 - 8 C. L. Flugel, R. G. Majzner, G. Krenciute, G. Dotti, S. R. Riddell and D. L. Wagner, *et al.* Overcoming on-target, off-tumour toxicity of CAR T cell therapy for solid tumours, *Nat. Rev. Clin. Oncol.*, 2023, **20**(1), 49–62.
 - 9 K. E. De Visser and J. A. Joyce, The evolving tumor microenvironment: From cancer initiation to metastatic outgrowth, *Cancer Cell*, 2023, **41**(3), 374–403.
 - 10 H. T. Nia, L. L. Munn and R. K. Jain, Physical traits of cancer, *Science*, 2020, **370**(6516), eaaz0868.
 - 11 G. T. Motz and G. Coukos, The parallel lives of angiogenesis and immunosuppression: cancer and other tales, *Nat. Rev. Immunol.*, 2011, **11**(10), 702–711.
 - 12 V. O. Oria and J. T. Erler, Tumor Angiocrine Signaling: Novel Targeting Opportunity in Cancer, *Cells*, 2023, **12**(20), 2510.
 - 13 T. Suwa, M. Kobayashi, J. M. Nam and H. Harada, Tumor microenvironment and radioresistance, *Exp. Mol. Med.*, 2021, **53**(6), 1029–1035.
 - 14 P. W. T. Lee, L. R. Koseki, T. Haitani, H. Harada and M. Kobayashi, Hypoxia-Inducible Factor-Dependent and Independent Mechanisms Underlying Chemoresistance of Hypoxic Cancer Cells, *Cancers*, 2024, **16**(9), 1729.
 - 15 Z. Chen, F. Han, Y. Du, H. Shi and W. Zhou, Hypoxic microenvironment in cancer: molecular mechanisms and therapeutic interventions, *Signal Transduction Targeted Ther.*, 2023, **8**(1), 70.
 - 16 T. Donnem, J. Hu, M. Ferguson, O. Adighibe, C. Snell and A. L. Harris, *et al.* Vessel co-option in primary human tumors and metastases: an obstacle to effective anti-angiogenic treatment?, *Cancer Med.*, 2013, **2**(4), 427–436.
 - 17 B. V. Ineichen, E. Furrer, S. L. Grüninger, W. E. Zürrer and M. R. Macleod, Analysis of animal-to-human translation shows that only 5% of animal-tested therapeutic interventions obtain regulatory approval for human applications, *PLoS Biol.*, 2024, **22**(6), e3002667.
 - 18 E. Kaffe, M. Roulis, J. Zhao, R. Qu, E. Sefik and H. Mirza, *et al.* Humanized mouse liver reveals endothelial control of essential hepatic metabolic functions, *Cell*, 2023, **186**(18), 3793–3809.e26.
 - 19 FDA, About Alternative Methods, 2023, Available from: <https://www.fda.gov/science-research/advancing-alternative-methods-fda/about-alternative-methods>.
 - 20 FDA, FDA Announces Plan to Phase Out Animal Testing Requirement for Monoclonal Antibodies and Other Drugs, 2025, Available from: <https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-announces-plan-phase-out-animal-testing-requirement-monoclonal-antibodies-and-other-drugs>.
 - 21 A. Roth, MPS-WS Berlin 2019. Human microphysiological systems for drug development, *Science*, 2021, **373**(6561), 1304–1306.
 - 22 J. M. Ayuso, M. Virumbrales-Muñoz, J. M. Lang and D. J. Beebe, A role for microfluidic systems in precision medicine, *Nat. Commun.*, 2022, **13**(1), 3086.
 - 23 S. Di Cio, E. Marhuenda, M. Haddrick and J. E. Gautrot, Vascularised cardiac spheroids-on-a-chip for testing the toxicity of therapeutics, *Sci. Rep.*, 2024, **14**(1), 3370.
 - 24 Z. Hu, H. Zhiwei, Y. Cao, Y. Cao and E. A. Galan, *et al.* Vascularized Tumor Spheroid-on-a-Chip Model Verifies Synergistic Vasoprotective and Chemotherapeutic Effects, *ACS Biomater. Sci. Eng.*, 2022, **8**(3), 1215–1225.
 - 25 D. Kim, K. S. Hwang, E. U. Seo, S. Seo, B. C. Lee and N. Choi, *et al.* Vascularized Lung Cancer Model for Evaluating the Promoted Transport of Anticancer Drugs and Immune Cells in an Engineered Tumor Microenvironment, *Adv. Healthcare Mater.*, 2022, e2102581.
 - 26 J. Vasudevan, R. Vijayakumar, J. A. Reales-Calderon, M. S. Y. Lam, J. R. Ow and J. Aw, *et al.* In vitro integration of a functional vasculature to model endothelial regulation of chemotherapy and T-cell immunotherapy in liver cancer, *Biomaterials*, 2025, **320**, 123175.
 - 27 M. S. Lam, J. J. Aw, D. Tan, R. Vijayakumar, H. Y. G. Lim and S. Yada, *et al.* Unveiling the Influence of Tumor Microenvironment and Spatial Heterogeneity on Temozolomide Resistance in Glioblastoma Using an Advanced Human In Vitro Model of the Blood-Brain Barrier and Glioblastoma, *Small*, 2023, **19**(52), 2302280.
 - 28 L. Liu, H. Wang, R. Chen, Y. Song, W. Wei and D. Baek, *et al.* Cancer-on-a-chip for precision cancer medicine, *Lab Chip*, 2025, **25**(14), 3314–3347.
 - 29 S. Wang, J. Wang, Z. Chen, J. Luo, W. Guo and L. Sun, *et al.* Targeting M2-like tumor-associated macrophages is a potential therapeutic approach to overcome antitumor drug resistance, *npj Precis. Oncol.*, 2024, **8**(1), 31.
 - 30 M. Li, L. He, J. Zhu, P. Zhang and S. Liang, Targeting tumor-associated macrophages for cancer treatment, *Cell Biosci.*, 2022(1), 85.
 - 31 T. M. Nywening, A. Wang-Gillam, D. E. Sanford, B. A. Belt, R. Z. Panni and B. M. Cusworth, *et al.* Targeting tumour-



- associated macrophages with CCR2 inhibition in combination with FOLFIRINOX in patients with borderline resectable and locally advanced pancreatic cancer: a single-centre, open-label, dose-finding, non-randomised, phase 1b trial, *Lancet Oncol.*, 2016, **17**(5), 651–662.
- 32 S. Su, J. Chen, H. Yao, J. Liu, S. Yu and L. Lao, *et al.* CD10+GPR77+ Cancer-Associated Fibroblasts Promote Cancer Formation and Chemoresistance by Sustaining Cancer Stemness, *Cell*, 2018, **172**(4), 841–856.e16.
 - 33 H. Chen, Y. Li, H. Li, X. Chen, H. Fu and D. Mao, *et al.* NBS1 lactylation is required for efficient DNA repair and chemotherapy resistance, *Nature*, 2024, **631**(8021), 663–669.
 - 34 P. Swietach, S. Patiar, C. T. Supuran, A. L. Harris and R. D. Vaughan-Jones, The Role of Carbonic Anhydrase 9 in Regulating Extracellular and Intracellular pH in Three-dimensional Tumor Cell Growths, *J. Biol. Chem.*, 2009, **284**(30), 20299–20310.
 - 35 S. Zhong, J. H. Jeong, Z. Chen, Z. Chen and J. L. Luo, Targeting Tumor Microenvironment by Small-Molecule Inhibitors, *Transl. Oncol.*, 2020, **13**(1), 57–69.
 - 36 U. G. A. Sattler, S. S. Meyer, V. Quennet, C. Hoerner, H. Knoerzer and C. Fabian, *et al.* Glycolytic metabolism and tumour response to fractionated irradiation, *Radiother. Oncol.*, 2010, **94**(1), 102–109.
 - 37 A. Tiwari, R. Trivedi and S. Y. Lin, Tumor microenvironment: barrier or opportunity towards effective cancer therapy, *J. Biomed. Sci.*, 2022, **29**(1), 83.
 - 38 A. L. Harris, Hypoxia — a key regulatory factor in tumour growth, *Nat. Rev. Cancer*, 2002, **2**(1), 38–47.
 - 39 E. Krzywinska and C. Stockmann, Hypoxia, Metabolism and Immune Cell Function, *Biomedicines*, 2018, **6**(2), 56.
 - 40 Z. Yuan, Y. Li, S. Zhang, X. Wang, H. Dou and X. Yu, *et al.* Extracellular matrix remodeling in tumor progression and immune escape: from mechanisms to treatments, *Mol. Cancer*, 2023, **22**(1), 48.
 - 41 P. Carmeliet and R. K. Jain, Angiogenesis in cancer and other diseases, *Nature*, 2000, **407**(6801), 249–257.
 - 42 A. L. Magnussen and I. G. Mills, Vascular normalisation as the stepping stone into tumour microenvironment transformation, *Br. J. Cancer*, 2021, **125**(3), 324–336.
 - 43 N. Ohga, S. Ishikawa, N. Maishi, K. Akiyama, Y. Hida and T. Kawamoto, *et al.* Heterogeneity of Tumor Endothelial Cells, *Am. J. Pathol.*, 2012, **180**(3), 1294–1307.
 - 44 H. Hashizume, P. Baluk, S. Morikawa, J. W. McLean, G. Thurston and S. Roberge, *et al.* Openings between defective endothelial cells explain tumor vessel leakiness, *Am. J. Pathol.*, 2000, **156**(4), 1363–1380.
 - 45 M. De Palma, D. Biziato and T. V. Petrova, Microenvironmental regulation of tumour angiogenesis, *Nat. Rev. Cancer*, 2017, **17**(8), 457–474.
 - 46 R. Lugano, M. Ramachandran and A. Dimberg, Tumor angiogenesis: causes, consequences, challenges and opportunities, *Cell. Mol. Life Sci.*, 2020, **77**(9), 1745–1770.
 - 47 P. B. Vermeulen, D. Verhoeven, G. Hubens, E. Van Marck, G. Goovaerts and M. Huyghe, *et al.* Microvessel density, endothelial cell proliferation and tumour cell proliferation in human colorectal adenocarcinomas, *Ann. Oncol.*, 1995, **6**(1), 59–64.
 - 48 A. Giatromanolaki, E. Sivridis, G. Minopoulos, A. Polychronidis, C. Manolas and C. Simopoulos, *et al.* Differential assessment of vascular survival ability and tumor angiogenic activity in colorectal cancer, *Clin. Cancer Res.*, 2002, **8**(5), 1185–1191.
 - 49 S. Acharyya, T. Oskarsson, S. Vanharanta, S. Malladi, J. Kim and P. G. Morris, *et al.* A CXCL1 Paracrine Network Links Cancer Chemoresistance and Metastasis, *Cell*, 2012, **150**(1), 165–178.
 - 50 C. Anderberg, H. Li, L. Fredriksson, J. Andrae, C. Betsholtz and X. Li, *et al.* Paracrine Signaling by Platelet-Derived Growth Factor-CC Promotes Tumor Growth by Recruitment of Cancer-Associated Fibroblasts, *Cancer Res.*, 2009, **69**(1), 369–378.
 - 51 R. Straussman, T. Morikawa, K. Shee, M. Barzily-Rokni, Z. R. Qian and J. Du, *et al.* Tumour micro-environment elicits innate resistance to RAF inhibitors through HGF secretion, *Nature*, 2012, **487**(7408), 500–504.
 - 52 V. Baeriswyl and G. Christofori, The angiogenic switch in carcinogenesis, *Semin. Cancer Biol.*, 2009, **19**(5), 329–337.
 - 53 J. Folkman, Tumor Angiogenesis: Therapeutic Implications, *N. Engl. J. Med.*, 1971, **285**(21), 1182–1186.
 - 54 R. Zhang, Y. Yao, H. Gao and X. Hu, Mechanisms of angiogenesis in tumour, *Front. Oncol.*, 2024, **14**, 1359069.
 - 55 D. Hanahan, Hallmarks of Cancer: New Dimensions, *Cancer Discovery*, 2022, **12**(1), 31–46.
 - 56 D. Hanahan and R. A. Weinberg, Hallmarks of Cancer: The Next Generation, *Cell*, 2011, **144**(5), 646–674.
 - 57 S. Ramakrishnan, V. Anand and S. Roy, Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor Signaling in Hypoxia and Inflammation, *J. NeuroImmune Pharmacol.*, 2014, **9**(2), 142–160.
 - 58 B. Sun, D. Zhang, S. Zhang, W. Zhang, H. Guo and X. Zhao, Hypoxia influences vasculogenic mimicry channel formation and tumor invasion-related protein expression in melanoma, *Cancer Lett.*, 2007, **249**(2), 188–197.
 - 59 R. K. Jain, Antiangiogenesis Strategies Revisited: From Starving Tumors to Alleviating Hypoxia, *Cancer Cell*, 2014, **26**(5), 605–622.
 - 60 A. P. Elias and S. Dias, Microenvironment Changes (in pH) Affect VEGF Alternative Splicing, *Cancer Microenviron.*, 2008, **1**(1), 131–139.
 - 61 T. Echizen, T. Osanai, T. Ashitate, H. Yokoyama, S. Shibutani and M. Tanaka, *et al.* Upregulation of soluble vascular endothelial growth factor receptor type 1 by endogenous prostacyclin inhibitor coupling factor 6 in vascular endothelial cells: a role of acidosis-induced c-Src activation, *Hypertens. Res.*, 2009, **32**(3), 182–187.
 - 62 Z. L. Liu, H. H. Chen, L. L. Zheng, L. P. Sun and L. Shi, Angiogenic signaling pathways and anti-angiogenic therapy for cancer, *Signal Transduction Targeted Ther.*, 2023, **8**(1), 198.



- 63 L. J. Metheny-Barlow and L. Y. Li, The enigmatic role of angiopoietin-1 in tumor angiogenesis, *Cell Res.*, 2003, **13**(5), 309–317.
- 64 S. Morikawa, P. Baluk, T. Kaidoh, A. Haskell, R. K. Jain and D. M. McDonald, Abnormalities in Pericytes on Blood Vessels and Endothelial Sprouts in Tumors, *Am. J. Pathol.*, 2002, **160**(3), 985–1000.
- 65 J. I. Greenberg, D. J. Shields, S. G. Barillas, L. M. Acevedo, E. Murphy and J. Huang, *et al.* A role for VEGF as a negative regulator of pericyte function and vessel maturation, *Nature*, 2008, **456**(7223), 809–813.
- 66 Z. Zhang, Q. Zhang and Y. Wang, CAF-mediated tumor vascularization: From mechanistic insights to targeted therapies, *Cell. Signalling*, 2025, **132**, 111827.
- 67 Y. Zhu, J. M. Herndon, D. K. Sojka, K. W. Kim, B. L. Knolhoff and C. Zuo, *et al.* Tissue-Resident Macrophages in Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinoma Originate from Embryonic Hematopoiesis and Promote Tumor Progression, *Immunity*, 2017, **47**(2), 323–338.e6.
- 68 J. S. Lewis, R. J. Landers, J. C. Underwood, A. L. Harris and C. E. Lewis, Expression of vascular endothelial growth factor by macrophages is up-regulated in poorly vascularized areas of breast carcinomas, *J. Pathol.*, 2000, **192**(2), 150–158.
- 69 A. S. Harney, E. N. Arwert, D. Entenberg, Y. Wang, P. Guo and B. Z. Qian, *et al.* Real-Time Imaging Reveals Local, Transient Vascular Permeability, and Tumor Cell Intravasation Stimulated by TIE2hi Macrophage-Derived VEGFA, *Cancer Discovery*, 2015, **5**(9), 932–943.
- 70 D. G. DeNardo and B. Ruffell, Macrophages as regulators of tumour immunity and immunotherapy, *Nat. Rev. Immunol.*, 2019, **19**(6), 369–382.
- 71 D. Matoba, T. Noda, S. Kobayashi, Y. Sakano, K. Matsumoto and C. Yamanaka, *et al.* Tumor Endothelial Cells Induce M2 Macrophage Polarization via IL -4, Enhancing Tumor Growth in Hepatocellular Carcinoma, *Cancer Sci.*, 2025, **116**(11), 2972–2985.
- 72 Y. Yang, Z. Guo, W. Chen, X. Wang, M. Cao and X. Han, *et al.* M2 Macrophage-Derived Exosomes Promote Angiogenesis and Growth of Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinoma by Targeting E2F2, *Mol. Ther.*, 2021, **29**(3), 1226–1238.
- 73 C. Baer, M. L. Squadrito, M. L. Iruela-Arispe and M. De Palma, Reciprocal interactions between endothelial cells and macrophages in angiogenic vascular niches, *Exp. Cell Res.*, 2013, **319**(11), 1626–1634.
- 74 D. Yang, J. Liu, H. Qian and Q. Zhuang, Cancer-associated fibroblasts: from basic science to anticancer therapy, *Exp. Mol. Med.*, 2023, **55**(7), 1322–1332.
- 75 A. Vonlaufen, S. Joshi, C. Qu, P. A. Phillips, Z. Xu and N. R. Parker, *et al.* Pancreatic Stellate Cells: Partners in Crime with Pancreatic Cancer Cells, *Cancer Res.*, 2008, **68**(7), 2085–2093.
- 76 D. Ezhilarasan, Hepatic stellate cells in the injured liver: Perspectives beyond hepatic fibrosis, *J. Cell. Physiol.*, 2022, **237**(1), 436–449.
- 77 K. Hosaka, Y. Yang, T. Seki, C. Fischer, O. Dubey and E. Fredlund, *et al.* Pericyte-fibroblast transition promotes tumor growth and metastasis, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2016, **113**(38), E5618–E5627.
- 78 C. E. Weber, A. N. Kothari, P. Y. Wai, N. Y. Li, J. Driver and M. A. C. Zapf, *et al.* Osteopontin mediates an MZF1-TGF- β 1-dependent transformation of mesenchymal stem cells into cancer-associated fibroblasts in breast cancer, *Oncogene*, 2015, **34**(37), 4821–4833.
- 79 P. Barcellos-de-Souza, G. Comito, C. Pons-Segura, M. L. Taddei, V. Gori and V. Becherucci, *et al.* Mesenchymal Stem Cells are Recruited and Activated into Carcinoma-Associated Fibroblasts by Prostate Cancer Microenvironment-Derived TGF- β 1, *Stem Cells*, 2016, **34**(10), 2536–2547.
- 80 E. M. Zeisberg, S. Potenta, L. Xie, M. Zeisberg and R. Kalluri, Discovery of Endothelial to Mesenchymal Transition as a Source for Carcinoma-Associated Fibroblasts, *Cancer Res.*, 2007, **67**(21), 10123–10128.
- 81 C. Iwamoto, K. Ohuchida, T. Shinkawa, S. Okuda, Y. Otsubo and T. Okumura, *et al.* Bone marrow-derived macrophages converted into cancer-associated fibroblast-like cells promote pancreatic cancer progression, *Cancer Lett.*, 2021, **512**, 15–27.
- 82 P. C. Tang, J. Y. Chung, V. W. Xue, J. Xiao, X. Meng and X. Huang, *et al.* Smad3 Promotes Cancer-Associated Fibroblasts Generation via Macrophage-Myofibroblast Transition, *Adv. Sci.*, 2022, **9**(1), 2101235.
- 83 Y. A. Fouad and C. Aanei, Revisiting the hallmarks of cancer, *Am. J. Cancer Res.*, 2017, **7**(5), 1016–1036.
- 84 Z. Zhang and Q. Zhang, CAF-mediated tumor vascularization: From mechanistic insights to targeted therapies, *Cell. Signalling*, 2025, **132**, 111827.
- 85 M. K. Sewell-Loftin, S. V. H. Bayer, E. Crist, T. Hughes, S. M. Joison, G. D. Longmore and S. C. George, Cancer-associated fibroblasts support vascular growth through mechanical force, *Sci. Rep.*, 2017, **7**(1), 12574.
- 86 A. Orimo, P. B. Gupta, D. C. Sgroi, F. Arenzana-Seisdedos, T. Delaunay, R. Naeem, V. J. Carey, A. L. Richardson and R. A. Weinberg, Stromal Fibroblasts Present in Invasive Human Breast Carcinomas Promote Tumor Growth and Angiogenesis through Elevated SDF-1/CXCL12 Secretion, *Cell*, 2005, **121**(3), 335–348.
- 87 W. Liang and N. Ferrara, The Complex Role of Neutrophils in Tumor Angiogenesis and Metastasis, *Cancer Immunol. Res.*, 2016, **4**(2), 83–91.
- 88 H. M. Fathallah-Shaykh, L. J. Zhao, A. I. Kafrouni, G. M. Smith and J. Forman, Gene Transfer of IFN- γ into Established Brain Tumors Represses Growth by Antiangiogenesis, *J. Immunol.*, 2000, **164**(1), 217–222.
- 89 T. Kammertoens, C. Friese, A. Arina, C. Idel, D. Briesemeister and M. Rothe, *et al.*, Tumour ischaemia by interferon- γ resembles physiological blood vessel regression, *Nature*, 2017, **545**(7652), 98–102.
- 90 S. B. Coffelt, C. E. Lewis, L. Naldini, J. M. Brown, N. Ferrara and M. De Palma, Elusive identities and overlapping



- phenotypes of proangiogenic myeloid cells in tumors, *Am. J. Pathol.*, 2010, **176**(4), 1564–1576.
- 91 A. Bruno, G. Ferlazzo, A. Albini and D. M. Noonan, A think tank of TINK/TANKs: tumor-infiltrating/tumor-associated natural killer cells in tumor progression and angiogenesis, *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.*, 2014, **106**(8), dju200.
 - 92 L. Bougaret, L. Delort, H. Billard, C. Lequeux, N. Goncalves-Mendes and A. Mojallal, *et al.*, Supernatants of Adipocytes From Obese Versus Normal Weight Women and Breast Cancer Cells: In Vitro Impact on Angiogenesis, *J. Cell. Physiol.*, 2017, **232**(7), 1808–1816.
 - 93 L. M. Arendt, J. McCready, P. J. Keller, D. D. Baker, S. P. Naber and V. Seewaldt, *et al.*, Obesity Promotes Breast Cancer by CCL2-Mediated Macrophage Recruitment and Angiogenesis, *Cancer Res.*, 2013, **73**(19), 6080–6093.
 - 94 A. Armulik, G. Genové, C. Betsholtz and Developmental Pericytes, Physiological, and Pathological Perspectives, Problems, and Promises, *Dev. Cell*, 2011, **21**(2), 193–215.
 - 95 M. Yan, G. Lesyk, A. Radziwon-Balicka and P. Jurasz, Pharmacological Regulation of Platelet Factors That Influence Tumor Angiogenesis, *Semin. Oncol.*, 2014, **41**(3), 370–377.
 - 96 H. W. Lee, Y. Xu, L. He, W. Choi, D. Gonzalez and S. W. Jin, *et al.* Role of Venous Endothelial Cells in Developmental and Pathologic Angiogenesis, *Circulation*, 2021, **144**(16), 1308–1322.
 - 97 Q. Zeng, M. Mousa, A. S. Nadukkandy, L. Franssens, H. Alnaqbi and F. Y. Alshamsi, *et al.* Understanding tumour endothelial cell heterogeneity and function from single-cell omics, *Nat. Rev. Cancer*, 2023, **23**(8), 544–564.
 - 98 C. D. Arvanitis, G. B. Ferraro and R. K. Jain, The blood–brain barrier and blood–tumour barrier in brain tumours and metastases, *Nat. Rev. Cancer*, 2020, **20**(1), 26–41.
 - 99 X. Pan, X. Li, L. Dong, T. Liu, M. Zhang and L. Zhang, *et al.* Tumour vasculature at single-cell resolution, *Nature*, 2024, **632**, 429–436.
 - 100 J. Wen, Single-cell transcriptomics reveals antigen-presenting capacity and therapeutic resistance potential of immunomodulatory endothelial cells in colorectal cancer, *Immun., Inflammation Dis.*, 2024, **12**(6), e1311.
 - 101 Y. Zhang, S. P. Narayanan, R. Mannan, G. Raskind, X. Wang and P. Vats, *et al.* Single-cell analyses of renal cell cancers reveal insights into tumor microenvironment, cell of origin, and therapy response, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2021, **118**(24), e2103240118.
 - 102 Y. Xie, L. He, R. Lugano, Y. Zhang, H. Cao and Q. He, *et al.* Key molecular alterations in endothelial cells in human glioblastoma uncovered through single-cell RNA sequencing, *JCI Insight*, 2021, **6**(15), e150861.
 - 103 C. Gu, D. A. Martella, L. A. Rose, N. Rouatbi, C. Wang, A. Zam, V. Caprettini, M. Jensen, S. Liu, C. Hagemann, S. Memdouh, A. Serio, V. Abbate, K. T. Al-Jamal, M. Parsons, M. S. Bergholt, P. M. Brennan, A. Zaritsky and C. Chiappini, Nanoneedles enable spatiotemporal lipidomics of living tissues, *Nat. Nanotechnol.*, 2025, **20**, 1262–1272.
 - 104 S. Guelfi, K. Hodivala-Dilke and G. Bergers, Targeting the tumour vasculature: from vessel destruction to promotion, *Nat. Rev. Cancer*, 2024, **24**(10), 655–675.
 - 105 J. Garcia, H. I. Hurwitz, A. B. Sandler, D. Miles, R. L. Coleman and R. Deurloo, *et al.* Bevacizumab (Avastin®) in cancer treatment: A review of 15 years of clinical experience and future outlook, *Cancer Treat. Rev.*, 2020, **86**, 102017.
 - 106 M. R. Gilbert, J. J. Dignam, T. S. Armstrong, J. S. Wefel, D. T. Blumenthal and M. A. Vogelbaum, *et al.* A Randomized Trial of Bevacizumab for Newly Diagnosed Glioblastoma, *N. Engl. J. Med.*, 2014, **370**(8), 699–708.
 - 107 K. J. Wenger, M. Wagner, S. J. You, K. Franz, P. N. Harter and M. C. Burger, *et al.* Bevacizumab as a last-line treatment for glioblastoma following failure of radiotherapy, temozolomide and lomustine, *Oncol. Lett.*, 2017, **14**(1), 1141–1146.
 - 108 J. C. Yang, L. Haworth, R. M. Sherry, P. Hwu, D. J. Schwartzentruber and S. L. Topalian, *et al.* A Randomized Trial of Bevacizumab, an Anti-Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor Antibody, for Metastatic Renal Cancer, *N. Engl. J. Med.*, 2003, **349**(5), 427–434.
 - 109 R. Jin, A. S. Ogbomo, N. A. Accortt, L. S. Lal, G. Bishi and D. Sandschafer, *et al.* Real-world outcomes among patients with metastatic colorectal cancer treated first line with a bevacizumab biosimilar (bevacizumab-awwb), *Ther. Adv. Med. Oncol.*, 2023, **15**, 17588359231182386.
 - 110 H. Verdaguer, J. Tabernero and T. Macarulla, Ramucirumab in metastatic colorectal cancer: evidence to date and place in therapy, *Ther. Adv. Med. Oncol.*, 2016, **8**(3), 230–242.
 - 111 E. De Luca, D. Marino and M. Di Maio, Ramucirumab, A Second-Line Option For Patients With Hepatocellular Carcinoma: A Review Of The Evidence, *Cancer Manage. Res.*, 2020, **12**, 3721–3729.
 - 112 E. Larkins, B. Scepura, G. M. Blumenthal, E. Bloomquist, S. Tang and M. Biabie, *et al.* U.S. Food and Drug Administration Approval Summary: Ramucirumab for the Treatment of Metastatic Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer Following Disease Progression On or After Platinum-Based Chemotherapy, *Oncologist*, 2015, **20**(11), 1320–1325.
 - 113 L. Fala, Cyramza (Ramucirumab) Approved for the Treatment of Advanced Gastric Cancer and Metastatic Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer, *Am. Health Drug Benef.*, 2015(Spec Feature), 49–53.
 - 114 K. T. Yeung and E. E. W. Cohen, Lenvatinib in Advanced, Radioactive Iodine-Refractory, Differentiated Thyroid Carcinoma, *Clin. Cancer Res.*, 2015, **21**(24), 5420–5426.
 - 115 M. Kudo, R. S. Finn, S. Qin, K. H. Han, K. Ikeda and F. Piscaglia, *et al.* Lenvatinib versus sorafenib in first-line treatment of patients with unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma: a randomised phase 3 non-inferiority trial, *Lancet*, 2018, **391**(10126), 1163–1173.



- 116 R. J. Motzer, T. E. Hutson, H. Glen, M. D. Michaelson, A. Molina and T. Eisen, *et al.* Lenvatinib, everolimus, and the combination in patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma: a randomised, phase 2, open-label, multicentre trial, *Lancet Oncol.*, 2015, **16**(15), 1473–1482.
- 117 C. P. Miller, C. Tsuchida, Y. Zheng, J. Himmelfarb and S. Akilesh, A 3D Human Renal Cell Carcinoma-on-a-Chip for the Study of Tumor Angiogenesis, *Neoplasia*, 2018, **20**(6), 610–620.
- 118 J. K. Lee, S. R. Park, B. K. Jung, Y. K. Jeon, Y. S. Lee and M. K. Kim, *et al.* Exosomes Derived from Mesenchymal Stem Cells Suppress Angiogenesis by Down-Regulating VEGF Expression in Breast Cancer Cells, *PLoS One*, 2013, **8**(12), e84256.
- 119 E. Kaya-Tilki, A. A. Öztürk, S. Engür-Öztürk and M. Dikmen, Enhanced anti-angiogenic effects of aprepitant-loaded nanoparticles in human umbilical vein endothelial cells, *Sci. Rep.*, 2024, **14**(1), 19837.
- 120 A. Martinez-Usatorre, E. Kadioglu, G. Boivin, C. Cianciaruso, A. Guichard and B. Torchia, *et al.* Overcoming microenvironmental resistance to PD-1 blockade in genetically engineered lung cancer models, *Sci. Transl. Med.*, 2021, **13**(606), eabd1616.
- 121 A. M. A. Lorza, H. Ravi, R. C. Philip, J. P. Galons, T. P. Trouard and N. A. Parra, *et al.* Dose-response assessment by quantitative MRI in a phase 1 clinical study of the anti-cancer vascular disrupting agent crolibulin, *Sci. Rep.*, 2020, **10**(1), 14449.
- 122 P. Hinnen and F. A. L. M. Eskens, Vascular disrupting agents in clinical development, *Br. J. Cancer*, 2007, **96**(8), 1159–1165.
- 123 Y. W. J. Paulis, E. J. M. Huijbers, D. W. J. Van Der Schaft, P. M. M. B. Soetekouw, P. Pauwels and V. C. G. Tjan-Heijnen, *et al.* CD44 enhances tumor aggressiveness by promoting tumor cell plasticity, *Oncotarget*, 2015, **6**(23), 19634–19646.
- 124 C. W. Menke-van Der Houven Van Oordt, C. Gomez-Roca, C. Van Herpen, A. L. Coveler, D. Mahalingam and H. M. W. Verheul, *et al.* First-in-human phase I clinical trial of RG7356, an anti-CD44 humanized antibody, in patients with advanced, CD44-expressing solid tumors, *Oncotarget*, 2016, **7**(48), 80046–80058.
- 125 R. K. Jain, Normalization of tumor vasculature: an emerging concept in antiangiogenic therapy, *Science*, 2005, **307**(5706), 58–62.
- 126 A. G. Sorensen, K. E. Emblem, P. Polaskova, D. Jennings, H. Kim and M. Ancukiewicz, *et al.* Increased Survival of Glioblastoma Patients Who Respond to Antiangiogenic Therapy with Elevated Blood Perfusion, *Cancer Res.*, 2012, **72**(2), 402–407.
- 127 R. Xu, C. Xu, C. Liu, C. Cui and J. Zhu, Efficacy and safety of bevacizumab-based combination therapy for treatment of patients with metastatic colorectal cancer, *OncoTargets Ther.*, 2018, **11**, 8605–8621.
- 128 J. Suminokura, M. Miyamoto, T. Yoshikawa, H. Kouta, Y. Kikuchi and T. Hada, *et al.* Potential efficacy of weekly low-dose administration of bevacizumab as a combination therapy for platinum-resistant ovarian carcinoma: a retrospective analysis, *BMC Cancer*, 2022, **22**(1), 176.
- 129 C. Defferrari, S. Campora, M. D'Amico, A. Piccardo, E. Biscaldi and D. Rosselli, *et al.* A case series of low dose bevacizumab and chemotherapy in heavily pretreated patients with epithelial ovarian cancer, *J. Ovarian Res.*, 2012, **5**(1), 17.
- 130 L. Chen, H. Zhou, H. Wu, Q. Lu, J. Huang and S. Wang, Effect of immunotherapy or anti-angiogenesis therapy combined with chemotherapy for advanced triple-negative breast cancer: A real-world retrospective study, *Int. Immunopharmacol.*, 2024, **143**, 113516.
- 131 R. Bell, J. Brown, M. Parmar, M. Toi, T. Suter and G. G. Steger, *et al.* Final efficacy and updated safety results of the randomized phase III BEATRICE trial evaluating adjuvant bevacizumab-containing therapy in triple-negative early breast cancer, *Ann. Oncol.*, 2017, **28**(4), 754–760.
- 132 W. Sun and A. Patel, Ziv-aflibercept in metastatic colorectal cancer, *Biol.: Targets Ther.*, 2013, **2014**(8), 13–25.
- 133 E. Van Cutsem, J. Tabernero, R. Lakomy, H. Prenen, J. Prausová and T. Macarulla, *et al.* Addition of Aflibercept to Fluorouracil, Leucovorin, and Irinotecan Improves Survival in a Phase III Randomized Trial in Patients With Metastatic Colorectal Cancer Previously Treated With an Oxaliplatin-Based Regimen, *J. Clin. Oncol.*, 2012, **30**(28), 3499–3506.
- 134 G. K. Abou-Alfa, P. R. Galle, Y. Chao, J. Erinjeri, J. Heo and M. J. Borad, *et al.* PHOCUS: A Phase 3, Randomized, Open-Label Study of Sequential Treatment with Pexa-Vec (JX-594) and Sorafenib in Patients with Advanced Hepatocellular Carcinoma, *Liver Cancer*, 2024, **13**(3), 248–264.
- 135 A. Saeed, R. Park and W. Sun, The integration of immune checkpoint inhibitors with VEGF targeted agents in advanced gastric and gastroesophageal adenocarcinoma: a review on the rationale and results of early phase trials, *J. Hematol. Oncol.*, 2021, **14**(1), 13.
- 136 B. I. Rini, S. Halabi, J. E. Rosenberg, W. M. Stadler, D. A. Vaena and L. Archer, *et al.* Phase III Trial of Bevacizumab Plus Interferon Alfa Versus Interferon Alfa Monotherapy in Patients With Metastatic Renal Cell Carcinoma: Final Results of CALGB 90206, *J. Clin. Oncol.*, 2010, **28**(13), 2137–2143.
- 137 A. Amin, A. Z. Dudek, T. F. Logan, R. S. Lance, J. M. Holzbeierlein and J. J. Knox, *et al.* Survival with AGS-003, an autologous dendritic cell-based immunotherapy, in combination with sunitinib in unfavorable risk patients with advanced renal cell carcinoma (RCC): Phase 2 study results, *J. Immunother. Cancer.*, 2015, **3**(1), 14.
- 138 B. Escudier, J. Bellmunt, S. Négrier, E. Bajetta, B. Melichar and S. Bracarda, *et al.* Phase III Trial of Bevacizumab Plus Interferon Alfa-2a in Patients With Metastatic Renal Cell Carcinoma (AVOREN): Final Analysis of Overall Survival, *J. Clin. Oncol.*, 2010, **28**(13), 2144–2150.
- 139 S. C. J. Yeung, M. She, H. Yang, J. Pan, L. Sun and D. Chaplin, Combination Chemotherapy Including Combretastatin A4 Phosphate and Paclitaxel Is Effective against Anaplastic Thyroid Cancer in a Nude Mouse Xenograft Model, *J. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab.*, 2007, **92**(8), 2902–2909.



- 140 B. Siim, A. Lee, S. Shalal-Zwain, F. Pruijn, M. McKeage and W. Wilson, Marked potentiation of the antitumour activity of chemotherapeutic drugs by the antivascular agent 5,6-dimethylxanthenone-4-acetic acid (DMXAA), *Cancer Chemother. Pharmacol.*, 2003, **51**(1), 43–52.
- 141 K. Grosios, P. M. Loadman, D. J. Swaine, G. R. Pettit and M. C. Bibby, Combination chemotherapy with combretastatin A-4 phosphate and 5-fluorouracil in an experimental murine colon adenocarcinoma, *Anticancer Res.*, 2000, **20**(1A), 229–233.
- 142 D. Fukumura, J. Kloepper, Z. Amoozgar, D. G. Duda and R. K. Jain, Enhancing cancer immunotherapy using antiangiogenics: opportunities and challenges, *Nat. Rev. Clin. Oncol.*, 2018, **15**(5), 325–340.
- 143 R. Ganss, Tumour vessel remodelling: new opportunities in cancer treatment, *Vasc. Biol.*, 2020, **2**(1), R35–R43.
- 144 Y. Kubota, H. K. Kleinman, G. R. Martin and T. J. Lawley, Role of laminin and basement membrane in the morphological differentiation of human endothelial cells into capillary-like structures, *J. Cell Biol.*, 1988, **107**(4), 1589–1598.
- 145 B. Baudin, A. Bruneel, N. Bosselut and M. Vaubourdolle, A protocol for isolation and culture of human umbilical vein endothelial cells, *Nat. Protoc.*, 2007, **2**(3), 481–485.
- 146 I. Kocherova, A. Bryja, P. Mozdzia, A. Angelova Volponi, M. Dyszkiewicz-Konwińska and H. Piotrowska-Kempisty, *et al.* Human Umbilical Vein Endothelial Cells (HUVECs) Co-Culture with Osteogenic Cells: From Molecular Communication to Engineering Prevascularised Bone Grafts, *J. Clin. Med.*, 2019, **8**(10), 1602.
- 147 E. B. Peters, Endothelial Progenitor Cells for the Vascularization of Engineered Tissues, *Tissue Eng., Part B*, 2018, **24**(1), 1–24.
- 148 V. V. Orlova, F. E. Van Den Hil, S. Petrus-Reurer, Y. Drabsch, P. Ten Dijke and C. L. Mummery, Generation, expansion and functional analysis of endothelial cells and pericytes derived from human pluripotent stem cells, *Nat. Protoc.*, 2014, **9**(6), 1514–1531.
- 149 C. Patsch, L. Challet-Meylan, E. C. Thoma, E. Urich, T. Heckel and J. F. O'Sullivan, *et al.* Generation of vascular endothelial and smooth muscle cells from human pluripotent stem cells, *Nat. Cell Biol.*, 2015, **17**(8), 994–1003.
- 150 S. Yao, S. Chen, J. Clark, E. Hao, G. M. Beattie and A. Hayek, *et al.* Long-term self-renewal and directed differentiation of human embryonic stem cells in chemically defined conditions, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2006, **103**(18), 6907–6912.
- 151 D. James, H.-s. Nam, M. Seandel, D. Nolan, T. Janovitz and M. Tomishima, *et al.* Expansion and maintenance of human embryonic stem cell-derived endothelial cells by TGF β inhibition is Id1 dependent, *Nat. Biotechnol.*, 2010, **28**(2), 161–166.
- 152 P. N. Nwokoye and O. J. Abilez, Bioengineering methods for vascularizing organoids, *Cells Rep. Methods*, 2024, **4**(6), 100779.
- 153 R. Patra, K. Ghosal, R. Saha, P. Sarkar, S. Chattopadhyay and K. Sarkar, *Encyclopedia of Materials: Plastics and Polymers*, Elsevier, 2022, pp. 567–592.
- 154 T. J. Kwak and E. Lee, In vitro modeling of solid tumor interactions with perfused blood vessels, *Sci. Rep.*, 2020, **10**(1), 20142.
- 155 R. F. Nicosia and A. Ottinetti, Modulation of microvascular growth and morphogenesis by reconstituted basement membrane gel in three-dimensional cultures of rat aorta: A comparative study of angiogenesis in Matrigel, collagen, fibrin, and plasma clot, *In Vitro Cell. Dev. Biol.*, 1990, **26**(2), 119–128.
- 156 C. O'Connor, E. Brady, Y. Zheng, E. Moore and K. R. Stevens, Engineering the multiscale complexity of vascular networks, *Nat. Rev. Mater.*, 2022, **7**(9), 702–716.
- 157 L. S. Ferreira, S. Gerecht, J. Fuller, H. F. Shieh, G. Vunjak-Novakovic and R. Langer, Bioactive hydrogel scaffolds for controllable vascular differentiation of human embryonic stem cells, *Biomaterials*, 2007, **28**(17), 2706–2717.
- 158 M. P. Lutolf, J. L. Lauer-Fields, H. G. Schmoekel, A. T. Metters, F. E. Weber and G. B. Fields, *et al.* Synthetic matrix metalloproteinase-sensitive hydrogels for the conduction of tissue regeneration: Engineering cell-invasion characteristics, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2003, **100**(9), 5413–5418.
- 159 C. Radermacher, A. Rohde, V. Kucikas, E. M. Buhl, S. Wein and D. Jonigk, *et al.* Various Hydrogel Types as a Potential In Vitro Angiogenesis Model, *Gels*, 2024, **10**(12), 820.
- 160 N. Yamamura, R. Sudo, M. Ikeda and K. Tanishita, Effects of the Mechanical Properties of Collagen Gel on the In Vitro Formation of Microvessel Networks by Endothelial Cells, *Tissue Eng.*, 2007, **13**(7), 1443–1453.
- 161 Z. Wei, R. Schnellmann, H. C. Pruitt and S. Gerecht, Hydrogel Network Dynamics Regulate Vascular Morphogenesis, *Cell Stem Cell*, 2020, **27**(5), 798–812.e6.
- 162 S. Maji and H. Lee, Engineering Hydrogels for the Development of Three-Dimensional In Vitro Models, *Int. J. Mol. Sci.*, 2022, **23**(5), 2662.
- 163 S. Riffle and R. S. Hegde, Modeling tumor cell adaptations to hypoxia in multicellular tumor spheroids, *J. Exp. Clin. Cancer Res.*, 2017, **36**(1), 102.
- 164 Y. Zhao, S. Landau, S. Okhovatian, C. Liu, R. X. Z. Lu and B. F. L. Lai, *et al.* Integrating organoids and organ-on-a-chip devices, *Nat. Rev. Bioeng.*, 2024, **2**(7), 588–608.
- 165 S. Zhang, Z. Wan and R. D. Kamm, Vascularized organoids on a chip: strategies for engineering organoids with functional vasculature, *Lab Chip*, 2021, **21**(3), 473–488.
- 166 Y. C. Jiao, Y. X. Wang, W. Z. Liu, J. W. Xu, Y. Y. Zhao and C. Z. Yan, *et al.* Advances in the differentiation of pluripotent stem cells into vascular cells, *World J. Stem Cells*, 2024, **16**(2), 137–150.
- 167 A. Dellaquila, C. Le Bao, D. Letourneur and T. Simon-Yarza, In Vitro Strategies to Vascularize 3D Physiologically Relevant Models, *Adv. Sci.*, 2021, **8**(19), 2100798.
- 168 M. N. Nakatsu, R. C. A. Sainson, J. N. Aoto, K. L. Taylor, M. Aitkenhead and S. Pérez-del-Pulgar, *et al.* Angiogenic



- sprouting and capillary lumen formation modeled by human umbilical vein endothelial cells (HUVEC) in fibrin gels: the role of fibroblasts and Angiopoietin-1[☆], *Microvasc. Res.*, 2003, **66**(2), 102–112.
- 169 B. Andrée, H. Ichanti, S. Kalies, A. Heisterkamp, S. Strauß and P. M. Vogt, *et al.* Formation of three-dimensional tubular endothelial cell networks under defined serum-free cell culture conditions in human collagen hydrogels, *Sci. Rep.*, 2019, **9**(1), 5437.
 - 170 O. Ham, Y. B. Jin, J. Kim and M. O. Lee, Blood vessel formation in cerebral organoids formed from human embryonic stem cells, *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.*, 2020, **521**(1), 84–90.
 - 171 B. Çakir, B. Cakir, Y. Xiang, Y. Tanaka, K. L. Billiar and M. H. Kural, *et al.* Engineering of human brain organoids with a functional vascular-like system, *Nat. Methods*, 2019, **16**(11), 1169–1175.
 - 172 T. Takebe, K. Sekine, M. Enomura, H. Koike, M. Kimura and T. Ogaeri, *et al.*, Vascularized and functional human liver from an iPSC-derived organ bud transplant, *Nature*, 2013, **499**(7459), 481–484.
 - 173 E. Song, M. Kim, S. Lee, H. W. Liu, J. Kim and D. H. Choi, *et al.* VONet: A deep learning network for 3D reconstruction of organoid structures with a minimal number of confocal images, *Patterns*, 2024, **5**(10), 101063.
 - 174 M. T. Pham, K. M. Pollock, M. D. Rose, W. A. Cary, H. R. Stewart and P. Zhou, *et al.* Generation of human vascularized brain organoids, *Neuroreport.*, 2018, **29**(7), 588–593.
 - 175 G. Giustarini, G. Teng, A. Pavesi and G. Adriani, Characterization of 3D heterocellular spheroids of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma for the study of cell interactions in the tumor immune microenvironment, *Front. Oncol.*, 2023, **13**, 1156769.
 - 176 H. Shoval, A. Karsch-Bluman, Y. Brill-Karniely, T. Stern, G. Zamir and A. Hubert, *et al.* Tumor cells and their crosstalk with endothelial cells in 3D spheroids, *Sci. Rep.*, 2017, **7**(1), 10428.
 - 177 T. Franchi-Mendes, N. Lopes and C. Brito, Heterotypic Tumor Spheroids in Agitation-Based Cultures: A Scaffold-Free Cell Model That Sustains Long-Term Survival of Endothelial Cells, *Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol.*, 2021, **9**, 649949.
 - 178 M. A. Skylar-Scott, S. G. M. Uzel, L. L. Nam, J. H. Ahrens, R. L. Truby and S. Damaraju, *et al.* Biomanufacturing of organ-specific tissues with high cellular density and embedded vascular channels, *Sci. Adv.*, 2019, **5**(9), eaaw2459.
 - 179 A. Saraswathibhatla, D. Indana and O. Chaudhuri, Cell-extracellular matrix mechanotransduction in 3D, *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.*, 2023, **24**(7), 495–516.
 - 180 X. Di, X. Gao, L. Peng, J. Ai, X. Jin and S. Qi, *et al.* Cellular mechanotransduction in health and diseases: from molecular mechanism to therapeutic targets, *Signal Transduction Targeted Ther.*, 2023, **8**(1), 282.
 - 181 K. K. Sanford, W. R. Earle and G. D. Likely, The growth in vitro of single isolated tissue cells, *J. Natl. Cancer Inst.*, 1948, **9**(3), 229–246.
 - 182 D. C. Duffy, J. C. McDonald, O. J. A. Schueller and G. M. Whitesides, Rapid Prototyping of Microfluidic Systems in Poly(dimethylsiloxane), *Anal. Chem.*, 1998, **70**(23), 4974–4984.
 - 183 T. Brevig, U. Krühne, R. A. Kahn, T. Ahl, M. Beyer and L. H. Pedersen, Hydrodynamic guiding for addressing subsets of immobilized cells and molecules in microfluidic systems, *BMC Biotechnol.*, 2003, **3**(1), 10.
 - 184 J. W. Song, W. Gu, N. Futai, K. A. Warner, J. E. Nor and S. Takayama, Computer-Controlled Microcirculatory Support System for Endothelial Cell Culture and Shearing, *Anal. Chem.*, 2005, **77**(13), 3993–3999.
 - 185 J. W. Song, S. P. Cavnar, A. C. Walker, K. E. Luker, M. Gupta and Y. C. Tung, *et al.* Microfluidic Endothelium for Studying the Intravascular Adhesion of Metastatic Breast Cancer Cells, *PLoS One*, 2009, **4**(6), e5756.
 - 186 D. Huh, B. D. Matthews, A. Mammoto, M. Montoya-Zavala, H. Y. Hsin and D. E. Ingber, Reconstituting Organ-Level Lung Functions on a Chip, *Science*, 2010, **328**(5986), 1662–1668.
 - 187 I. K. Zervantonakis, S. K. Hughes-Alford, J. L. Charest, J. S. Condeelis, F. B. Gertler and R. D. Kamm, Three-dimensional microfluidic model for tumor cell intravasation and endothelial barrier function, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2012, **109**(34), 13515–13520.
 - 188 F. Jiang, Y. Zhang, G. Fang, Y. Wang, A. Dupuy and J. Jin, *et al.* Intravasation-On-μDevice (INVADE): Engineering Dynamic Vascular Interfaces to Study Cancer Cell Intravasation, *Adv. Mater.*, 2025, **37**(26), 2501466.
 - 189 M. B. Chen, J. A. Whisler, J. S. Jeon and R. D. Kamm, Mechanisms of tumor cell extravasation in an in vitro microvascular network platform, *Integr. Biol.*, 2013, **5**(10), 1262.
 - 190 S. Bersini, A. Miermont, A. Pavesi, R. D. Kamm, J. P. Thiery and M. Moretti, *et al.* A combined microfluidic-transcriptomic approach to characterize the extravasation potential of cancer cells, *Oncotarget.*, 2018, **9**(90), 36110–36125.
 - 191 H. L. Penny, J. L. Sieow, G. Adriani, W. H. Yeap, P. See Chi Ee and B. San Luis, *et al.* Warburg metabolism in tumor-conditioned macrophages promotes metastasis in human pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma, *Onco Targets Ther.*, 2016, **5**(8), e1191731.
 - 192 J. Bai, G. Adriani, T. M. Dang, T. Y. Tu, H. X. Leong Penny and S. C. Wong, *et al.* Contact-dependent carcinoma aggregate dispersion by M2a macrophages via ICAM-1 and β2 integrin interactions, *Oncotarget.*, 2015, **6**(28), 25295–25307.
 - 193 H. Y. Cho, J. H. Choi, K. J. Kim, M. Shin and J. W. Choi, Microfluidic System to Analyze the Effects of Interleukin 6 on Lymphatic Breast Cancer Metastasis, *Front. Bioeng. Biotechnol.*, 2021, **8**, 611802.
 - 194 H. Mollica, Y. J. Teo, A. S. M. Tan, D. Z. M. Tan, P. Decuzzi and A. Pavesi, *et al.* A 3D pancreatic tumor model to study T cell infiltration, *Biomater. Sci.*, 2021, **9**(22), 7420–7431.



- 195 L. De Haan, J. Suijker, R. Van Roey, N. Berges, E. Petrova and K. Queiroz, *et al.* A Microfluidic 3D Endothelium-on-a-Chip Model to Study Transendothelial Migration of T Cells in Health and Disease, *Int. J. Mol. Sci.*, 2021, **22**(15), 8234.
- 196 Y. T. Ho, G. Adriani, S. Beyer, P. T. Nhan, R. D. Kamm and J. C. Y. Kah, A Facile Method to Probe the Vascular Permeability of Nanoparticles in Nanomedicine Applications, *Sci. Rep.*, 2017, **7**(1), 707.
- 197 M. G. Barbato, R. C. Pereira, H. Mollica, A. Palange, M. Ferreira and P. Decuzzi, A permeable on-chip microvasculature for assessing the transport of macromolecules and polymeric nanoconstructs, *J. Colloid Interface Sci.*, 2021, **594**, 409–423.
- 198 Y. Shin, J. S. Jeon, S. Han, G. S. Jung, S. Shin and S. H. Lee, *et al.* In vitro 3D collective sprouting angiogenesis under orchestrated ANG-1 and VEGF gradients, *Lab Chip*, 2011, **11**(13), 2175.
- 199 H. H. Hsu, P. L. Ko, C. C. Peng, Y. J. Cheng, H. M. Wu and Y. C. Tung, Studying sprouting angiogenesis under combination of oxygen gradients and co-culture of fibroblasts using microfluidic cell culture model, *Mater. Today Bio*, 2023, **21**, 100703.
- 200 A. Mercurio, L. Sharples, F. Corbo, C. Franchini, A. Vacca and A. Catalano, *et al.* Phthalimide Derivative Shows Anti-angiogenic Activity in a 3D Microfluidic Model and No Teratogenicity in Zebrafish Embryos, *Front. Pharmacol.*, 2019, **10**, 349.
- 201 C. Kim, J. Kasuya, J. Jeon, S. Chung and R. D. Kamm, A quantitative microfluidic angiogenesis screen for studying anti-angiogenic therapeutic drugs, *Lab Chip*, 2015, **15**(1), 301–310.
- 202 C. B. X. Huang and T. Y. Tu, Recent advances in vascularized tumor-on-a-chip, *Front. Oncol.*, 2023, **13**, 1150332.
- 203 S. J. Hachey, S. Movsesyan, Q. Nguyen, G. Burton-Sojo, A. Tankazyan and W. Jie, *et al.* An in vitro vascularized micro-tumor model of human colorectal cancer recapitulates in vivo responses to standard-of-care therapy, *Lab Chip*, 2021, **21**(7), 1333–1351.
- 204 Y. Nashimoto, T. Hayashi, I. Kunita, A. Nakamasu, Y.-S. Torisawa and M. Nakayama, *et al.* Integrating perfusable vascular networks with a three-dimensional tissue in a microfluidic device, *Integr. Biol.*, 2017, **9**(6), 506–518.
- 205 J. Park, S. Kim, J. Hong and J. S. Jeon, Enabling perfusion through multicellular tumor spheroids promoting lumenization in a vascularized cancer model, *Lab Chip*, 2022, **22**(22), 4335–4348.
- 206 K. Haase, G. S. Offeddu, M. R. Gillrie and R. D. Kamm, Endothelial Regulation of Drug Transport in a 3D Vascularized Tumor Model, *Adv. Funct. Mater.*, 2020, **30**(48), 2002444.
- 207 Z. Wan, M. A. Floryan, M. F. Coughlin, S. Zhang, A. X. Zhong and S. E. Shelton, *et al.* New Strategy for Promoting Vascularization in Tumor Spheroids in a Microfluidic Assay, *Adv. Healthcare Mater.*, 2023, **12**(14), 2201784.
- 208 M. Dey, M. H. Kim, M. Dogan, M. Nagamine, L. Kozhaya and N. Celik, *et al.* Chemotherapeutics and CAR-T Cell-Based Immunotherapeutics Screening on a 3D Bioprinted Vascularized Breast Tumor Model, *Adv. Funct. Mater.*, 2022, **32**(52), 2203966.
- 209 A. Sobrino, D. T. T. Phan, R. Datta, X. Wang, S. J. Hachey and M. Romero-Lopez, *et al.*, 3D microtumors in vitro supported by perfused vascular networks, *Sci. Rep.*, 2016, **6**(1), 31589–31589.
- 210 G. S. Offeddu, E. Cambria, S. E. Shelton, K. Haase, Z. Wan and L. Possenti, *et al.* Personalized Vascularized Models of Breast Cancer Desmoplasia Reveal Biomechanical Determinants of Drug Delivery to the Tumor, *Adv. Sci.*, 2024, **11**(38), e2402757.
- 211 S. Lee, S. Kim, D.-J. Koo, Y. James, J. B. Yu and H. Cho, *et al.* 3D Microfluidic Platform and Tumor Vascular Mapping for Evaluating Anti-Angiogenic RNAi-Based Nanomedicine, *ACS Nano*, 2020, **15**(1), 338–350.
- 212 Y. Kim, J. Ko, N. Shin, S. Park, S.-R. Lee and S. Kim, *et al.* All-in-one microfluidic design to integrate vascularized tumor spheroid into high-throughput platform, *Biotechnol. Bioeng.*, 2022, **17**(3), 035029.
- 213 G. Adriani, D. Ma, A. Pavesi, R. D. Kamm and E. L. K. Goh, A 3D neurovascular microfluidic model consisting of neurons, astrocytes and cerebral endothelial cells as a blood–brain barrier, *Lab Chip*, 2017, **17**(3), 448–459.
- 214 A. Folch, *Introduction to BioMEMS*, CRC Press, Taylor and Francis Group, 2013, vol. 1.
- 215 S. N. Bhatia and D. E. Ingber, Microfluidic organs-on-chips, *Nat. Biotechnol.*, 2014, **32**(8), 760–772.
- 216 Y. Nashimoto, R. Okada, S. Hanada, Y. Arima, K. Nishiyama and T. Miura, *et al.* Vascularized cancer on a chip: The effect of perfusion on growth and drug delivery of tumor spheroid, *Biomaterials*, 2020, **229**, 119547.
- 217 Y. Bi, V. S. Shirure, R. Liu, C. Cunningham and D. Li, *et al.*, Tumor-on-a-chip platform to interrogate the role of macrophages in tumor progression, *Integr. Biol.*, 2020, **12**(9), 221–232.
- 218 A. Özkan, N. Ghousifam, N. Ghousifam, P. Jack Hoopes, P. J. Hoopes and T. E. Yankeelov, *et al.* In vitro vascularized liver and tumor tissue microenvironments on a chip for dynamic determination of nanoparticle transport and toxicity, *Biotechnol. Bioeng.*, 2019, **116**(5), 1201–1219.
- 219 D. Nothdurfter, C. Ploner, D. C. Coraça-Huber, D. Wilflingseder, T. Müller and M. Hermann, *et al.* 3D bioprinted, vascularized neuroblastoma tumor environment in fluidic chip devices for precision medicine drug testing, *Biofabrication*, 2022, **14**(3), 035002.
- 220 G. Silvani, C. Basirun, W. Huawei, C. Mehner, K. Poole and P. Bradbury, *et al.* A 3D-Bioprinted Vascularized Glioblastoma-on-a-Chip for Studying the Impact of Simulated Microgravity as a Novel Pre-Clinical Approach in Brain Tumor Therapy, *Adv. Ther.*, 2021, 2100106.
- 221 J. Ahn, D. H. Kim, D. J. Koo, J. Lim, T. E. Park and J. Lee, *et al.* 3D microengineered vascularized tumor spheroids for drug delivery and efficacy testing, *Acta Biomater.*, 2023, **165**, 153–167.



- 222 S. U. Park, T. H. Kim, S. H. Kim, S. You, Y. Jung and Y. Jung, Three-Dimensional Vascularized Lung Cancer-on-a-Chip with Lung Extracellular Matrix Hydrogels for In Vitro Screening, *Cancers*, 2021, **13**(16), 3930.
- 223 R. J. Motzer, T. Powles, M. Burotto, B. Escudier, M. T. Bourlon and A. Y. Shah, *et al.* Nivolumab plus cabozantinib versus sunitinib in first-line treatment for advanced renal cell carcinoma (CheckMate 9ER): long-term follow-up results from an open-label, randomised, phase 3 trial, *Lancet Oncol.*, 2022, **23**(7), 888–898.
- 224 S. A. Wells, B. G. Robinson, R. F. Gagel, H. Dralle, J. A. Fagin and M. Santoro, *et al.* Vandetanib in patients with locally advanced or metastatic medullary thyroid cancer: a randomized, double-blind phase III trial, *J. Clin. Oncol.*, 2012, **30**(2), 134–141.
- 225 J. P. Straehla, J. P. Straehla, C. Hajal, C. Hajal, H. C. Safford and H. C. Safford, *et al.* A predictive microfluidic model of human glioblastoma to assess trafficking of blood–brain barrier-penetrant nanoparticles, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2022, **119**(23), e2118697119.
- 226 Y. Kurata, T. Tanaka and M. Nangaku, Prolyl hydroxylase domain inhibitors: a new era in the management of renal anemia, *Ann. Transl. Med.*, 2019, **7**(Suppl 8), S334.
- 227 K. Cannita, S. Paradisi, V. Cocciolone, A. Bafille, L. Rinaldi and A. Irelli, *et al.* New schedule of bevacizumab/paclitaxel as first-line therapy for metastatic HER2-negative breast cancer in a real-life setting, *Cancer Med.*, 2016, **5**(9), 2232–2239.
- 228 A. F. Siekmann, Biology of vascular mural cells, *Development*, 2023, **150**(16), dev200271.
- 229 S. Halldorsson, E. Lucumi, R. Gómez-Sjöberg and R. M. T. Fleming, Advantages and challenges of microfluidic cell culture in polydimethylsiloxane devices, *Biosens. Bioelectron.*, 2015, **63**, 218–231.
- 230 Qureator Inc, First FDA IND Milestone Achieved Using Human Vascularized Organoid Efficacy Data, 2025, Available from: <https://www.fiercebiotech.com/biotech/patient-deaths-prompt-partial-hold-daiichi-mercks-global-phase-3-adc-program>.

