DOI: https://doi.org/10.17650/2949-5857-2024-14-3-59-68

Emerging trends in oncology: a comprehensive literature review

Kirolos Eskandar
Diakonie Klinik Mosbach, Germany

Contacts: Kirolos Eskandar *kiroloss.eskandar@gmail.com*

Recent decades have witnessed remarkable advancements in the field of oncology, with innovations spanning from novel immunotherapies to precision medicine approaches tailored to individual tumor profiles. This comprehensive literature review explores emerging trends in oncology, encompassing diverse topics such as the genomic landscape of cancer, the advent of liquid biopsies for non-invasive diagnostics, and the intricate interplay between cancer cells and the tumor microenvironment. Additionally, this review delves into the transformative potential of artificial intelligence and machine learning in cancer research and clinical decision-making. Furthermore, it addresses critical issues including cancer epidemiology, disparities in access to care, and strategies for optimizing cancer survivorship and quality of life. By synthesizing recent research findings and highlighting key developments, this review aims to provide a holistic perspective on the evolving landscape of oncology, offering insights that may guide future research directions and enhance patient care outcomes.

Keywords: oncology, cancer, precision medicine, immunotherapy, artificial intelligence

For citation: Kirolos Eskandar. Emerging trends in oncology: a comprehensive literature review. Khirurgiya i onkologiya = Surgery and Oncology 2024;14(3):59–68.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.17650/2949-5857-2024-14-3-59-68

Новые тенденции в онкологии: комплексный обзор литературы

Киролос Эскандар

Diakonie Klinik Mosbach, Германия

Контакты: Киролос Эскандар *kiroloss.eskandar@gmail.com*

В последние десятилетия в области лечения онкологических заболеваний отмечаются значительные достижения: от новых иммунотерапевтических подходов до прецизионного лечения, индивидуализированного по отношению непосредственно к генотипу опухоли. Данный обширный обзор литературы раскрывает новые тенденции в онкологии, охватывая различные темы, такие как генотипический профиль злокачественных опухолей, появление жидкостных биопсий для неинвазивной диагностики, сложное взаимодействие между злокачественными клетками и микроокружением опухоли. Кроме того, в обзоре показан потенциал искусственного интеллекта и машинного обучения в исследованиях злокачественных новообразований и принятии клинических решений; рассматриваются важнейшие вопросы, включая эпидемиологию рака, неравенство в доступе к медицинской помощи и стратегии оптимизации качества жизни и выживаемости при онкологических заболеваниях. Обобщая актуальные исследования и выделяя ключевые результаты, обзор направлен на то, чтобы предоставить целостную перспективу развивающейся сферы онкологии, предлагая идеи, которые могут определить будущие направления исследований, способных улучшить результаты лечения пациентов.

Ключевые слова: онкология, рак, точная медицина, иммунотерапия, искусственный интеллект

Для цитирования: Kirolos Eskandar. Emerging trends in oncology: a comprehensive literature review. Surgery and Oncology 2024;14(3):59–68
DOI: https://doi.org/10.17650/2949-5857-2024-14-3-59-68

Introduction

Over the past several decades, significant strides have been made in the understanding, diagnosis, and treatment of cancer, positioning oncology as a dynamic and rapidly evolving field at the forefront of medical research and clinical practice. The relentless pursuit of innovative

approaches to cancer prevention, detection, and therapy has resulted in a paradigm shift in oncological care, offering new hope to patients worldwide.

Advancements in genomic technologies have revolutionized our understanding of cancer biology, shedding light on the complex interplay of genetic and epigenetic alterations driving tumorigenesis [1]. The elucidation of the genomic landscape of various cancer types has paved the way for the development of targeted therapies aimed at disrupting specific molecular pathways implicated in tumor growth and progression [2]. Furthermore, the advent of precision medicine approaches, which utilize genomic profiling to tailor treatment strategies to the individual genetic makeup of each patient's tumor, holds immense promise for improving therapeutic efficacy and minimizing treatment-related toxicities [3].

In parallel, the emergence of immunotherapy as a transformative treatment modality has revolutionized the landscape of cancer therapy, harnessing the power of the immune system to recognize and eradicate malignant cells [4]. Immune checkpoint inhibitors, such as anti-PD-1 and anti-CTLA-4 antibodies, have demonstrated remarkable efficacy in a variety of cancer types, leading to durable responses and prolonged survival in subsets of patients [5]. Moreover, adoptive cell therapies, including chimeric antigen receptor (CAR) T-cell therapy, have emerged as potent weapons in the arsenal against cancer, offering the potential for long-term remission in patients with refractory disease [6].

In addition to advances in therapeutic modalities, the development of non-invasive diagnostic techniques, such as liquid biopsies, has revolutionized the landscape of cancer detection and monitoring [7]. Liquid biopsies, which entail the analysis of circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA), circulating tumor cells (CTCs), and other biomarkers present in peripheral blood or other bodily fluids, offer a minimally invasive means of interrogating the molecular characteristics of tumors, enabling early detection of cancer recurrence and monitoring of treatment response [8].

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning algorithms into oncology research and clinical practice represents another frontier in the fight against cancer, offering the potential to accelerate the pace of discovery and optimize patient care [9]. AI-powered tools for image analysis, predictive modeling, and drug discovery hold promise for enhancing diagnostic accuracy, predicting treatment outcomes, and identifying novel therapeutic targets [10].

However, despite these remarkable advancements, significant challenges remain in the realm of oncology, including disparities in cancer incidence, access to care, and treatment outcomes [11]. Addressing these disparities requires a multifaceted approach encompassing efforts to promote health equity, increase access to screening and treatment services, and implement culturally competent care delivery models [12].

In light of these considerations, this literature review aims to provide a comprehensive overview of recent developments and emerging trends in the field of oncology. By synthesizing the latest research findings and highlighting key advancements, this review seeks to offer insights that may inform future research directions, guide clinical decision-making, and ultimately improve patient outcomes.

Immunotherapy advancements

In recent years, cancer immunotherapy has emerged as a promising treatment modality revolutionizing the landscape of oncology. Harnessing the power of the immune system to recognize and eradicate cancer cells, immunotherapy offers a novel approach to cancer treatment that complements traditional modalities such as chemotherapy and radiation therapy [4]. Key advancements in cancer immunotherapy include the development and clinical implementation of immune checkpoint inhibitors, chimeric antigen receptor (CAR) T-cell therapy, and cancer vaccines.

Immune checkpoint inhibitors represent a groundbreaking class of immunotherapeutic agents that have demonstrated remarkable efficacy across various cancer types [5]. By targeting inhibitory pathways such as programmed cell death protein 1 (PD-1) and cytotoxic T-lymphocyte-associated protein 4 (CTLA-4), checkpoint inhibitors unleash the antitumor immune response, leading to durable tumor regression and prolonged survival in subsets of patients [13]. Notable examples include pembrolizumab and nivolumab, which have been approved for the treatment of melanoma, non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC), and other malignancies [14].

Another significant advancement in cancer immunotherapy is CAR-T cell therapy, a form of adoptive cell therapy that involves engineering patients' T cells to express chimeric antigen receptors targeting tumor-specific antigens [6]. CAR-T cell therapy has demonstrated remarkable efficacy in hematologic malignancies, particularly in patients with relapsed or refractory B-cell acute lymphoblastic leukemia (B-ALL) and diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (DLBCL) [15]. Approved CAR-T cell therapies such as axicabtagene ciloleucel and tisagenlecleucel have ushered in a new era of personalized cancer treatment, offering hope to patients with otherwise dire prognoses [16].

In addition to checkpoint inhibitors and CAR-T cell therapy, cancer vaccines have emerged as a promising strategy for stimulating antitumor immune responses and preventing cancer recurrence [17]. Cancer vaccines work by priming the immune system to recognize and target tumor-associated antigens, thereby eliciting an adaptive immune response against cancer cells [18]. While early cancer vaccine trials showed limited efficacy, recent advancements in vaccine design and delivery have reinvigorated interest in this approach [19]. Notable examples include the human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccine, which has proven highly effective in preventing HPV-related cervical and oropharyngeal cancers [20].

Overall, the rapid pace of advancements in cancer immunotherapy holds promise for transforming the treatment landscape and improving outcomes for patients with cancer. However, challenges remain, including identifying predictive biomarkers of response, managing immune-related adverse events, and overcoming mechanisms of resistance [21]. Continued research efforts aimed at elucidating the underlying mechanisms of immunotherapy resistance and developing novel therapeutic strategies will be crucial for realizing the full potential of immunotherapy in oncology.

Precision medicine and targeted therapies

Precision oncology, also known as personalized or stratified medicine, represents a paradigm shift in cancer treatment that aims to tailor therapeutic interventions to the individual genetic makeup of each patient's tumor [3]. By leveraging genomic technologies and molecular profiling techniques, precision medicine offers the promise of improved treatment outcomes and reduced treatment-related toxicities [22]. Key advancements in precision oncology include the identification of biomarkers predictive of treatment response and the development of targeted therapies directed against specific molecular targets.

Central to the concept of precision medicine is the identification of predictive biomarkers that can inform treatment selection and guide therapeutic decision-making [23]. Biomarkers may include genetic mutations, gene expression profiles, protein expression levels, or other molecular features associated with tumor biology and response to therapy [24]. Notable examples of predictive biomarkers in oncology include mutations in the epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) gene in non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC), which predict sensitivity to EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs) such as gefitinib and erlotinib [25].

In addition to predictive biomarkers, the development of targeted therapies directed against specific molecular targets has revolutionized the treatment landscape in oncology [26]. Targeted therapies exploit vulnerabilities unique to cancer cells, such as aberrant signaling pathways or overexpressed growth factor receptors, while sparing normal cells from collateral damage [27]. Examples of targeted therapies include small molecule inhibitors, monoclonal antibodies, and antibody-drug conjugates, which selectively target oncogenic drivers such as BRAF mutations in melanoma or HER2 amplification in breast cancer [28].

Furthermore, advances in high-throughput sequencing technologies have enabled comprehensive genomic profiling of tumors, facilitating the identification of actionable alterations and the rational design of targeted treatment strategies [29]. Multigene panel testing, whole-exome sequencing, and whole-genome sequencing have become increasingly accessible tools for characterizing the mutational landscape of tumors and identifying potential therapeutic targets [30]. Moreover, initiatives such as The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) have generated large-scale genomic datasets that serve as valuable resources for elucidating the molecular underpinnings of cancer and identifying novel therapeutic targets [31].

Despite the remarkable progress in precision oncology, challenges remain, including the need for improved biomarker validation, the development of effective combination therapies, and the emergence of resistance mechanisms [32]. Additionally, access to comprehensive genomic profiling and targeted therapies may be limited by factors such as cost, insurance coverage, and geographic location [33]. Addressing these challenges will be critical for realizing the full potential of precision medicine in oncology and optimizing outcomes for patients with cancer.

Genomic landscape of cancer

The genomic landscape of cancer is characterized by a myriad of somatic alterations, including mutations, copy number variations (CNVs), and chromosomal rearrangements, which collectively contribute to the initiation, progression, and therapeutic response of tumors [1]. Recent studies leveraging high-throughput sequencing technologies have provided unprecedented insights into the genomic alterations associated with various types of cancer, elucidating key driver events and signaling pathways implicated in oncogenesis [2].

Mutational profiling of cancer genomes has revealed a diverse array of somatic mutations affecting genes involved in critical cellular processes such as cell proliferation, apoptosis, and DNA repair [34]. Driver mutations, which confer a selective growth advantage to tumor cells, often target oncogenes or tumor suppressor genes, disrupting their normal function and contributing to malignant transformation [35]. For example, mutations in the TP53 tumor suppressor gene are commonly observed in a wide range of cancer types and are associated with increased genomic instability and resistance to therapy [36].

In addition to point mutations, cancer genomes frequently harbor CNVs, encompassing amplifications, deletions, and other structural alterations that affect the dosage of genes critical for tumor growth and survival [37]. Amplifications of oncogenes such as MYC and HER2 are frequently observed in various cancer types and are associated with increased proliferation and aggressive tumor behavior [38]. Conversely, deletions affecting tumor suppressor genes such as PTEN and CDKN2A are implicated in tumor initiation and progression [39].

Chromosomal rearrangements, including translocations, inversions, and fusions, represent another hallmark of cancer genomes, often resulting in the dysregulation of key cellular pathways and the generation of oncogenic fusion proteins [40]. Notable examples include the BCR-ABL fusion gene in chronic myeloid leukemia (CML) and the EML4-ALK fusion gene in non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC), which serve as therapeutic targets for tyrosine kinase inhibitors [41].

Furthermore, advances in genomic technologies, such as next-generation sequencing (NGS) and single-cell sequencing, have enabled comprehensive characterization of intra-tumor heterogeneity and clonal evolution, shedding light on the dynamic nature of cancer progression and treatment resistance [42]. By elucidating the clonal architecture of tumors and identifying subclonal populations with distinct genetic profiles, these studies provide valuable insights into therapeutic vulnerabilities and potential strategies for overcoming resistance [43].

Liquid biopsies

Liquid biopsies have emerged as a revolutionary tool in the field of oncology, offering a non-invasive and minimally invasive approach for cancer diagnosis, prognosis, and treatment monitoring. Unlike traditional tissue biopsies, which require invasive procedures and may not capture the heterogeneity of tumors, liquid biopsies enable the analysis of tumor-derived biomarkers present in bodily fluids such as blood, urine, and cerebrospinal fluid. This approach holds immense promise for personalized cancer care, providing clinicians with real-time insights into tumor dynamics and guiding treatment decisions based on the molecular profile of individual tumors.

At the forefront of liquid biopsies is the analysis of circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA), which consists of small fragments of tumor-derived DNA shed into the bloodstream by apoptotic or necrotic tumor cells. ctDNA carries genetic alterations characteristic of the parental tumor, including point mutations, copy number variations (CNVs), and chromosomal rearrangements. By analyzing ctDNA, clinicians can obtain a comprehensive snapshot of the genomic landscape of cancer, facilitating early detection of cancer, monitoring of treatment response, and detection of minimal residual disease (MRD) following therapy. Recent studies have demonstrated the clinical utility of ctDNA-based liquid biopsies across various cancer types, including lung cancer, colorectal cancer, and breast cancer. For example, in patients with non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC), detection of EGFR mutations in ctDNA has been shown to correlate with treatment response to EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs) and predict the emergence of resistance mutations [44].

In addition to ctDNA, liquid biopsies can capture circulating tumor cells (CTCs), which are rare tumor cells shed into the bloodstream from primary and metastatic tumor sites. CTCs represent a heterogeneous population of cells with varying phenotypic and molecular characteristics, offering insights into tumor heterogeneity, metastatic potential, and treatment response. The enumeration and molecular characterization of CTCs have shown prognostic value in various cancer types, with higher CTC counts associated with poor clinical outcomes. Furthermore, CTCs provide a unique opportunity for real-time monitoring of treatment response and detection of therapeutic targets. For instance, in patients with metastatic breast cancer, HER2-positive CTCs have been identified as potential biomarkers for guiding HER2-targeted therapy [45].

Moreover, liquid biopsies can capture exosomes, small extracellular vesicles released by tumor cells that carry a cargo of proteins, nucleic acids, and other molecules reflective of the parental tumor. Exosomes play a critical role in intercellular communication within the tumor microenvironment and systemic dissemination of tumor-derived material. The analysis of exosomal biomarkers holds promise for non-invasive monitoring of disease progression, assessment of treatment response, and identification of therapeutic targets. Recent studies have demonstrated the clinical relevance of exosomal biomarkers in various cancer types, including prostate cancer, pancreatic cancer, and melanoma. For example, in patients with pancreatic cancer, exosomal microRNAs have been identified as potential biomarkers for early detection and prognostic evaluation [46].

In addition to their diagnostic and prognostic utility, liquid biopsies offer valuable insights into the mechanisms of cancer progression and treatment resistance. By longitudinally monitoring the evolution of tumor-derived biomarkers over the course of treatment, clinicians can identify emerging resistance mechanisms and adapt treatment strategies accordingly. For example, in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer receiving anti-EGFR therapy, the emergence of KRAS mutations in ctDNA has been associated with acquired resistance to therapy and disease progression [47]. Similarly, in patients with hormone receptor-positive breast cancer receiving endocrine therapy, the detection of ESR1 mutations in ctDNA has been correlated with resistance to treatment and disease recurrence [48].

Cancer metabolism

Cancer metabolism refers to the reprogramming of metabolic pathways in cancer cells to sustain their rapid proliferation, survival, and metastatic potential [30]. Mounting evidence suggests that alterations in cellular metabolism are not just bystander effects of oncogenic mutations but rather integral drivers of tumorigenesis and tumor progression [49]. Understanding the metabolic dependencies of cancer cells offers insights into novel therapeutic strategies aimed at exploiting metabolic vulnerabilities to selectively target malignant cells while sparing normal tissues.

One of the hallmark features of cancer metabolism is the preferential utilization of aerobic glycolysis, known as the Warburg effect, wherein cancer cells metabolize glucose to lactate even under normoxic conditions [50]. This metabolic switch provides cancer cells with a rapid source of energy and biomass precursors essential for sustaining their increased proliferative capacity [51]. Moreover, aerobic glycolysis generates metabolic byproducts that contribute to the acidic tumor microenvironment, promoting tumor invasion and metastasis [52].

In addition to increased glycolytic flux, cancer cells exhibit alterations in other metabolic pathways, including amino acid metabolism, lipid metabolism, and nucleotide metabolism [53]. For example, cancer cells often display increased uptake and utilization of glutamine, an essential amino acid that serves as a nitrogen donor for nucleotide synthesis and a carbon source for anaplerotic reactions [54]. Furthermore, dysregulated lipid metabolism, characterized by enhanced de novo lipogenesis and lipid uptake, provides cancer cells with membrane building blocks and signaling molecules critical for tumor growth and survival [55].

The rewiring of metabolic pathways in cancer cells not only fulfills their bioenergetic and biosynthetic demands but also confers metabolic vulnerabilities that can be targeted therapeutically [56]. Several strategies for exploiting metabolic dependencies in cancer cells have been explored, including inhibition of key metabolic enzymes, disruption of nutrient uptake and transport, and modulation of signaling pathways involved in metabolic regulation [57]. Notable examples include targeting glycolysis with small molecule inhibitors of hexokinase or pyruvate kinase, inhibiting glutamine metabolism with glutaminase inhibitors, and disrupting lipid metabolism with fatty acid synthesis inhibitors [58].

Moreover, recent advances in precision medicine and molecular profiling have enabled the identification of metabolic vulnerabilities specific to individual cancer subtypes or molecular subgroups [59]. By integrating genomic, transcriptomic, and metabolomic data, researchers can pinpoint aberrant metabolic pathways driving tumorigenesis and identify druggable targets for therapeutic intervention [60]. For instance, tumors harboring mutations in genes involved in the tricarboxylic acid (TCA) cycle, such as isocitrate dehydrogenase (IDH) or succinate dehydrogenase (SDH) may be sensitive to inhibitors targeting these metabolic pathways [61].

Tumor microenvironment

The tumor microenvironment (TME) is a complex ecosystem comprised of cancer cells, stromal cells, immune cells, and the extracellular matrix (ECM), all of which interact dynamically to regulate tumor growth, metastasis, and therapy response [62]. Emerging evidence suggests that the TME plays a critical role in shaping the behavior of cancer cells and influencing disease progression [63]. Understanding the intricate interplay between cancer cells and their microenvironment is essential for developing effective therapeutic strategies that target both malignant cells and the surrounding stromal components.

One of the key components of the TME is the immune infiltrate, which consists of various immune cell populations, including T cells, B cells, natural killer (NK) cells, macrophages, and dendritic cells [64]. The immune infiltrate exerts dual roles in tumor progression, with certain immune cell subsets promoting tumor growth and metastasis, while others exert anti-tumor activities and suppress tumor growth [65]. For example, tumor-associated macrophages (TAMs) can exhibit pro-tumorigenic functions by promoting angiogenesis, ECM remodeling, and immunosuppression, thereby creating a permissive microenvironment for tumor growth [66]. Conversely, cytotoxic T cells and NK cells play a critical role in immune surveillance and tumor eradication by recognizing and eliminating cancer cells [67].

In addition to immune cells, the TME is rich in stromal cells, including cancer-associated fibroblasts (CAFs), endothelial cells, and pericytes, which contribute to tumor progression through various mechanisms [68].

CAFs are a major component of the tumor stroma and play a critical role in ECM remodeling, angiogenesis, and immune modulation [69]. By secreting growth factors, cytokines, and ECM proteins, CAFs create a supportive niche for tumor growth and metastasis [70]. Moreover, endothelial cells and pericytes facilitate tumor angiogenesis and vascularization, providing oxygen and nutrients essential for tumor survival and dissemination [71].

Furthermore, the ECM, comprising structural proteins such as collagen, fibronectin, and laminin, acts as a scaffold that supports tumor growth and invasion [72]. Aberrant ECM remodeling in the TME promotes tumor cell proliferation, migration, and invasion, contributing to tumor aggressiveness and metastatic spread [73]. Moreover, the ECM serves as a reservoir for growth factors and cytokines that regulate tumor-stromal interactions and modulate immune responses [74].

The dynamic crosstalk between cancer cells and the TME has profound implications for therapy response and treatment resistance [75]. Tumor-stromal interactions can confer resistance to conventional therapies, such as chemotherapy and radiation therapy, by promoting tumor cell survival and reducing drug penetration into the tumor mass [76]. Moreover, immune evasion mechanisms employed by cancer cells, such as upregulation of immune checkpoint molecules (e. g., PD-L1), can impair anti-tumor immune responses and limit the efficacy of immunotherapy [77].

Artificial intelligence and machine learning in oncology

Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) have emerged as powerful tools in cancer research and clinical practice, revolutionizing various aspects of oncology, including image analysis, predictive modeling, and drug discovery [9]. Leveraging large datasets and sophisticated algorithms, AI and ML have the potential to enhance diagnostic accuracy, improve treatment outcomes, and accelerate the development of novel therapeutic strategies [78].

One of the most significant applications of AI and ML in oncology is in medical imaging analysis, where algorithms are trained to interpret radiological images and identify patterns indicative of cancerous lesions [79]. Deep learning techniques, such as convolutional neural networks (CNNs), have shown remarkable performance in tasks such as tumor detection, segmentation, and classification across various imaging modalities, including magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), computed tomography (CT), and positron

emission tomography (PET) [80]. These AI-powered imaging tools can aid radiologists in detecting and characterizing tumors with greater accuracy and efficiency, leading to earlier diagnosis and improved patient outcomes [81].

Furthermore, AI and ML algorithms are being utilized to develop predictive models that stratify patients based on their risk of cancer development, progression, and treatment response [82]. By integrating clinical, genomic, and imaging data, these models can identify prognostic biomarkers, predict treatment outcomes, and guide personalized treatment decisions [83]. For example, predictive models based on gene expression profiles have been developed to estimate the likelihood of recurrence in patients with early-stage breast cancer, informing adjuvant treatment strategies [84]. Similarly, machine learning approaches have been applied to predict response to immunotherapy in patients with advanced melanoma, guiding patient selection and treatment planning [85].

Moreover, AI and ML are playing a pivotal role in accelerating drug discovery and development in oncology [86]. By analyzing large-scale genomic and pharmacological datasets, ML algorithms can identify novel drug targets, predict drug response, and optimize drug combinations [87]. For instance, AI-driven drug screening platforms have been used to identify repurposed drugs with anti-cancer properties, expediting the translation of existing therapies into new indications [88]. Additionally, ML algorithms have been applied to design and optimize synthetic compounds with enhanced potency and selectivity against specific cancer targets, facilitating the development of next-generation therapeutics [89].

Cancer epidemiology and risk factors

Cancer epidemiology aims to identify and characterize the distribution and determinants of cancer incidence and mortality in populations, providing valuable insights into the etiology of cancer and informing preventive strategies [90].

Epidemiological studies have identified a diverse array of risk factors associated with different types of cancer, including environmental exposures, lifestyle factors, and genetic predisposition [91]. Understanding the complex interplay between these risk factors is essential for developing effective cancer prevention and control measures.

Environmental exposures play a significant role in cancer development, with numerous carcinogens present in the air, water, food, and workplace contributing to cancer risk [92]. For example, exposure to tobacco smoke is a well-established risk factor for lung cancer, accounting for a substantial proportion of cancer-related deaths worldwide [93]. Similarly, occupational exposure to asbestos, benzene, and ionizing radiation has been linked to an increased risk of mesothelioma, leukemia, and other cancers [94]. Moreover, environmental pollution, including air pollution and water contamination, has been associated with elevated cancer risk, highlighting the importance of environmental regulation and public health interventions [95].

Lifestyle factors, including diet, physical activity, and alcohol consumption, also play a critical role in cancer development [96]. Diets rich in fruits, vegetables, and whole grains are associated with a reduced risk of certain cancers, such as colorectal cancer, whereas diets high in processed meats, saturated fats, and sugary beverages are associated with an increased risk [97]. Furthermore, physical inactivity and sedentary behavior have been linked to an elevated risk of several cancers, including breast, colon, and endometrial cancer [98]. Additionally, excessive alcohol consumption is a well-established risk factor for various cancers, including liver, esophageal, and breast cancer [99].

Genetic predisposition plays a significant role in cancer susceptibility, with inherited genetic variants contributing to the risk of certain cancers [100]. Hereditary cancer syndromes, such as hereditary breast and ovarian cancer syndrome (caused by mutations in BRCA1 and BRCA2 genes) and Lynch syndrome (caused by mutations in DNA mismatch repair genes), confer an increased risk of developing specific types of cancer at a younger age [101]. Moreover, common genetic variants identified through genome-wide association studies (GWAS) have been associated with modest increases in cancer risk, highlighting the polygenic nature of cancer susceptibility [102]. Integrating genetic information into cancer risk assessment and screening programs can enhance risk stratification and inform personalized prevention strategies [103].

Cancer survivorship and quality of life

Cancer survivorship refers to the period following the completion of cancer treatment, during which individuals continue to live with or beyond cancer, facing various physical, emotional, and psychosocial challenges [104]. As the number of cancer survivors continues to grow due to advances in early detection and treatment, there is increasing recognition of the importance of addressing survivorship issues and promoting the quality of life (QoL) for cancer survivors [105]. Interventions and strategies aimed at improving survivorship outcomes encompass a multidisciplinary approach, including survivorship care plans, psychosocial support, and rehabilitation programs [106].

Survivorship care plans (SCPs) are comprehensive documents that outline a summary of cancer diagnosis and treatment, as well as recommendations for follow-up care and surveillance [107]. SCPs facilitate communication between healthcare providers and survivors, empowering survivors to take an active role in their post-treatment care [108]. Moreover, SCPs serve as valuable tools for addressing survivors' informational needs, providing guidance on managing treatment-related side effects, monitoring for cancer recurrence, and promoting healthy lifestyle behaviors [109]. Evidence suggests that the implementation of SCPs improves patient satisfaction, adherence to surveillance recommendations, and long-term QoL among cancer survivors [110].

Psychosocial support plays a crucial role in addressing the emotional and psychosocial needs of cancer survivors,

helping them cope with the psychological impact of cancer diagnosis and treatment [111]. Psychosocial interventions, such as individual counseling, support groups, and cognitive-behavioral therapy, provide survivors with opportunities to express their feelings, share experiences, and learn coping strategies for managing anxiety, depression, and distress [112]. Additionally, interventions aimed at enhancing social support networks and addressing financial concerns can further contribute to improving survivors' QoL and overall well-being [113].

Rehabilitation programs are integral components of survivorship care, focusing on restoring physical function, mitigating treatment-related side effects, and optimizing survivors' functional independence and quality of life [114]. Cancer rehabilitation services may include physical therapy, occupational therapy, speech therapy, and lymphedema management, tailored to meet the unique needs and preferences of individual survivors [115]. By addressing functional impairments, pain, fatigue, and other treatment-related sequelae, rehabilitation programs help survivors regain confidence, improve mobility, and enhance their overall QoL [116].

Health equity and access to care

Health equity in cancer care refers to the principle that all individuals, regardless of their race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, or geographic location, should have equal opportunities to access high-quality cancer prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and supportive care services [117]. However, disparities persist in cancer incidence, diagnosis, and outcomes, with certain populations experiencing disproportionate burden and poorer survival rates [11]. Addressing these disparities requires a multifaceted approach that encompasses policy interventions, community engagement, and healthcare delivery reforms to promote health equity and ensure access to cancer care for all populations [118].

One of the key determinants of health equity in cancer care is socioeconomic status, which influences access to preventive services, early detection, and timely treatment [119]. Individuals from disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds are more likely to experience barriers to cancer screening and diagnosis, including lack of health insurance, financial constraints, and limited access to healthcare facilities [120]. Moreover, socioeconomic disparities in cancer outcomes are compounded by structural inequities, such as residential segregation, inadequate transportation, and limited availability of healthcare providers in underserved communities [121]. Efforts to address socioeconomic disparities in cancer care require comprehensive strategies that address social determinants of health, expand access to health insurance coverage, and invest in community-based interventions to improve healthcare access and utilization [122].

Racial and ethnic disparities also contribute to inequities in cancer care, with minority populations experiencing higher rates of cancer incidence, late-stage diagnosis, and mortality compared to non-Hispanic White populations [123]. Factors such as cultural beliefs, language barriers, and mistrust of the healthcare system can impede access to cancer prevention and treatment services among racial and ethnic minority groups [12]. Additionally, structural racism and discrimination contribute to disparities in healthcare access and quality of care, further exacerbating health inequities [124]. Initiatives aimed at addressing racial and ethnic disparities in cancer care include culturally competent healthcare delivery, community outreach and education, and targeted interventions to increase participation in cancer screening and clinical trials among minority populations [125].

Geographic disparities in cancer care also pose challenges to health equity, with rural and remote communities facing unique barriers to accessing cancer services [126]. Limited availability of healthcare providers, long travel distances to specialized cancer centers, and insufficient infrastructure for telehealth services contribute to disparities in cancer outcomes among rural populations [127]. Moreover, disparities in cancer mortality rates between urban and rural areas have been attributed to differences in socioeconomic status, health behaviors, and healthcare access [126]. Strategies to address geographic disparities in cancer care include expanding telemedicine services, implementing mobile screening programs, and fostering collaboration between urban and rural healthcare providers to improve access to cancer prevention, diagnosis, and treatment services in underserved areas [128].

Conclusion

In conclusion, this literature review article has provided a comprehensive overview of key advancements and challenges in the field of oncology. From immunotherapy breakthroughs to precision medicine, genomic landscapes, and innovations in cancer diagnosis and survivorship, the diverse array of topics covered reflects the dynamic nature of cancer research and clinical practice. Moreover, the discussion on health equity and access to care underscores the importance of addressing disparities to ensure equitable cancer outcomes for all populations. Moving forward, continued collaboration among researchers, healthcare providers, policymakers, and communities will be essential in advancing cancer care, promoting health equity, and ultimately improving patient outcomes and quality of life.

REFERENCES / ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1. Stratton M.R., Campbell P.J., Futreal P.A. The cancer genome. Nature 2009;458(7239):719–24.
2. Vogelstein B., Papadopoulos N., Velculescu V.E. et al. Cancer genome landscapes. Science 2013;339(6127):1546–58.
3. Garraway L.A., Verweij J., Ballman K.V. Precision oncology: an overview. J Clin Oncol 2013;31(15):1803–5.
4. Mellman I., Coukos G., Dranoff G. Cancer immunotherapy comes of age. Nature 2011;480(7378):480–9.
5. Topalian S.L., Drake C.G., Pardoll D.M. Immune checkpoint blockade: a common denominator approach to cancer therapy. Cancer Cell 2015;27(4):450–61.
6. June C.H., Sadelain M. Chimeric antigen receptor therapy. N Engl J Med 2018;379(1):64–73.
7. Wan J.C.M., Massie C,. Garcia-Corbacho J. et al. Liquid biopsies come of age: towards implementation of circulating tumour DNA. Nat Rev Cancer 2017;17(4):223–38.
8. Siravegna G., Marsoni S., Siena S., Bardelli A. Integrating liquid biopsies into the management of cancer. Nat Rev Clin Oncol 2017;14(9):531–48.
9. Esteva A., Kuprel B., Novoa R.A. et al. Dermatologist-level classification of skin cancer with deep neural networks. Nature 2017;542(7639):115–8.
10. Angermueller C., Pärnamaa T., Parts L., Stegle O. Deep learning for computational biology. Mol Syst Biol 2016;12(7):878.
11. Ward E., Jemal A., Cokkinides V. et al. Cancer disparities by race/ethnicity and socioeconomic status. CA Cancer J Clin 2004;54(2):78–93.
12. Unequal Treatment: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care. Eds. B.D. Smedley, A.Y. Stith, A.R. Nelson. Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 2003.
13. Sharma P., Allison J.P. Immune checkpoint targeting in cancer therapy: toward combination strategies with curative potential. Cell 2015;161(2):205–14.
14. Ribas A., Wolchok J.D. Cancer immunotherapy using checkpoint blockade. Science 2018;359(6382):1350–5.
15. Neelapu S.S., Locke F.L., Bartlett N.L. et al. Axicabtagene ciloleucel CAR T-cell therapy in refractory large B-cell lymphoma. N Engl J Med 2017;377(26):2531–44.
16. Maude S.L., Laetsch T.W., Buechner J. et al. Tisagenlecleucel in children and young adults with B-cell lymphoblastic leukemia. N Engl J Med 2018;378(5):439–48.
17. Sahin U., T reci . Personalized vaccines for cancer immunotherapy. Science 2018;359(6382):1355–60.
18. Rosenberg S.A., Yang J.C., Restifo N.P. Cancer immunotherapy: moving beyond current vaccines. Nat Med 2004;10(9):909–15.
19. Palucka K., Banchereau J. Dendritic-cell-based therapeutic cancer vaccines. Immunity 2013;39(1):38–48.
20. Joura E.A., Giuliano A.R., Iversen O.-E. et al. A 9-valent HPV vaccine against infection and intraepithelial neoplasia in women. N Engl J Med 2015;372(8):711–23.
21. Sharma P., Hu-Lieskovan S., Wargo J.A., Ribas A. Primary, adaptive, and acquired resistance to cancer immunotherapy. Cell 2017;168(4):707–23.
22. Collins F.S., Varmus H. A new initiative on precision medicine. N Engl J Med 2015;372(9):793–5.
23. Schilsky R.L. Personalized medicine in oncology: the future is now. Nat Rev Drug Discov 2010;9(5):363–6.
24. Johnson D.B., Dahlman K.H., Knol J. et al. Enabling a genetically informed approach to cancer medicine: a retrospective evaluation of the impact of comprehensive tumor profiling using a targeted next-generation sequencing panel. Oncologist 2014;19(6):616–22.
25. Pao W., Miller V.A., Politi K.A. et al. Acquired resistance of lung adenocarcinomas to gefitinib or erlotinib is associated with a second mutation in the EGFR kinase domain. PLoS Med 2005;2(3):e73.
26. Hanahan D., Weinberg R.A. Hallmarks of cancer: the next generation. Cell 2011;144(5):646–74.
27. Druker B.J., Talpaz M., Resta D.J. et al. Efficacy and safety of a specific inhibitor of the BCR-ABL tyrosine kinase in chronic myeloid leukemia. N Engl J Med 2001;344(14):1031–7.
28. Baselga J., Swain S.M. Novel anticancer targets: revisiting ERBB2 and discovering ERBB3. Nat Rev Cancer 2009;9(7):463–75.
29. Mardis E.R. The impact of next-generation sequencing technology on genetics. Trends Genet 2008;24(3):133–41.
30. Frampton G.M., Fichtenholtz A., Otto G.A. et al. Development and validation of a clinical cancer genomic profiling test based on massively parallel DNA sequencing. Nat Biotechnol 2013;31(11):1023–31.
31. Weinstein J.N., Collisson E.A., Mills G.B. et al. The cancer genome atlas pan-cancer analysis project. Nat Genet 2013;45(10):1113–20.
32. Van Allen E.M., Wagle N., Levy M.A. Clinical analysis and interpretation of cancer genome data. J Clin Oncol 2013;31(15):1825–33.
33. Prasad V., Fojo T., Brada M. Precision oncology: origins, optimism, and potential. Lancet Oncol 2016;17(2):e81–e86.
34. Lawrence M.S., Stojanov P., Polak P. et al. Mutational heterogeneity in cancer and the search for new cancer-associated genes. Nature 2013;499(7457):214–8.
35. Martincorena I., Campbell P.J. Somatic mutation in cancer and normal cells. Science 2015;349(6255):1483–9.
36. Olivier M., Hollstein M., Hainaut P. TP53 mutations in human cancers: origins, consequences, and clinical use. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol 2010;2(1):a001008.
37. Beroukhim R., Mermel C.H., Porter D. et al. The landscape of somatic copy-number alteration across human cancers. Nature 2010;463(7283):899–905.
38. Dang C.V. MYC on the path to cancer. Cell 2012;149(1):22–35.
39. Knudson A.G. Jr. Mutation and cancer: statistical study of retinoblastoma. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 1971;68(4):820–3.
40. Mitelman F., Johansson B., Mertens F. The impact of translocations and gene fusions on cancer causation. Nat Rev Cancer 2007;7(4):233–45.
41. Rowley J.D. Letter: A new consistent chromosomal abnormality in chronic myelogenous leukaemia identified by quinacrine fluorescence and Giemsa staining. Nature 1973;243(5405):290–3.
42. Navin N., Hicks J. Future medical applications of single-cell sequencing in cancer. Genome Med 2011;3(5):31.
43. McGranahan N., Swanton C. Clonal heterogeneity and tumor evolution: past, present, and the future. Cell 2017;168(4):613–28.
44. Oxnard G.R., Paweletz C.P., Kuang Y. et al. Noninvasive detection of response and resistance in EGFR-mutant lung cancer using quantitative next-generation genotyping of cell-free plasma DNA. Clin Cancer Res 2014;20(6):1698–705.
45. Ignatiadis M., Lee M., Jeffrey S.S. Circulating tumor cells and circulating tumor DNA: challenges and opportunities on the path to clinical utility. Clin Cancer Res 2015;21(21):4786–800.
46. Kahlert C., Melo S.A., Protopopov A. et al. Identification of double-stranded genomic DNA spanning all chromosomes with mutated KRAS and p53 DNA in the serum exosomes of patients with pancreatic cancer. J Biol Chem 2014;289(7):3869–75.
47. Misale S., Yaeger R., Hobor S. et al. Emergence of KRAS mutations and acquired resistance to anti-EGFR therapy in colorectal cancer. Nature 2012;486(7404):532–6.
48. Fribbens C., O'Leary B., Kilburn L. et al. Plasma ESR1 mutations and the treatment of estrogen receptor-positive advanced breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 2016;34(25):2961–8.
49. Pavlova N.N., Thompson C.B. The emerging hallmarks of cancer metabolism. Cell Metab 2016;23(1):27–47.
50. Warburg O. On the origin of cancer cells. Science 1956;123(3191):309–14.
51. Liberti M.V., Locasale J.W. The Warburg effect: how does it benefit cancer cells? Trends Biochem Sci 2016;41(3):211–8.
52. Gatenby R.A., Gillies R.J. Why do cancers have high aerobic glycolysis? Nat Rev Cancer 2004;4(11):891–9.

53. DeBerardinis R.J., Chandel N.S. Fundamentals of cancer metabolism. Sci Adv 2016;2(5):e1600200.
54. Altman B.J., Stine Z.E., Dang C.V. From Krebs to clinic: glutamine metabolism to cancer therapy. Nat Rev Cancer 2016;16(10):619–34.
55. Santos C.R., Schulze A. Lipid metabolism in cancer. FEBS J 2012;279(15):2610–23.
56. Boroughs L.K., DeBerardinis R.J. Metabolic pathways promoting cancer cell survival and growth. Nat Cell Biol 2015;17(4):351–9.
57. Vander Heiden M.G., DeBerardinis R.J. Understanding the intersections between metabolism and cancer biology. Cell 2017;168(4):657–69.
58. Lien E.C., Lyssiotis C.A., Cantley L.C. Metabolic reprogramming by the PI3K-Akt-mTOR pathway in cancer. Recent Results Cancer Res 2016;207:39–72.
59. Hirschey M.D., DeBerardinis R.J., Diehl A.M.E. et al. Dysregulated metabolism contributes to oncogenesis. Semin Cancer Biol 2015;35 Suppl(S):S129–S150.
60. Metallo C.M. Expanding the reach of cancer metabolomics. Cancer Prev Res (Phila) 2012;5(12):1337–40.
61. Mullen A.R., DeBerardinis R.J. Genetically-defined metabolic reprogramming in cancer. Trends Endocrinol Metab 2012;23(11):552–9.
62. Quail D.F., Joyce J.A. Microenvironmental regulation of tumor progression and metastasis. Nat Med 2013;19(11):1423–37.
63. Binnewies M., Roberts E.W., Kersten K. et al. Understanding the tumor immune microenvironment (TIME) for effective therapy. Nat Med 2018;24(5):541–50.
64. Hanahan D., Coussens L.M. Accessories to the crime: functions of cells recruited to the tumor microenvironment. Cancer Cell 2012;21(3):309–22.
65. Fridman W.H., Pagès F., Sautès-Fridman C. et al. The immune contexture in human tumours: impact on clinical outcome. Nat Rev Cancer 2012;12(4):298–306.
66. Mantovani A., Allavena P. The interaction of anticancer therapies with tumor-associated macrophages. J Exp Med 2015;212(4):435–45.
67. Waldhauer I., Steinle A. NK cells and cancer immunosurveillance. Oncogene 2008;27(45):5932–43.
68. Kalluri R., Zeisberg M. Fibroblasts in cancer. Nat Rev Cancer 2006;6(5):392–401.
69. Sahai E., Astsaturov I., Cukierman E. et al. A framework for advancing our understanding of cancer-associated fibroblasts. Nat Rev Cancer 2020;20(3):174–86.
70. hlund D., Elyada E., Tuveson D. Fibroblast heterogeneity in the cancer wound. J Exp Med 2014;211(8):1503–23.
71. Bergers G., Hanahan D. Modes of resistance to anti-angiogenic therapy. Nat Rev Cancer 2008;8(8):592–603.
72. Pickup M.W., Mouw J.K., Weaver V.M. The extracellular matrix modulates the hallmarks of cancer. EMBO Rep 2014;15(12):1243–53.
73. Levental K.R., Yu H., Kass L. et al. Matrix crosslinking forces tumor progression by enhancing integrin signaling. Cell 2009;139(5):891–906.
74. Lu P., Weaver V.M., Werb Z. The extracellular matrix: a dynamic niche in cancer progression. J Cell Biol 2012;196(4):395–406.
75. Egeblad M., Nakasone E.S., Werb Z. Tumors as organs: complex tissues that interface with the entire organism. Dev Cell 2010;18(6):884–901.
76. Straussman R., Morikawa T., Shee K. et al. Tumour micro-environment elicits innate resistance to RAF inhibitors through HGF secretion. Nature 2012;487(7408):500–4.
77. Chen D.S., Mellman I. Elements of cancer immunity and the cancer-immune set point. Nature 2017;541(7637):321–30.
78. McKinney S.M., Sieniek M., Godbole V. et al. International evaluation of an AI system for breast cancer screening. Nature 2020;577(7788):89–94.
79. Litjens G., Kooi T., Bejnordi B.E. et al. A survey on deep learning in medical image analysis. Med Image Anal 2017;42:60–88.
80. Choi H., Jin K.H. Predicting breast tumor proliferation from whole-slide images: the TUPAC16 challenge. Med Image Anal 2019;54:111–21.
81. Yasaka K., Akai H., Abe O., Kiryu S. Deep learning with convolutional neural network in radiology. Jpn J Radiol 2018;36(5):257–72.
82. Coudray N., Ocampo P.S., Sakellaropoulos T. et al. Classification and mutation prediction from non-small cell lung cancer histopathology images using deep learning. Nat Med 2018;24(10):1559–67.
83. Gulshan V,. Peng L., Coram M. et al. Development and validation of a deep learning algorithm for detection of diabetic retinopathy in retinal fundus photographs. JAMA 2016;316(22):2402–10.
84. Parker J.S., Mullins M., Cheang M.C.U. et al. Supervised risk predictor of breast cancer based on intrinsic subtypes. J Clin Oncol 2009;27(8):1160–7.
85. Snyder A., Makarov V., Merghoub T. et al. Genetic basis for clinical response to CTLA-4 blockade in melanoma. N Engl J Med 2014;371(23):2189–99.
86. Topol E.J. High-performance medicine: the convergence of human and artificial intelligence. Nat Med 2019;25(1):44–56.
87. Aliper A., Plis S., Artemov A. et al. Deep learning applications for predicting pharmacological properties of drugs and drug repurposing using transcriptomic data. Mol Pharm 2016;13(7):2524–30.
88. Corsello S.M., Nagari R.T., Spangler R.D. et al. Discovering the anticancer potential of non-oncology drugs by systematic viability profiling. Nat Cancer 2020;1(2):235–48.
89. Liu Y., Yu H., Daley T.P. et al. CRISPR activation screens systematically identify factors that drive neuronal fate and reprogramming. Cell Stem Cell 2018;23(5):758–71.
90. Colditz G.A., Wei E.K. Preventability of cancer: the relative contributions of biologic and social and physical environmental determinants of cancer mortality. Annu Rev Public Health 2012;33:137–56.
91. Bray F., Ferlay J., Soerjomataram I. et al. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA Cancer J Clin 2018;68(6): 394–424.
92. Vineis P., Wild C.P. Global cancer patterns: causes and prevention. Lancet 2014;383(9916):549–57.
93. Torre L.A., Bray F., Siegel R.L. et al. Global cancer statistics, 2012. CA Cancer J Clin 2015;65(2):87–108.
94. Rushton L., Bagga S., Bevan R. et al. Occupation and cancer in Britain. Br J Cancer 2010;102(9):1428–37.
95. Smith K.R., Samet J.M., Romieu I. et al. Indoor air pollution in developing countries and acute lower respiratory infections in children. Thorax 2000;55(6):518–32.
96. Islami F., Goding Sauer A., Miller K.D. et al. Proportion and number of cancer cases and deaths attributable to potentially modifiable risk factors in the United States. CA Cancer J Clin 2018;68(1):31–54.
97. World Cancer Research Fund/American Institute for Cancer Research. Diet, Nutrition, Physical Activity and Cancer: a Global Perspective. Continuous Update Project Expert Report. 2018. Available from: https://www.wcrf.org/dietandcancer
98. Moore S.C., Lee I.M., Weiderpass E. et al. Association of leisure-time physical activity with risk of 26 types of cancer in 1.44 million adults. JAMA Intern Med 2016;176(6):816–25.
99. Shield K.D., Soerjomataram I., Rehm J. Alcohol use and burden for 195 countries and territories, 1990–2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. Lancet 2018;392(10152):1015–35.
100. Lichtenstein P., Holm N.V., Verkasalo P.K. et al. Environmental and heritable factors in the causation of cancer--analyses of cohorts of twins from Sweden, Denmark, and Finland. N Engl J Med 2000;343(2):78–85.
101. Mucci L.A., Hjelmborg J.B., Harris J.R. et al. Familial risk and heritability of cancer among twins in Nordic countries. JAMA 2016;315(1):68–76.
102. Michailidou K., Lindström S., Dennis J. et al. Association analysis identifies 65 new breast cancer risk loci. Nature 2017;551(7678):92–4.

103. Kuchenbaecker K.B., Hopper J.L., Barnes D.R. et al. Risks of breast, ovarian, and contralateral breast cancer for BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutation carriers. JAMA 2017;317(23):2402–16.
104. From Cancer Patient to Cancer Survivor: Lost in Transition. Eds. M. Hewitt, S. Greenfield, E. Stovall. Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 2006.
105. Miller K.D., Siegel R.L., Lin C.C. et al. Cancer treatment and survivorship statistics, 2016. CA Cancer J Clin 2016;66(4): 271–89.
106. McCabe M.S., Bhatia S., Oeffinger K.C. et al. American Society of Clinical Oncology statement: achieving high-quality cancer survivorship care. J Clin Oncol 2013;31(5):631–40.
107. Hewitt M.E., Bamundo A., Day R. et al. Perspectives on post-treatment cancer care: qualitative research with survivors, nurses, and physicians. J Clin Oncol 2007;25(16):2270–3.
108. Salz T., Oeffinger K.C., McCabe M.S. et al. Survivorship care plans in research and practice. CA Cancer J Clin 2012;62(2):101–17.
109. Earle C.C. Failing to plan is planning to fail: improving the quality of care with survivorship care plans. J Clin Oncol 2006;24(32):5112–6.
110. Salz T., McCabe M.S., Onstad E.E. et al. Survivorship care plans: is there buy-in from community oncology providers? Cancer 2014;120(5):722–30.
111. Holland J.C., Andersen B., Breitbart W.S. et al. Distress management. J Natl Compr Canc Netw 2013;11(2):190–209.
112. Jacobsen P.B., Wagner L.I. A new quality standard: the integration of psychosocial care into routine cancer care. J Clin Oncol 2012;30(11):1154–9.
113. Sammarco A. Perceived social support, uncertainty, and quality of life of younger breast cancer survivors. Cancer Nurs 2001;24(3):212–9.
114. Silver J.K., Baima J. Cancer prehabilitation: an opportunity to decrease treatment-related morbidity, increase cancer treatment options, and improve physical and psychological health outcomes. Am J Phys Med Rehabil 2013;92(8):715–27.
115. Stout N.L., Silver J.K., Raj V.S. et al. Toward a national initiative in cancer rehabilitation: recommendations from a subject matter expert group. Arch Phys Med Rehabil 2016;97(11):2006–15.
116. Mustian K.M., Alfano C.M., Heckler C. et al. Comparison of pharmaceutical, psychological, and exercise treatments for cancer-related fatigue: a meta-analysis. JAMA Oncol 2017;3(7):961–8.
117. Braveman P., Gruskin S. Defining equity in health. J Epidemiol Community Health 2003;57(4):254–8.
118. Betancourt J.R., Green A.R., Carrillo J.E. et al. Defining cultural competence: a practical framework for addressing racial/ethnic disparities in health and health care. Public Health Rep 2003;118(4):293–302.
119. Adler N.E., Newman K. Socioeconomic disparities in health: pathways and policies. Health Aff (Millwood) 2002;21(2):60–76.
120. Berkman L.F., Kawachi I. Social epidemiology. Oxford University Press, 2000.
121. Williams D.R., Collins C. Racial residential segregation: a fundamental cause of racial disparities in health. Public Health Rep 2001;116(5):404–16.
122. Graham G.N., Ostrove J.M. Cognitive predictors of socioeconomic differences in health behaviors: a preliminary investigation. J Health Psychol 2000;5(3):357–67.
123. Freeman H.P. Poverty, culture, and social injustice: determinants of cancer disparities. CA Cancer J Clin 2004;54(2):72–7.
124. Gee G.C., Ford C.L. Structural racism and health inequities: old issues, new directions. Du Bois Rev 2011;8(1):115–32.
125. Laveist T.A., Isaac L.A., Williams K.P. Mistrust of health care organizations is associated with underutilization of health services. Health Serv Res 2009;44(6):2093–105.
126. Henley S.J., Anderson R.N., Thomas C.C. et al. Invasive cancer incidence, 2004-2013, and deaths, 2006-2015, in nonmetropolitan and metropolitan counties – United States. MMWR Surveill Summ 2017;66(14):1–13.
127. Coughlin S.S., Thompson T. Colorectal cancer screening practices among men and women in rural and nonrural areas of the United States, 1999. J Rural Health 2004;20(2):118–24.
128. Davis M.M., Renfro S., Pham R. et al. Geographic and population-level disparities in colorectal cancer testing: a multilevel analysis of Medicaid and commercial claims data. Prev Med 2017;101:44–52.

ORCID of author / ORCID автора
Kirolos Eskandar: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0085-3284

Ethics approval and consent to participate. Not applicable.
Одобрение этики и согласие на участие. Неприменимо.

Consent for publication. Not applicable.
Согласие на публикацию. Неприменимо.

Availability of data and material. Data sharing not applicable to this article as no data-sets were generated or analyzed during the current study.
Наличие исходных данных и материалов. Совместное использование данных неприменимо к этой статье, так как во время текущего исследования не было создано или проанализировано ни одного набора данных.

Conflict of interest. The author declares no conflict of interest.
Конфликт интересов. Автор заявляет об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

Funding. The work was performed without external funding.
Финансирование. Работа выполнена без спонсорской поддержки.

Статья поступила: 11.05.2024. **Принята к публикации:** 23.07.2024. **Опубликована онлайн:** 04.09.2024.
Article submitted: 11.05.2024. **Accepted for publication:** 23.07.2024. **Published online:** 04.09.2024.