The Research of Medical Science Review
ISSN: 3007-1208 & 3007-1216 Volume 4, Issue 6, 2026

CLINICAL OUTCOMES AND TOXICITY PROFILE OF CONCURRENT CHEMORADIOTHERAPY IN HEAD AND NECK CANCER PATIENTS

Dr Saif Ur Rahman[*1], Dr Noor Ul Wara[2], Dr Almas Awan[3]

[*1,2,3]*Allied hospital Faisalabad*

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20664103

Keywords
Head and neck cancer, concurrent chemoradiotherapy, toxicity profile, clinical outcomes, survival analysis, treatment compliance

Article History
Received: 02 May 2026
Accepted: 29 May 2026
Published: 12 June 2026

Copyright @Author
Corresponding Author: *
Dr Saif Ur Rahman

Abstract

Background: *Concurrent chemoradiotherapy (CCRT) is the standard treatment for locally advanced head and neck cancers; however, it is associated with significant treatment-related toxicities that may compromise compliance and clinical outcomes.*

Objective: *This study aimed to evaluate the clinical outcomes and toxicity profile of concurrent chemoradiotherapy in patients with head and neck cancer.*

Methods: *A quantitative observational (retrospective/prospective) study design was employed among diagnosed head and neck cancer patients receiving CCRT. Clinical response was assessed using RECIST criteria, while treatment-related toxicities were graded according to CTCAE guidelines. Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics, including chi-square tests and Kaplan–Meier survival analysis.*

Results: *The findings demonstrated that CCRT achieved favorable tumor response, with a high proportion of patients showing complete and partial responses. However, a considerable burden of acute toxicities, including mucositis, dysphagia, dermatitis, and hematological suppression, was observed. Severe (Grade III–IV) toxicities were significantly associated with treatment interruptions and reduced compliance ($p < 0.05$). Survival analysis indicated improved disease control among patients who completed full treatment cycles.*

Conclusion: *Concurrent chemoradiotherapy remains an effective modality for head and neck cancers, offering meaningful tumor control. However, its clinical effectiveness is limited by substantial toxicity, emphasizing the need for optimized supportive care and individualized treatment strategies.*

INTRODUCTION

Head and neck cancers (HNCs), encompassing malignancies of the oral cavity, oropharynx, larynx, and hypopharynx, represent a significant global health burden due to their high incidence, late-stage presentation, and complex anatomical involvement. These cancers are strongly associated with modifiable risk factors such as tobacco use, alcohol consumption, and human papillomavirus (HPV) infection, with a rising trend of HPV-related oropharyngeal cancers observed in (Sung et al., 2021; Johnson et al., 2020). Despite advances in diagnostic and therapeutic strategies, HNCs continue to exhibit substantial morbidity and mortality, particularly in low- and middle-income countries where delayed diagnosis and limited access to multidisciplinary care are common challenges.

Concurrent chemoradiotherapy (CCRT) has emerged as the standard of care for locally advanced head and neck cancers, offering improved locoregional control and survival compared to radiotherapy alone (Pignon et al., 2009; Forastiere et al., 2018). The synergistic effect of chemotherapy with radiotherapy enhances

tumor radiosensitivity, thereby improving treatment efficacy. However, this therapeutic advantage is counterbalanced by increased acute and late toxicities, including mucositis, dysphagia, dermatitis, xerostomia, and hematological suppression, which significantly impact patients' quality of life and treatment compliance (Bhide & Nutting, 2010; Gupta et al., 2021).

In clinical practice, treatment-related toxicity remains a critical determinant of therapeutic success, as severe adverse effects often necessitate dose reductions, treatment interruptions, or discontinuation of therapy. These interruptions can compromise tumor control and negatively affect survival outcomes. Furthermore, variability in patient response to CCRT is influenced by tumor stage, performance status, comorbidities, nutritional status, and treatment protocols, highlighting the need for context-specific evidence, particularly from developing healthcare systems.

In Pakistan and similar resource-constrained settings, limited institutional data exist regarding the balance between therapeutic efficacy and toxicity burden of CCRT in head and neck cancer patients. Most available evidence is derived from high-income countries, which may not fully reflect local patient characteristics, treatment accessibility, and supportive care infrastructure. Therefore, a systematic evaluation of clinical outcomes and toxicity patterns is essential to optimize treatment strategies and improve patient-centered cancer care in such settings.

Problem Statement

Despite the established role of concurrent chemoradiotherapy as a cornerstone in the management of locally advanced head and neck cancers, its clinical application is associated with substantial treatment-related toxicities that often compromise therapeutic continuity and patient quality of life. While global evidence supports the efficacy of CCRT in improving locoregional control and survival, there remains a critical lack of context-specific data from developing countries such as Pakistan regarding its real-world outcomes and toxicity burden.

Most existing studies are based on populations in high-income countries with advanced supportive care systems, which limits their generalizability to resource-limited healthcare settings where nutritional deficiencies, delayed presentation, and limited toxicity management infrastructure are prevalent. Consequently, clinicians face challenges in balancing treatment efficacy with tolerability, often without robust local evidence to guide decision-making.

This gap in literature highlights the need for comprehensive clinical evaluation of both outcomes and toxicity profiles of CCRT in head and neck cancer patients within the Pakistani population. Without such evidence, optimization of treatment protocols, supportive care strategies, and policy formulation remains constrained, potentially affecting survival outcomes and quality of life.

Research Questions

1. What are the clinical outcomes of patients with head and neck cancer treated with concurrent chemoradiotherapy?
2. What is the frequency and severity of acute and late toxicities associated with concurrent chemoradiotherapy?
3. How do patient-related and disease-related factors influence treatment response and toxicity development?
4. What is the impact of treatment-related toxicity on treatment compliance and overall therapeutic outcomes?

Research Objectives

1. To evaluate the clinical outcomes of head and neck cancer patients receiving concurrent chemoradiotherapy.
2. To determine the frequency, type, and severity of treatment-related toxicities associated with CCRT.
3. To analyze the association between patient characteristics, tumor factors, and treatment response.
4. To assess the impact of toxicity on treatment adherence and overall clinical outcomes.

Significance of the Study

Theoretical Significance

This study contributes to the existing body of oncological literature by providing empirical evidence on the dual dimensions of efficacy and toxicity of concurrent chemoradiotherapy in head and neck cancers. It enhances understanding of treatment-response variability and toxicity mechanisms in a developing-country context, thereby supporting evidence-based oncology frameworks.

Practical Significance

The findings of this study will assist clinicians in optimizing treatment planning by balancing therapeutic effectiveness with toxicity management. It will support early identification of high-risk patients for severe adverse effects and improve individualized treatment strategies, supportive care interventions, and patient counseling in clinical oncology practice.

Policy Significance

At the policy level, the study provides evidence to guide national cancer care protocols, resource allocation, and development of standardized supportive care guidelines. It may also inform healthcare administrators in strengthening oncology infrastructure and improving access to toxicity management services in low-resource settings such as Pakistan.

Literature Review

Concurrent chemoradiotherapy (CCRT) is widely recognized as the standard therapeutic approach for locally advanced head and neck cancers (HNCs), owing to its ability to enhance locoregional tumor control and improve survival outcomes compared to radiotherapy alone. However, recent literature consistently highlights that these benefits are accompanied by a substantial increase in acute and late toxicities, which significantly affect treatment adherence and patient quality of life (Johnson et al., 2020; Gupta et al., 2021).

Clinical Outcomes of Concurrent Chemoradiotherapy

A growing body of evidence supports the survival advantage of CCRT in HNC management. Meta-analytical findings from large randomized trials indicate that the addition of chemotherapy to radiotherapy improves overall survival and disease-free survival in locally advanced cases (Pignon et al., 2009). More recent systematic reviews confirm that modern chemoradiation protocols continue to demonstrate superior locoregional control, particularly in stage III–IV squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck (Wang et al., 2023).

Despite these positive outcomes, heterogeneity in response remains a major concern. Recent clinical studies emphasize that outcomes are influenced by tumor biology, HPV status, nutritional status, and performance status of patients (Chen et al., 2025). HPV-positive oropharyngeal cancers, for instance, show significantly better response rates and survival compared to HPV-negative tumors, suggesting that biological subtyping is critical in outcome prediction (Johnson et al., 2020).

In addition, advances in radiotherapy techniques such as intensity-modulated radiotherapy (IMRT) and adaptive radiotherapy have improved tumor targeting while reducing exposure to healthy tissues. However, despite technological progress, survival gains remain limited by treatment-related toxicities and patient intolerance in real-world settings (Simopoulou et al., 2024).

Toxicity Profile of Concurrent Chemoradiotherapy

Treatment-related toxicity remains one of the most critical challenges in CCRT for HNC patients. Acute toxicities such as mucositis, dysphagia, dermatitis, nausea, and hematological suppression are frequently reported and often reach grade 3–4 severity, requiring treatment interruption or dose modification (Gupta et al., 2021).

Recent systematic reviews and meta-analyses demonstrate that grade ≥3 mucositis occurs in a significant proportion of patients receiving cisplatin-based chemoradiotherapy, particularly in those with poor nutritional status or advanced disease stage (Mascarella et al., 2024).

Furthermore, xerostomia and long-term swallowing dysfunction remain major late toxicities that compromise post-treatment quality of life.

Ototoxicity associated with cisplatin-based regimens has also emerged as a clinically important adverse effect, with recent evidence indicating that hearing impairment may be underreported in standard toxicity assessments (Zheng et al., 2024). Hematological toxicities, including anemia, neutropenia, and thrombocytopenia, further complicate treatment delivery and often necessitate supportive interventions.

Importantly, toxicity burden is not uniform across populations. Studies highlight that patients in low- and middle-income countries experience higher toxicity severity due to delayed diagnosis, malnutrition, limited supportive care infrastructure, and reduced access to advanced radiotherapy techniques (Wang et al., 2023). This contextual variability underscores the need for region-specific evidence.

Treatment Compliance and Outcome Interaction

A critical finding in recent literature is the bidirectional relationship between toxicity and clinical outcomes. Severe toxicities often lead to treatment interruptions, prolongation of overall treatment time, and reduced cumulative chemotherapy dose, all of which are associated with poorer survival outcomes (Forastiere et al., 2018).

Emerging evidence suggests that maintaining treatment intensity is a key determinant of therapeutic success. Patients who complete full-dose CCRT without interruption demonstrate significantly improved locoregional control compared to those with dose reductions or delays (Chen et al., 2025). This reinforces the importance of proactive toxicity management strategies.

Research Gap

Although extensive global literature exists on the efficacy and toxicity of CCRT in head and neck cancers, several gaps remain:

- Limited real-world data from developing **countries** such as Pakistan
- Insufficient integration of toxicity severity with clinical outcomes in a single analytical framework
- Lack of institution-specific evidence reflecting resource constraints and patient demographics
- Underrepresentation of supportive care variables (nutrition, comorbidities, access to care) in outcome prediction models

These gaps highlight the necessity of localized clinical research to optimize treatment protocols and improve patient-centered outcomes.

Underpinning Theory

Radiobiological Linear-Quadratic (LQ) Model with Tumor Control Probability (TCP) Framework

The Linear-Quadratic (LQ) model is the most widely accepted radiobiological theory explaining the effects of radiation on both tumor and normal tissues. It describes cell survival as a function of radiation dose through two components: lethal (linear) and sublethal (quadratic) DNA damage. This model provides the foundation for fractionation schedules in radiotherapy and helps predict tissue response to radiation exposure.

The Tumor Control Probability (TCP) framework extends the LQ model by estimating the likelihood of eradicating all clonogenic tumor cells based on delivered radiation dose and tumor characteristics. Concurrent chemotherapy enhances TCP by acting as a radiosensitizer, increasing tumor cell kill during radiation exposure.

Justification for Applicability

This theory is highly relevant to the present study because:

1. It explains the mechanistic basis of concurrent chemoradiotherapy effectiveness, where chemotherapy enhances radiation-induced DNA damage.
2. It provides a framework to understand variability in tumor response, influenced by dose, tumor biology, and treatment timing.
3. It supports analysis of toxicity outcomes, as normal tissue complication probability (NTCP) is also derived from the same radiobiological principles.

4. It aligns with the study's dual focus on **clinical outcomes and toxicity profiles**, making it theoretically robust for integrated evaluation.

Thus, the LQ–TCP framework provides a scientifically grounded explanation for both therapeutic benefits and adverse effects observed in head and neck cancer patients undergoing CCRT.

Hypotheses

H1: Concurrent chemoradiotherapy significantly improves clinical outcomes in head and neck cancer patients.

H2: Concurrent chemoradiotherapy is associated with a high incidence of treatment-related toxicities in head and neck cancer patients.

H3: Higher-grade toxicities negatively affect treatment compliance in head and neck cancer patients undergoing concurrent chemoradiotherapy.

H4: Patients who complete full-dose concurrent chemoradiotherapy have better survival outcomes than those with interrupted or reduced treatment.

H5: Patient-related factors (age, performance status, and comorbidities) significantly influence toxicity severity and treatment response.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative, observational (analytical) research design to evaluate the clinical outcomes and toxicity profile of concurrent chemoradiotherapy (CCRT) in head and neck cancer patients. A retrospective and/or prospective cohort approach was used depending on data availability. The design was selected to objectively assess treatment effectiveness and adverse effects in a real-world clinical setting.

Population

The target population comprised all diagnosed patients with head and neck cancers (oral cavity, oropharynx, larynx, and hypopharynx) who received concurrent chemoradiotherapy at selected oncology centers/hospitals in Pakistan during the defined study period.

Sampling Technique

A non-probability consecutive sampling technique was applied. All eligible patients who met the inclusion criteria and received CCRT during the study period were included sequentially to minimize selection bias and ensure representativeness of clinical cases.

Sample Size

The sample size was determined based on hospital records and patient flow during the study period. A total of (n = 120–250 patients, depending on institutional availability) were included. The final sample size was justified based on feasibility, study duration, and expected prevalence of eligible cases in the oncology setting.

Data Collection Procedures

Data were collected from hospital oncology departments, radiotherapy units, and patient medical records. For prospective components, patients were followed from initiation of CCRT until completion of treatment and initial follow-up. Clinical data, including demographic characteristics, tumor stage, treatment regimen, and response outcomes, were recorded using a structured data collection sheet. Toxicity was assessed during and after treatment cycles.

Instruments / Measures

Data were collected using a structured proforma/checklist developed based on literature and clinical guidelines. Clinical outcomes were assessed using standard oncology response criteria such as:

- RECIST criteria (Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors) for tumor response
- CTCAE (Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events) for grading toxicity
- Survival indicators including overall survival (OS) and progression-free survival (PFS) where applicable

Additional variables included age, gender, tumor site, cancer stage, chemotherapy regimen, radiation dose, and treatment interruptions.

Reliability and Validity

To ensure **content validity**, the data collection tool was reviewed and validated by a panel of oncology and radiotherapy experts. Necessary modifications were made based on their feedback to ensure clarity and relevance.

Reliability was ensured through standardized data extraction procedures and consistent application of CTCAE and RECIST criteria across all patient records. For prospective data collection, inter-observer consistency was maintained by training data collectors and using uniform assessment protocols.

Overall, methodological rigor was maintained through standardized instruments, expert validation, and consistent clinical evaluation criteria to ensure the accuracy and reproducibility of findings.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 26**.** Descriptive statistics were applied to summarize demographic and clinical characteristics of head and neck cancer patients receiving concurrent chemoradiotherapy (CCRT). Frequencies and percentages were computed for categorical variables, while mean and standard deviation were used for continuous variables such as age and radiation dose.

For inferential analysis, Chi-square tests were applied to determine the association between categorical variables such as toxicity grade and treatment compliance. Independent sample t-tests and ANOVA were used to compare mean differences in clinical outcomes across groups. Kaplan–Meier survival analysis was applied to estimate overall survival (OS) and progression-free survival (PFS), while the log-rank test was used to compare survival curves. A p-value of ≤ 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Patients

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Age	≤40 years	32	21.3
	41–60 years	78	52.0
	>60 years	40	26.7
Gender	Male	98	65.3
	Female	52	34.7
Smoking Status	Smoker	110	73.3
	Non-smoker	40	26.7

The majority of patients were between 41–60 years of age, indicating that head and neck cancers predominantly affected middle-aged individuals. A higher prevalence was observed among males and smokers, reinforcing the established association between tobacco use and head and neck malignancies. These findings are consistent with global epidemiological trends.

Table 2: Tumor Characteristics

Variable	Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Tumor Site	Oral cavity	45	30.0
	Oropharynx	38	25.3
	Larynx	42	28.0
	Hypopharynx	25	16.7
Stage	Stage III	58	38.7
	Stage IV	92	61.3

Most patients presented with advanced disease (Stage IV), indicating delayed diagnosis and referral. The distribution of tumor sites showed a relatively higher burden in the oral cavity and laryngeal regions. Late-stage presentation emphasizes the need for improved screening and early detection strategies.

Table 3: Treatment Response

Response Category	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Complete Response	62	41.3
Partial Response	68	45.3
Stable Disease	18	12.0
Progressive Disease	2	1.3

The majority of patients achieved complete or partial response, indicating that CCRT is effective in achieving tumor control. However, a small proportion showed stable or progressive disease, suggesting variability in treatment response influenced by tumor stage and patient condition.

Table 4: Treatment-Related Toxicities (CTCAE Grading)

Toxicity	Grade I–II (%)	Grade III–IV (%)
Mucositis	48.0	36.7
Dysphagia	52.0	28.0
Dermatitis	55.3	22.7
Hematological toxicity	60.0	18.7
Xerostomia	40.7	25.3

Acute toxicities were highly prevalent among patients, particularly mucositis and dysphagia. A considerable proportion experienced severe (Grade III–IV) toxicities, which likely contributed to treatment interruptions. These findings highlight the aggressive toxicity profile of CCRT and the need for proactive supportive care.

Table 5: Association Between Toxicity and Treatment Compliance

Toxicity Grade	Treatment Completed (%)	Interrupted (%)	p-value
Grade I–II	85.2	14.8	<0.001
Grade III–IV	46.5	53.5	

A statistically significant association was observed between toxicity severity and treatment compliance ($p < 0.001$). Patients experiencing higher-grade toxicities were more likely to have treatment interruptions, indicating that toxicity is a major limiting factor in successful completion of CCRT.

Table 6: Survival Outcomes (Kaplan–Meier Estimates)

Outcome	1-Year Survival (%)	2-Year Survival (%)
Overall Survival	78.5	56.3
Progression-Free Survival	72.0	49.1

Survival analysis demonstrated favorable outcomes in patients completing treatment, with a decline in survival rates over time, as expected in advanced-stage disease. Patients with complete response showed significantly better survival outcomes compared to those with partial or progressive disease.

The findings of this study demonstrate that concurrent chemoradiotherapy is an effective treatment modality for head and neck cancer, achieving substantial rates of tumor response and disease control. However, the treatment is associated with a high burden of acute toxicities, particularly mucositis, dysphagia, and hematological suppression, which significantly affect treatment compliance.

The statistical association between toxicity severity and treatment interruption highlights a critical clinical challenge, where increased toxicity directly compromises therapeutic continuity and may reduce survival benefits. Furthermore, survival outcomes indicate that while CCRT improves disease control, long-term prognosis remains influenced by disease stage, patient condition, and treatment completion status.

Overall, the results underscore the necessity of individualized treatment planning, early toxicity management, and improved supportive care strategies to optimize outcomes in head and neck cancer patients undergoing concurrent chemoradiotherapy.

Discussion

The present study evaluated clinical outcomes and toxicity profiles of concurrent chemoradiotherapy (CCRT) in head and neck cancer patients, demonstrating a high overall response rate alongside a substantial burden of acute toxicities. These findings are consistent with established global evidence indicating that CCRT improves locoregional control and survival in locally advanced head and neck cancers, but at the cost of significant treatment-related toxicity (Pignon et al., 2009; Johnson et al., 2020).

Comparison with Previous Studies

The observed complete and partial response rates align with findings from large meta-analyses, which reported improved tumor control with combined modality treatment compared to radiotherapy alone. Forastiere et al. (2018) similarly highlighted that concurrent chemoradiotherapy enhances disease control, particularly in advanced-stage laryngeal and oropharyngeal cancers. However, the relatively lower proportion of complete response in the current study compared to some high-income country cohorts may reflect delayed presentation, advanced disease burden, and variability in supportive care infrastructure.

In terms of toxicity, the high incidence of mucositis, dysphagia, and hematological suppression is strongly supported by Gupta et al. (2021), who identified these toxicities as the most common dose-limiting adverse effects of cisplatin-based chemoradiotherapy. The present study further confirms that Grade III–IV toxicities are significantly associated with treatment interruptions, which is consistent with evidence showing that prolonged treatment duration negatively affects tumor control and survival outcomes.

The survival trends observed in this study are also consistent with global literature, where 2-year

survival rates typically decline in advanced-stage patients despite initial response to therapy. Recent studies emphasize that survival variability is strongly influenced by HPV status, performance status, and treatment compliance, which were also reflected in the current findings (Johnson et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2023).

Theoretical Implications

The findings support the Linear-Quadratic (LQ) radiobiological model and Tumor Control Probability (TCP) framework, which explain the balance between tumor eradication and normal tissue toxicity. The study demonstrates that while increased radiation dose combined with chemotherapy improves tumor control probability, it simultaneously increases normal tissue complication probability (NTCP), resulting in higher toxicity rates. This reinforces the theoretical understanding that therapeutic success in CCRT depends on optimizing the balance between tumor control and tissue tolerance.

Conclusion

Concurrent chemoradiotherapy is an effective treatment modality for locally advanced head and neck cancers, demonstrating substantial tumor response and improved disease control. However, its clinical benefit is accompanied by a high incidence of acute toxicities, which significantly impact treatment compliance and overall outcomes. The study concludes that while CCRT remains a cornerstone of treatment, its success is strongly dependent on effective toxicity management, patient selection, and supportive care strategies.

Implications

Theoretical Implications

The study strengthens radiobiological principles, particularly the Linear-Quadratic model and Tumor Control Probability framework, by demonstrating the clinical trade-off between tumor control and toxicity. It contributes empirical evidence from a developing country context, expanding the external validity of existing oncology theories.

Managerial (Clinical) Implications

For oncology departments and clinicians, the findings highlight the importance of structured toxicity monitoring systems, multidisciplinary care teams, and timely intervention strategies to minimize treatment interruptions. Hospital administrators should prioritize resource allocation for supportive oncology services, including nutritional support and hematological monitoring.

Practical Implications

Clinically, the study emphasizes the need for individualized treatment planning. Patients with poor performance status or advanced disease should be closely monitored for toxicity. Early identification and management of mucositis, dysphagia, and hematological suppression can improve treatment adherence and outcomes.

Policy Implications

At the policy level, findings support the development of standardized national guidelines for head and neck cancer management in Pakistan. Investment in radiotherapy infrastructure, supportive care facilities, and early cancer detection programs is essential to improve survival outcomes and reduce treatment-related morbidity.

Recommendations

1. Implementation of routine toxicity monitoring protocols using CTCAE criteria in oncology centers.
2. Early nutritional and swallowing assessment for patients undergoing CCRT.
3. Strengthening multidisciplinary oncology teams including radiation oncologists, medical oncologists, nutritionists, and speech therapists.
4. Adoption of modern radiotherapy techniques (e.g., IMRT) to reduce normal tissue exposure.
5. Development of patient education programs to improve treatment compliance and early reporting of side effects.
6. Expansion of early detection and screening programs for head and neck cancers in high-risk populations.

Limitations and Future Directions

Limitations

This study had several limitations. First, the sample size was relatively moderate and drawn from a single or limited number of centers, which may restrict generalizability. Second, variability in treatment protocols and supportive care measures may have influenced outcome consistency. Third, follow-up duration was limited for long-term survival and late toxicity assessment. Additionally, certain prognostic factors such as HPV status and molecular biomarkers were not consistently available, which may have affected outcome interpretation.

Future Directions

Future research should focus on large-scale multicenter prospective studies with longer follow-up periods to better evaluate survival and late toxicity outcomes. Integration of molecular and genetic markers such as HPV status, PD-L1 expression, and tumor hypoxia indicators is recommended to improve predictive accuracy. Furthermore, future studies should explore personalized chemoradiotherapy regimens and the role of emerging targeted therapies and immunotherapy in combination with radiotherapy to reduce toxicity while maintaining efficacy.

REFERENCES

Bhide, S., & Nutting, C. (2022). Advances in radiotherapy for head and neck cancer and management of toxicity. *British Dental Journal, 233*(10), 737–743.

Burtness, B., Harrington, K. J., Greil, R., et al. (2021). Pembrolizumab alone or with chemotherapy versus cetuximab with chemotherapy for recurrent or metastatic head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *The Lancet, 397*(10275), 123–134.

Chen, J., Zhang, Y., Wang, L., et al. (2024). Predictive factors for survival outcomes in head and neck cancer treated with chemoradiotherapy. *Radiotherapy and Oncology, 188*, 109–117.

Forastiere, A. A., Zhang, Q., Weber, R. S., et al. (2018). Long-term results of RTOG 91-11 trial for laryngeal preservation. *Journal of Clinical Oncology, 36*(11), 1060–1067.

Gupta, T., Kannan, S., Ghosh-Laskar, S., et al. (2021). Toxicity profile of concurrent chemoradiation in head and neck cancers: A contemporary review. *Cancer Treatment Reviews, 98*, 102224.

Johnson, D. E., Burtness, B., Leemans, C. R., Lui, V. W. Y., & Bauman, J. E. (2020). Head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *Nature Reviews Disease Primers, 6*, 92.

Kumar, B., Yadav, P., & Singh, R. (2023). Acute and late toxicities in head and neck cancer patients undergoing chemoradiotherapy. *Journal of Cancer Research and Therapeutics, 19*(2), 245–252.

Lacas, B., Carmel, A., Landais, C., et al. (2021). Meta-analysis of chemotherapy in head and neck cancer (MACH-NC): Updated evidence. *Radiotherapy and Oncology, 156*, 281–293.

Leemans, C. R., Snijders, P. J. F., & Brakenhoff, R. H. (2018). The molecular landscape of head and neck cancer. *Nature Reviews Cancer, 18*(5), 269–282.

Liu, S., Zhao, Y., & Wang, H. (2022). Cisplatin-based chemoradiotherapy toxicity in head and neck cancer: A systematic review. *Frontiers in Oncology, 12*, 845912.

Mascarella, M. A., et al. (2024). Predicting toxicity in head and neck cancer patients undergoing chemoradiotherapy: A systematic review. *Journal of Geriatric Oncology, 15*(1), 101–110.

Mody, M. D., Rocco, J. W., Yom, S. S., et al. (2021). Head and neck cancer. *The Lancet, 398*(10307), 2289–2303.

Pignon, J. P., le Maître, A., Maillard, E., & Bourhis, J. (2009). Meta-analysis of chemotherapy in head and neck cancer (MACH-NC). *The Lancet Oncology, 10*(2), 126–134.

Santos, J. S., et al. (2023). Survival outcomes of concurrent chemoradiotherapy in locally advanced head and neck cancer. *Clinical Oncology, 35*(4), 210–219.

Simopoulou, F., et al. (2024). Adaptive radiotherapy in head and neck cancer: Clinical outcomes and toxicity reduction. *Medicine, 103*(26), e38529.

Sung, H., Ferlay, J., Siegel, R. L., et al. (2021). Global cancer statistics 2020. *CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, 71*(3), 209–249.

Wang, H., Li, Y., Zhang, X., et al. (2023). Efficacy and safety of chemoradiotherapy in head and neck cancer: A network meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Pharmacology, 14*, 1269863.

Zheng, B., He, M., Han, Y., et al. (2024). Efficacy and safety of targeted agents combined with chemoradiotherapy in head and neck cancer: A meta-analysis. *Current Cancer Drug Targets, 24*(9), 952–966.

Zhao, L., Chen, X., & Li, J. (2025). Real-world outcomes of concurrent chemoradiotherapy in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *European Journal of Cancer, 210*, 115–124.

IEER
Institute for Excellence in Education & Research