Integrating Physical Therapy and Dental Care in the Rehabilitation of Patients with Head and Neck Cancer a Multidisciplinary Approach

Wafa Abdulaziz S Alhazmi[1], Rehab Abdrabalrasoul Al Ohaid[2], Fatimah Mohammed Abu Deeb[3], JwHara Wasel Al Sulami[4], Nouf Mansour Al Suliman[5], Zahrah Abdullah Al Sahwan[6], Walaa Hassan Albrahim[7], Fatimah Abdullah Al Sahwan[8], Azhar Saleh Mohammed Alashour[9], Alaithan Sheeth Mohammed[10], Wadia Jumah Alhameed[11]

[1] Dentist, Madinah Health Cluster, Email: waabalhazmi@moh.gov.sa
[2] Nurse, Health Care Administration, Preventive Medical, Email: rwaheed@moh.gov.sa
[3] Nurse, Health Care Administration, Preventive Medical, Email: fabudeeb@moh.gov.sa
[4] Nurse Specialist, Alwaha PHC MOH Eastern Jeddah Hospital, Email: jwalsulami@moh.gov.sa
[5] Nurse, Health Care Administration, Preventive Medical, Email: nmalsuliman@moh.gov.sa
[6] Nursing, Prince Mohammad bin Fahad Hospital, Email: zalsahwan@moh.gov.sa
[7] General Nursing, Prince Mohd Bin Fahad Hospital, Email: loyality_83@hotmail.com
[8] Physiotherapist, Al Naeriyah General Hospital, Email: falsahwan@moh.gov.sa
[9] Nursing, Prince Mohammed Bin Fahad Hospital, Email: aalashour@moh.gov.sa
[10] Physiotherapist, King Faisal General Hospital
[11] Health Services and Hospital Management Specialist, Qatif Central Hospital, Email: wadia2002@gmail.com

Abstract

The management of head and neck cancer (HNC) has evolved to achieve higher survival rates, yet patients frequently endure severe and persistent functional deficits that profoundly diminish their quality of life (QoL). The complex pathophysiology of treatment sequelae—including tissue fibrosis, neurovascular injury, and salivary gland dysfunction—demands a rehabilitation approach that transcends traditional, siloed care. This paper argues for the imperative of a fully integrated, multidisciplinary model that strategically unites physical therapy and dental care from pre-treatment through long-term survivorship. It delineates the distinct yet complementary roles of these disciplines: physical therapy in restoring cervical and shoulder mobility, managing trismus and lymphedema, while dental care focuses on pre-emptive oral management, mucositis control, and prosthetic rehabilitation. The paper further explores the critical importance of interdisciplinary assessment using shared metrics and patient-reported outcomes to guide care, and emphasizes the necessity of a patient-centered framework that prioritizes education, adherence, and QoL as the ultimate markers of success. By synthesizing evidence on interventions, protocols, and collaborative strategies, this research concludes that the systematic integration of physical therapy and dental care is not merely beneficial but essential for achieving the overarching goal of HNC rehabilitation: to help patients regain function, dignity, and a meaningful life after cancer.

Keywords- Head and Neck Cancer, Multidisciplinary Rehabilitation, Physical Therapy, Dental Care, Quality of Life, Trismus, Dysphagia, Osteoradionecrosis, Patient-Centered Care, Interdisciplinary Collaboration, Survivorship, Functional Outcomes.

Introduction:

Head and neck cancer (HNC) represents a significant global health challenge, encompassing a diverse group of malignancies affecting the oral cavity, pharynx, larynx, sinuses, and salivary glands. Ranked as the seventh most common cancer worldwide, its etiology is strongly linked to modifiable risk factors such as tobacco use, alcohol consumption, and increasingly, infection with oncogenic strains of the human papillomavirus (HPV) [1]. The primary treatment arsenal for HNC—surgery, radiation therapy (RT),

and chemotherapy, often used in aggressive multimodal regimens—has evolved considerably, leading to markedly improved survival and locoregional control rates. However, this therapeutic success is a double-edged sword, as the survival gains are frequently shadowed by a heavy burden of long-term morbidity. The anatomical and functional complexity of the head and neck region means that life-saving treatments invariably inflict collateral damage on critical structures responsible for breathing, swallowing, speech, and facial expression, profoundly impacting a patient's quality of life (QoL) [2].

The sequelae of HNC treatment are both multifaceted and severe. Surgical resection can lead to significant tissue defects, altered anatomy, and damage to cranial and peripheral nerves, resulting in functional impairments and cosmetic deformities [3]. Radiation therapy, while highly effective at eradicating microscopic disease, induces progressive fibrosis and scarring in muscles, blood vessels, and connective tissues. This can manifest as trismus (severely restricted jaw opening), cervical dystonia (limited neck mobility), xerostomia (chronic dry mouth), and dysphagia (impaired swallowing) [4]. Chemotherapy, particularly when combined with RT as chemoradiation, exacerbates acute toxicities like mucositis and potentiates long-term tissue damage. The cumulative effect is a patient population that, while potentially cured of cancer, is often left with a constellation of chronic disabilities that impede their return to a normal personal, social, and professional life [5]. This reality has catalyzed a critical shift in oncologic care, moving the paradigm from a narrow focus on survival metrics toward a broader, more humane emphasis on "functional survival" and the optimization of long-term health-related QoL.

In recognition of this complexity, the standard of care for HNC management has progressively adopted the multidisciplinary team (MDT) approach. This model convenes a diverse group of specialists—including surgical, medical, and radiation oncologists, pathologists, radiologists, nurse navigators, dietitians, and speech-language pathologists (SLPs)—to collaboratively design and execute a comprehensive treatment plan from diagnosis through survivorship [6]. The MDT framework has demonstrably improved diagnostic accuracy, treatment planning, and clinical outcomes. Yet, a significant gap often remains in the consistent and early integration of two rehabilitation-focused disciplines that are pivotal to functional recovery: physical therapy and dental care. Traditionally, these specialties have been relegated to a reactive, consultative role, brought into the patient's journey only after debilitating complications have already arisen. This fragmented approach fails to capitalize on the potential for proactive prevention and early intervention, leaving patients to navigate a disjointed rehabilitation process.

The Distinct and Complementary Roles of Physical Therapy and Dental Care

To appreciate the power of their integration, one must first understand the critical and distinct contributions of physical therapy and dental care within the HNC continuum. The scope of physical therapy in this context is extensive and spans the entire care timeline. In the pre-treatment phase, physiotherapists conduct baseline assessments of neck and shoulder range of motion (ROM), mandibular function, and functional capacity. This serves not only for prognostic purposes but also for patient education and the initiation of pre-habilitation exercises, which have been shown to improve post-treatment recovery outcomes [7]. Following treatment, PT interventions are indispensable. For cervical dysfunction, therapists employ targeted manual therapy, stretching, and strengthening exercises to combat radiation-induced fibrosis and maintain neck mobility [8]. For the common and debilitating shoulder dysfunction following neck dissection (particularly those affecting the spinal accessory nerve), physical therapists utilize neuromuscular re-education, scapular stabilization exercises, and modalities like functional electrical stimulation to manage pain and weakness, a condition known as shoulder syndrome [9].

Concurrently, the role of specialized dental care—provided by general dentists with oncology training and prosthodontists—is equally vital and structurally focused. The oral cavity is frequently the primary site of both the disease and its treatment-related toxicities. Dental interventions must begin with a comprehensive pre-treatment evaluation to eliminate septic foci,

perform necessary extractions, and manage periodontal disease. This is a critical prophylactic measure to prevent one of the most severe complications of RT: osteoradionecrosis (ORN) of the jaws [10]. Throughout and after cancer treatment, dental professionals are on the front lines managing oral mucositis, combating radiation caries accelerated by xerostomia, and providing topical fluoride regimens. Beyond managing disease, their rehabilitative role is profound. They are essential in fabricating prosthetic devices, such as obturators to close palatal defects after maxillectomy or mandibular guidance appliances to manage trismus, which are instrumental in restoring the prerequisites for swallowing and intelligible speech [11].

While the individual value of these disciplines is clear, their true transformative potential is realized only through deep, systematic integration. The functional outcomes they target are not isolated but exist in a state of profound interdependence. For example, the success of a physical therapist in restoring cervical extension and shoulder girdle stability directly enables the safe and effective laryngeal elevation necessary for a protective swallow—a synergy crucial for the SLP's efforts. Conversely, the most expertly designed dental prosthesis will fail if the patient suffers from severe trismus, preventing its insertion or impairing the tongue mobility needed to control food and saliva. Trismus itself is a prime exemplar of this synergy, as its management requires both the mechanical interventions from dentistry (e.g., dynamic bite openers) and the therapeutic exercises from physical therapy (e.g., passive stretching) [12]. A patient with uncontrolled dental pain or infection cannot fully engage in physical rehabilitation, and a patient with limited neck mobility cannot maintain adequate oral hygiene. When these disciplines operate in silos, critical gaps in care emerge, leading to delayed recovery, suboptimal functional outcomes, patient frustration, and ultimately, increased healthcare utilization.

Pathophysiology of Complications in Head and Neck Cancer Rehabilitation

The formidable challenge of rehabilitating patients with head and neck cancer (HNC) is rooted in the intricate and often severe pathophysiological sequelae induced by the disease itself and its necessary, yet destructive, treatments. Understanding these underlying mechanisms is crucial for developing effective, targeted rehabilitation strategies. The pathophysiological landscape can be broadly categorized into the effects of surgery, the multifaceted damage from radiation therapy, and the compounding impact of chemotherapy. Surgical interventions, while aimed at complete tumor resection, inevitably result in significant anatomical and functional disruption. The removal of muscles, nerves, bones, and soft tissues creates structural defects that directly impair core functions. For instance, a glossectomy (partial or total removal of the tongue) devastates the oral phase of swallowing and articulation, while a mandibulectomy alters the foundational architecture of the lower face, leading to malocclusion and drooping [13]. Perhaps one of the most neurologically impactful procedures is the neck dissection, particularly the radical type, which sacrifices the spinal accessory nerve (Cranial Nerve XI). This leads to denervation of the trapezius and sternocleidomastoid muscles, resulting in the debilitating "shoulder syndrome" characterized by pain, winging of the scapula, and profound weakness, which severely limits overhead arm motion and activities of daily living [14]. Furthermore, the disruption of lymphatic drainage during surgery predisposes patients to lymphedema, a chronic swelling of the face and neck that can cause pain, tightness, and further restrictions in mobility [15].

Radiation therapy (RT), a cornerstone of organ-preservation and adjuvant treatment, inflicts its damage through a complex and progressive pathophysiology that continues long after treatment concludes. The acute effects are primarily due to the destruction of rapidly dividing epithelial cells, leading to mucositis, dermatitis, and taste loss. However, it is the late effects that pose the greatest challenge to long-term rehabilitation. The central pathological process is a progressive tissue fibrosis mediated by a chronic inflammatory state and the sustained activation of fibroblasts. Radiation induces the persistent expression of pro-fibrotic cytokines, most notably Transforming Growth Factor-Beta (TGF-β), which promotes the excessive deposition of collagen and other extracellular matrix components [16]. This

fibrosis is not a static event but a dynamic process that evolves over months to years, leading to the stiffening and contraction of muscles, blood vessels, and connective tissues. In the masticatory system, this manifests as trismus, as the fibrosis of the pterygoid muscles, masseter, and temporalis, along with the temporomandibular joint (TMJ) capsule, severely restricts mandibular opening [17]. In the neck, radiation fibrosis syndrome causes a palpable woody induration, leading to pain, reduced cervical range of motion, and can even contribute to cervical kyphosis.

The pathophysiological impact of radiation extends profoundly to the highly specialized tissues of the upper aerodigestive tract. The salivary glands are exquisitely radiosensitive. Radiation causes apoptosis of acinar cells, vascular damage, and inflammatory infiltration, leading to a precipitous and often permanent decline in saliva production, a condition known as xerostomia [18]. The loss of saliva's lubricating, buffering, and antimicrobial properties has a catastrophic domino effect on oral health. It leads to a rapid shift in oral flora, promoting the growth of cariogenic bacteria like *Streptococcus mutans* and *Lactobacillus*, resulting in a rampant and atypical form of tooth decay known as radiation caries, which often affects the cervical and incisal surfaces of the teeth [19]. The most severe dental complication, osteoradionecrosis (ORN) of the jaw, represents a state of hypovascular, hypocellular, and hypoxic tissue. The "3H" theory posits that radiation causes endarteritis obliterans, leading to reduced blood flow and tissue hypoxia. This compromised state impairs the bone's ability to respond to trauma or infection (such as from a tooth extraction or dental caries), leading to necrosis and bone exposure that fails to heal for months [20]. This pathophysiology underscores the critical importance of pre-radiation dental screening and lifelong meticulous oral care.

The swallowing mechanism, or deglutition, is uniquely vulnerable to the combined pathophysiological insults of HNC treatment. Radiation-induced fibrosis affects the key muscles and connective tissues responsible for all phases of swallowing. Reduced base of tongue mobility and retraction impairs the oral phase and bolus propulsion. Fibrosis of the pharyngeal constrictors and suprahyoid muscles limits hyolaryngeal excursion, which is critical for airway protection and opening the upper esophageal sphincter during the pharyngeal phase [21]. Sensory neuropathy from damage to the glossopharyngeal (CN IX) and vagus (CN X) nerves further compounds the problem by diminishing the afferent trigger for the swallow reflex, leading to silent aspiration where food or liquid enters the airway without a protective cough. Chemotherapy, when used as part of concurrent chemoradiation protocols, acts as a radiosensitizer, exacerbating the severity and duration of many of these toxicities. It intensifies mucositis, xerostomia, and dermatitis, and can cause its own neuropathies, adding another layer of complexity to the patient's functional decline and pain profile [22].

Beyond these physical alterations, the pathophysiological processes have profound psychosocial consequences that are integral to the rehabilitation challenge. Chronic pain is a common and debilitating issue, arising from a combination of neuropathic pain (due to nerve damage during surgery or from perineural invasion), nociceptive pain (from tissue inflammation and fibrosis), and myofascial pain syndromes. The constant discomfort contributes to anxiety, depression, and sleep disturbances. The visible changes from surgery, such as disfigurement, and the functional losses like an altered voice or the need for a feeding tube, can lead to significant body image disturbance and social isolation [23]. The inability to eat normally—one of life's fundamental pleasures—is a particularly profound loss, leading to nutritional deficiencies, weight loss, and a diminished enjoyment of social gatherings that revolve around food [23].

Physical Therapy Interventions:

The role of physical therapy (PT) in the rehabilitation of head and neck cancer (HNC) patients is both proactive and restorative, guided by a set of core principles designed to counteract the specific pathophysiological sequelae of cancer treatments. The foundational principle of this rehabilitative approach is the concept of pre-habilitation, which involves initiating interventions *before* the commencement of surgery or radiation. The rationale is to establish a baseline of function, educate the patient on impending

challenges, and build physiological reserve, thereby potentially mitigating the severity of future impairments and improving post-treatment recovery capacity [24]. A second, equally critical principle is the need for a continuous and phased intervention model. Rehabilitation is not a single episode of care but a long-term process that evolves from the pre-treatment phase, through the acute treatment period, and into long-term survivorship, with goals and interventions adapting to the patient's changing condition [25]. Finally, PT in this population must be highly individualized and functionally oriented, addressing the specific deficits resulting from the patient's unique cancer location, treatment type, and personal goals, with the overarching aim of restoring independence in activities of daily living (ADLs) and improving overall quality of life.

The protocols for physical therapy intervention are structured to target the most common and debilitating impairments: cervical dysfunction, shoulder pathology, trismus, and lymphedema. For the cervical spine, the intervention protocol begins with a comprehensive assessment of active and passive range of motion (ROM). Treatment typically involves a combination of manual therapy techniques, such as soft tissue mobilization and gentle joint mobilizations, to address the fibrotic restrictions. This is complemented by a prescribed home exercise program of active and passive stretching to maintain and improve neck flexion, extension, rotation, and lateral flexion [26]. The emphasis is on consistent, daily stretching to combat the progressive nature of radiation fibrosis. For shoulder dysfunction, particularly after spinal accessory nerve injury, the PT protocol is multifaceted. It includes neuromuscular re-education to facilitate compensatory muscle activation, scapular stabilization exercises to improve dynamic control of the shoulder blade, and progressive strengthening of the remaining rotator cuff and periscapular muscles. Modalities such as functional electrical stimulation may be used to facilitate muscle contraction and reduce pain, while activity modification strategies are taught to protect the vulnerable joint during functional tasks [27].

The management of trismus requires a dedicated and persistent protocol due to the significant impact on nutrition, oral hygiene, and communication. The cornerstone of trismus management is the implementation of a regular stretching regimen using mechanical devices or manual techniques. Patients are often prescribed a dynamic jaw-opening device, such as a TheraBite® or Dynasplint®, which provides a low-load, prolonged stretch to the masticatory muscles and temporomandibular joint (TMJ) structures [28]. The protocol dictates consistent use, typically several times per day, with the force and duration progressively increased as tolerated. These mechanical stretches are often combined with manual self-stretching exercises and active ROM exercises. The evidence strongly supports that early initiation of these interventions, ideally before the onset of significant fibrosis, leads to superior outcomes in maintaining mandibular function [29]. For head and neck lymphedema, which can be both externally visible and internally debilitating, PT interventions are specialized and fall under the domain of Complete Decongestive Therapy (CDT). This comprehensive protocol involves two phases. The intensive Phase I includes manual lymphatic drainage (MLD), a light-touch massage technique designed to stimulate the lymphatic vessels and redirect fluid flow toward functioning lymph basins [30]. This is immediately followed by the application of multi-layered, short-stretch compression bandaging to maintain the reduction achieved through MLD. Patient education on meticulous skin care is integral to prevent infection. Phase II is the lifelong maintenance phase, where the patient is taught self-management strategies, including self-MLD and the use of custom-fitted compression garments, to sustain the volume reduction achieved in the first phase.

The integration of these PT protocols with other disciplines is paramount for maximizing patient outcomes. The interplay with dental care is a prime example. A physical therapist's success in improving jaw opening through trismus management directly enables a dentist or prosthodontist to perform adequate oral examinations, deliver restorative care, and fabricate or adjust prosthetic devices like obturators [31]. Conversely, a dentist's management of oral pain and infection allows the patient to participate more fully in their PT exercises. Similarly, the work of the physical therapist is synergistic with that of the

speech-language pathologist (SLP). Improved neck extension and shoulder girdle stability, achieved through PT, are biomechanical prerequisites for effective laryngeal elevation and safe swallowing, which are the primary focus of the SLP's dysphagia therapy [32]. This collaborative approach ensures that the rehabilitative efforts are not siloed but are instead part of a cohesive strategy to restore the complex, integrated functions of the head and neck.

The outcomes of a well-structured and timely physical therapy program are measurable and profoundly impactful on the patient's life. At the impairment level, studies have demonstrated statistically significant improvements in objective measures, including cervical ROM, mandibular opening (inter-incisal distance), and shoulder active range of motion (AROM) and strength [33]. These gains translate directly into functional improvements, such as the ability to turn the head while driving, open the mouth wide enough to eat solid foods, and reach overhead shelves without pain. Perhaps the most significant outcome is the positive effect on health-related quality of life (HRQoL). Validated patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs), such as the University of Washington Quality of Life scale (UW-QoL) and the Neck Dissection Impairment Index (NDII), consistently show that patients who participate in comprehensive PT report lower levels of pain, less disability, and better overall social and emotional function compared to those who do not receive such rehabilitation [34]. Furthermore, by preventing or mitigating severe complications like frozen shoulder and debilitating trismus, physical therapy plays a crucial role in reducing long-term healthcare costs and utilization.

Dental Care Strategies:

The role of dental care in the multidisciplinary management of head and neck cancer (HNC) is a continuous and dynamic process, spanning from pre-treatment preparation to long-term survivorship. Its strategies are fundamentally proactive, aiming to prevent complications, manage unavoidable side effects, and restore form and function to the stomatognathic system. These strategies can be systematically categorized into three critical domains: the foundational pillar of comprehensive oral health management, the acute-phase challenge of mucositis management, and the long-term goal of functional and aesthetic rehabilitation. The success of this tripartite approach is entirely dependent on the seamless integration of dental professionals into the oncology team from the moment of diagnosis, ensuring that oral considerations are not an afterthought but a core component of the therapeutic plan [35].

The cornerstone of dental management in HNC is the pre-treatment phase, which is arguably the most critical window for preventing severe long-term sequelae. The primary objective during this period is to create an oral environment that is as healthy and resilient as possible before the onslaught of radiation and/or chemotherapy. This begins with a comprehensive dental evaluation, including a full-mouth periodontal charting and necessary radiographs, to identify and eliminate all potential sources of infection and trauma [36]. Key interventions include the extraction of teeth with a poor prognosis, such as those with significant periodontal involvement, periapical pathology, or within the high-dose radiation field. This aggressive approach is the first and most important line of defense against osteoradionecrosis (ORN). Furthermore, meticulous scaling and root planing are performed to establish optimal periodontal health. Perhaps the most enduring pre-treatment strategy is the fabrication of custom fluoride trays. Patients are instructed on the lifelong daily application of high-concentration fluoride gel to remineralize enamel and dramatically reduce the risk of radiation caries, a direct consequence of post-radiation xerostomia [37]. This pre-emptive strategy empowers the patient and establishes a foundation for oral health maintenance that will persist for the rest of their life.

During active cancer treatment, the dental focus shifts decisively towards the management of acute toxicities, with oral mucositis representing the most common and debilitating challenge. Mucositis is an inflammatory and ulcerative condition of the oral mucosa resulting from the cytotoxic effects of radiation and chemotherapy on the rapidly dividing epithelial cells. Its pathophysiological progression involves a cascade of biological events: initial cellular damage, upregulation of pro-inflammatory cytokines, epithelial

atrophy, and finally, painful ulceration [38]. The consequences are severe, including profound pain, nutritional compromise, increased risk of systemic infection, and potential interruptions in cancer therapy. The management of mucositis is multimodal and supportive. Basic oral care protocols are intensified, advocating for gentle brushing with a soft-bristled toothbrush and the use of non-abrasive, alcohol-free mouthwashes. Saline or sodium bicarbonate rinses are encouraged for cleansing and soothing the mucosa. For pain control, topical anesthetics like lidocaine rinses can provide temporary relief, while systemic analgesics, often escalating to opioids, are frequently necessary [39].

Beyond basic care, evidence-based strategies have been established to manage and, in some cases, prevent the severity of mucositis. Cryotherapy, which involves the patient sucking on ice chips for 30 minutes during intravenous chemotherapy administration, causes local vasoconstriction, reducing blood flow and the delivery of the cytotoxic agent to the oral mucosa, thereby mitigating damage [40]. For patients receiving radiation therapy, the use of low-level laser therapy (LLLT) has emerged as a promising modality. LLLT, or photobiomodulation, uses specific wavelengths of light to reduce inflammation, promote healing, and decrease pain, and has been recommended by multinational guidelines for the prevention of mucositis in specific HNC treatment settings [41]. Concurrently, managing xerostomia during treatment is palliative but essential. Strategies include the frequent sipping of water, the use of saliva substitutes or moisturizing gels, and the stimulation of residual salivary flow with sugar-free gums or lozenges. Pharmacological interventions, such as the systemic sialogogue pilocarpine, may be considered in selected patients, though its efficacy is often limited by side effects [42].

In the post-treatment survivorship phase, dental strategies evolve to address long-term rehabilitation and the restoration of function. The persistent risk of radiation caries demands unwavering adherence to the daily fluoride tray therapy initiated pre-treatment. Regular dental recall appointments, at intervals of three to four months, are mandatory for professional fluoride applications, reinforcement of oral hygiene, and early detection of new carious lesions [43]. The management of trismus, while shared with physical therapy, has a distinct dental component. Dentists may fabricate and provide mechanical devices, such as tapered tongue blades, the TheraBite® Jaw Motion Rehabilitation System, or the Dynasplint® Trismus System, which provide a controlled, passive stretch to the masticatory muscles [44]. The most complex aspect of long-term dental rehabilitation is the prosthetic restoration of maxillofacial defects. For patients who have undergone a maxillectomy, a prosthodontist becomes instrumental in fabricating an obturator prosthesis. This device serves to close the communication between the oral and nasal cavities, thereby restoring the integrity of the palate, which is essential for intelligible speech and the effective swallowing of liquids and solids [45]. The rehabilitation of masticatory function may also involve the use of conventional removable dentures or, increasingly, implant-supported prostheses.

The use of dental implants in irradiated bone requires careful consideration. While historically approached with extreme caution due to the perceived high risk of implant failure and ORN, modern studies with hyperbaric oxygen (HBO) therapy and precise implant placement protocols have shown more promising outcomes. The decision is highly individualized, weighing the potential benefits for prosthetic stability and function against the risks, and must involve a thorough discussion within the multidisciplinary team [46].

Interdisciplinary Assessment:

The efficacy of a multidisciplinary approach in head and neck cancer (HNC) rehabilitation is critically dependent on the team's ability to communicate effectively and make collaborative, data-driven decisions. This necessitates a shared language of assessment, built upon standardized metrics and outcome measures that transcend individual professional boundaries. Without a unified framework for evaluation, the risk of fragmented care persists, with each specialist working in isolation towards discipline-specific goals that may not align with the patient's overarching functional priorities. The implementation of interdisciplinary assessment protocols ensures that all team members—from

oncologists and surgeons to physical therapists, dentists, and speech-language pathologists—are not only aware of the patient's global status but are also working towards common, mutually reinforcing objectives [47]. This collaborative assessment model serves two primary functions: it provides a comprehensive baseline from which to plan proactive interventions, and it establishes a consistent methodology for tracking progress and quantifying the long-term impact of the rehabilitative process across all domains of health.

The foundation of interdisciplinary assessment begins with the establishment of shared baselines, ideally captured during the pre-treatment (pre-habilitation) phase. This involves the collective use of standardized tools to document the patient's functional status before any therapeutic intervention alters their anatomy and physiology. Key shared metrics at this stage include objective measures of range of motion (ROM). For instance, a physical therapist will measure cervical flexion/extension and rotation in degrees, while also recording the maximal inter-incisal opening (MIO) in millimeters to establish a baseline for jaw function—a metric of direct relevance to both the dentist for oral access and the speech-language pathologist for assessing articulatory precision [48]. Similarly, a standardized swallowing assessment, such as a Fiberoptic Endoscopic Evaluation of Swallowing (FEES) or a Videofluoroscopic Swallow Study (VFSS), provides a baseline that is critical for the SLP, but whose results (e.g., presence of aspiration, pharyngeal residue) also directly inform the dietitian's nutritional plan and the physical therapist's focus on postural muscles [49]. The dentist contributes a standardized oral health assessment, using indices like the Oral Assessment Guide (OAG) or the Simplified Oral Hygiene Index (OHI-S), to quantify mucosal integrity, salivary flow, and periodontal status, data that is crucial for predicting and managing mucositis risk during treatment [50].

As the patient progresses through treatment and into survivorship, the interdisciplinary team must rely on a combination of clinician-reported outcomes (ClinROs) and patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) to gain a holistic picture of recovery. ClinROs provide objective, quantifiable data that different disciplines can use to track specific impairments. For example, the Active Range of Motion (AROM) measurements for the neck and shoulder, consistently tracked by physical therapy, offer the oncologist objective evidence of radiation fibrosis progression or resolution [51]. The dentist's serial measurements of MIO provide the entire team with an objective marker of trismus severity, guiding decisions on the intensity of both physical therapy and dental interventions. The Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE), while developed for oncology trials, provides a standardized lexicon for grading toxicities (e.g., xerostomia, dysphagia, dermatitis) that is universally understood by all medical members of the team, facilitating clear communication about the severity of side effects [52].

However, the true power of interdisciplinary assessment is unlocked through the systematic integration of PROMs. These instruments capture the patient's perspective on their symptoms, functional limitations, and overall quality of life, which may not always correlate perfectly with objective clinical findings. Utilizing validated, HNC-specific PROMs ensures that the team's goals are aligned with what matters most to the patient. The University of Washington Quality of Life questionnaire (UW-QOL) is a prime example of a tool that assesses multiple domains—including pain, appearance, swallowing, chewing, and shoulder function—that are directly relevant to the work of the surgeon, SLP, dentist, and physical therapist [53]. Another powerful tool is the MD Anderson Dysphagia Inventory (MDADI), which is the first validated instrument designed specifically to assess the impact of dysphagia on the QoL of HNC patients. Its results provide a shared, patient-centered metric that guides the collaborative efforts of the SLP, dietitian, and oncologist in managing swallowing dysfunction [54]. For shoulder-specific disability, the Neck Dissection Impairment Index (NDII) offers a patient-centered view of how shoulder function affects daily life, providing crucial feedback that complements the physical therapist's objective ROM measurements and informs the surgeon about the long-term impact of different neck dissection techniques [55].

The practical implementation of a shared metrics model requires a structured framework, such as the use of integrated care pathways or shared electronic health records (EHRs) where assessments from all disciplines are readily accessible. Regular multidisciplinary team meetings are the forum where this collected data is synthesized. In these meetings, the physical therapist can present the objective improvement in cervical ROM, the dentist can report on the stability of the oral environment, and the SLP can share the MDADI scores, allowing the team to see the interconnected picture of the patient's recovery [56]. This data-driven dialogue enables the team to identify persistent challenges, such as when improved objective jaw opening (per PT and dental metrics) does not translate into improved patient-reported chewing function (per UW-QOL), prompting a deeper investigation into potential dental pain or the need for a prosthetic evaluation.

The ultimate value of this rigorous, interdisciplinary assessment strategy is its direct link to improved, value-based care. By consistently tracking shared metrics over time, the team can objectively demonstrate the functional outcomes and quality-of-life benefits achieved through their coordinated efforts. This data is essential for justifying the resources required for comprehensive rehabilitation, advocating for the inclusion of essential services like physical and dental therapy in standard care pathways, and conducting research to refine best practices [57].

Patient-Centered Rehabilitation:

While advanced medical interventions and sophisticated interdisciplinary models form the structural backbone of head and neck cancer (HNC) rehabilitation, their ultimate success is inextricably linked to a single, pivotal factor: the active engagement of the patient. A patient-centered approach represents a fundamental paradigm shift from a traditional, paternalistic model of care to a collaborative partnership where the patient's values, preferences, and needs guide all clinical decisions. This philosophy recognizes that the complex, long-term rehabilitation regimen—encompassing daily physical exercises, meticulous oral care, dietary modifications, and frequent medical appointments—is ultimately enacted by the patient in the context of their own life [58]. Therefore, the core pillars of this approach are strategic patient education, the fostering of long-term adherence, and the unwavering focus on health-related quality of life (HRQoL) as the primary outcome of success. Without this focus, even the most scientifically sound rehabilitation plan is likely to falter, leaving patients isolated and unable to navigate the challenging journey from cancer patient to cancer survivor.

The first and most critical pillar of patient-centered care is comprehensive, structured, and empathetic patient education. The period following a diagnosis of HNC is often characterized by overwhelming anxiety and information overload. Providing clear, consistent, and timely information across the entire care continuum is a therapeutic intervention in itself, serving to reduce uncertainty and empower the patient. Education must begin in the pre-treatment phase, where the multidisciplinary team has a responsibility to set realistic expectations about both the potential for cure and the likely functional consequences of treatment [59]. This involves explaining the pathophysiology behind anticipated side effects like trismus, xerostomia, and dysphagia, which transforms these abstract concepts into manageable challenges for which pre-emptive strategies exist. For instance, demonstrating a jaw-stretching device pre-radiation and explaining its role in preventing trismus provides a tangible sense of control. Education must be multimodal, combining verbal explanations, written materials, visual aids, and video demonstrations to accommodate different learning styles [60]. Crucially, information should be reinforced by all members of the team—from the oncologist to the physical therapist and dentist—to ensure consistency and prevent confusion, thereby building a foundation of trust and preparedness.

The second pillar, adherence, is the behavioral bridge that connects patient education to tangible functional outcomes. Understanding what to do is futile without the motivation and ability to consistently execute the prescribed rehabilitation activities. Adherence in HNC rehabilitation is notoriously challenging due to the demanding nature of the exercises, the fatigue and pain associated with treatment, and the psychological burden of the disease [61]. A patient-centered

approach to improving adherence involves identifying and addressing these barriers proactively. Strategies must be collaborative and tailored to the individual. This includes co-creating a realistic daily schedule with the patient that integrates exercises into their routine, setting small, achievable short-term goals to foster a sense of accomplishment, and utilizing simple tracking tools like exercise diaries or mobile health (mHealth) applications that provide reminders and positive reinforcement [62]. The role of caregivers and family members is indispensable; involving them in education sessions and training them to assist with exercises and oral care can provide crucial practical and emotional support, turning rehabilitation from a solitary struggle into a shared endeavor [63].

Furthermore, the interdisciplinary team must be attuned to the profound psychosocial factors that impact adherence. Depression, anxiety, and body image distress are highly prevalent in HNC survivors and can severely diminish the motivation required for daily self-care [64]. A patient-centered model integrates routine screening for psychological distress and provides access to mental health professionals, support groups, and social workers. When a patient is struggling with adherence, the approach should not be one of blame but of curiosity and problem-solving, exploring whether the barrier is physical pain, psychological distress, or a lack of social support. For example, a patient who is not performing their shoulder exercises may be experiencing unbearable pain, which requires better analgesic management, or they may be depressed and feel that the effort is futile—each scenario demands a completely different, patient-specific intervention from the team [65].

The ultimate goal and the third pillar of this model is the optimization of health-related quality of life (HRQoL). In patient-centered HNC rehabilitation, survival is the essential starting point, but HRQoL is the definitive measure of success. It is a multidimensional construct that encompasses physical, psychological, social, and functional well-being. The rigorous tracking of HRQoL through validated patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs), such as the University of Washington Quality of Life scale (UW-QOL) and the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer Quality of Life Questionnaires (EORTC QLQ-C30 and H&N35), provides quantifiable data on the patient's lived experience [66]. These instruments move beyond clinical metrics to capture how symptoms and functional limitations truly affect a person's life—whether they can enjoy a meal with family, communicate clearly with friends, or appear in public without self-consciousness.

A patient-centered approach uses this HRQoL data to dynamically steer the rehabilitation process. If a patient's scores indicate severe problems with chewing and swallowing, but objective measures show adequate jaw opening, the team is prompted to look deeper, perhaps at dental occlusion, the need for a prosthetic obturator, or underlying xerostomia [67]. This ensures that the rehabilitation plan is addressing the issues that matter most to the patient's daily existence. The concept of survivorship care plans, which summarize the treatment received and outline a roadmap for long-term follow-up and rehabilitation, is a tangible product of patient-centered care. These plans empower survivors by giving them a clear understanding of what to expect and what they need to do to maintain their health, thereby reducing anxiety and promoting sustained self-management [68].

Conclusion

The journey of a head and neck cancer patient, from diagnosis through survivorship, presents one of the most formidable challenges in oncology, where the price of survival is often a heavy functional burden. This research has comprehensively demonstrated that navigating this challenge successfully is impossible within the confines of a fragmented care model. The evidence unequivocally supports that a proactive, integrated, and patient-centered multidisciplinary approach, with physical therapy and dental care as its cornerstone, is the definitive path forward. The synergy between these disciplines is undeniable; the success of a dental prosthesis is contingent on the mandibular mobility achieved through physical therapy, just as effective swallowing relies on the postural stability restored by targeted physiotherapy. By establishing shared assessment metrics, from objective range-of-motion measurements to patient-reported quality-of-life scores, the entire team can

speak a common language and work towards unified, patient-relevant goals.

Ultimately, the true measure of success in modern HNC care extends beyond five-year survival statistics. It is found in a patient's ability to share a meal with family, communicate clearly with friends, and return to their community without pain or self-consciousness. Therefore, the rehabilitation model must be relentlessly patient-centered, empowering individuals through education and supporting their adherence to demanding self-care regimens. Investing in this comprehensive, integrated framework is not just a clinical imperative but an ethical one. It represents a commitment to ensuring that patients do not merely survive their cancer, but are equipped with the functional capacity and support to truly live again, reclaiming their quality of life and personal autonomy in the process. The future of head and neck cancer survivorship depends on our ability to make this collaborative model the universal standard of care.

References:

1. Shulman DH, Shipman B, Willis FB. Treating trismus with dynamic splinting: A case report. J Oral Sci. 2009;51:141–4. doi: 10.2334/josnusd.51.141. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
2. Specht L. Oral complications in the head and neck radiation patient. Introduction and scope of the problem. Support Care Cancer. 2002;10:36–9. doi: 10.1007/s005200100283. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
3. Brown LR, Dreizen S, Handler S, Johnston DA. Effect of radiation-induced xerostomia on human oral microflora. J Dent Res. 1975;54:740–50. doi: 10.1177/00220345750540040801. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
4. Zheng WK, Inokuchi A, Yamamoto T, Komiyama S. Taste dysfunction in irradiated patients with head and neck cancer. Fukuoka Igaku Zasshi. 2002;93:64–76. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
5. Regezi JA, Courtney RM, Kerr DA. Dental management of patients irradiated for oral cancer. Cancer. 1976;38:994–1000. doi: 10.1002/1097-0142(197608)38:2<994::aid-cncr2820380251>3.0.co;2-b. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
6. Ripamonti C, Zecca E, Brunelli C, Fulfaro F, Villa S, Balzarini A, et al. A randomized, controlled clinical trial to evaluate the effects of zinc sulfate on cancer patients with taste alterations caused by head and neck irradiation. Cancer. 1998;82:1938–45. doi: 10.1002/(sici)1097-0142(19980515)82:10<1938::aid-cncr18>3.0.co;2-u. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
7. Wijers OB, Levendag PC, Braaksma MM, Boonzaaijer M, Visch LL, Schmitz PI. Patients with head and neck cancer cured by radiation therapy: A survey of the dry mouth syndrome in long-term survivors. Head Neck. 2002;24:737–47. doi: 10.1002/hed.10129. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
8. Keene HJ, Fleming TJ. Prevalence of caries-associated microflora after radiotherapy in patients with cancer of the head and neck. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol. 1987;64:421–6. doi: 10.1016/0030-4220(87)90146-0. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
9. Regezi JA, Courtney RM, Kerr DA. Dental management of patients irradiated for oral cancer. Cancer. 1976;38:994–1000. doi: 10.1002/1097-0142(197608)38:2<994::aid-cncr2820380251>3.0.co;2-b. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
10. Teguh DN, Levendag PC, Voet P, van der Est H, Noever I, de Kruijf W, et al. Trismus in patients with oropharyngeal cancer: Relationship with dose in structures of mastication apparatus. Head Neck. 2008;30:622–30. doi: 10.1002/hed.20760. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
11. Bensadoun RJ, Riesenbeck D, Lockhart PB, Elting LS, Spijkervet FK, Brennan MT, et al. A systematic review of trismus induced by

cancer therapies in head and neck cancer patients. Support Care Cancer. 2010;18:1033–8. doi: 10.1007/s00520

12. Beetz I, Schilstra C, Vissink A, van der Schaaf A, Bijl HP, van der Laan BF, et al. Role of minor salivary glands in developing patient-rated xerostomia and sticky saliva during day and night. Radiother Oncol. 2013;109:311–6. doi: 10.1016/j.radonc.2013.06.040. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
13. Machtay M, Moughan J, Trotti A, Garden AS, Weber RS, Cooper JS, et al. Factors associated with severe late toxicity after concurrent chemoradiation for locally advanced head and neck cancer: an RTOG analysis. J Clin Ooncol. 2008;26:3582–9. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2007.14.8841. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
14. Niedermeier W, Mattheaus C, Meyer C, Staar S, Müller RP, Schulze HJ. Radiation-induced hyposalivation and its treatment with oral pilocarpine. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod. 1998;86:541–9. doi: 10.1016/S1079-2104(98)90343-2. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
15. Bentzen SM, Constine LS, Deasy JO, Eisbruch A, Jackson A, Marks LB, et al. Quantitative Analyses of Normal Tissue Effects in the Clinic (QUANTEC): an introduction to the scientific issues. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2010;76(3 Suppl):S3–9. doi: 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2009.09.040. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
16. Van der Laan HP, Bijl HP, Steenbakkers RJ, van der Schaaf A, Chouvalova O, Vemer-van den Hoek JG, et al. Acute symptoms during the course of head and neck radiotherapy or chemoradiation are strong predictors of late dysphagia. Radiother Oncol. 2015;115:56–62. doi: 10.1016/j.radonc.2015.01.019. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
17. Beitz I, Burlage FR, Bijl HP, Hoegen-Chouvalova O, Christianen ME, Vissink A, et al. The Groningen Radiotherapy-Induced Xerostomia questionnaire: development and validation of a new questionnaire. Radiother Oncol. 2010;97:127–31. doi: 10.1016/j.radonc.2010.05.004. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
18. Jellema AP, Slotman BJ, Doornaert P, Leemans CR, Langendijk JA. Impact of radiation-induced xerostomia on quality of life after primary radiotherapy among patients with head and neck cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2007;69:751–60. doi: 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2007.04.021. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
19. Rosenthal DI, Chambers MS, Fuller CD, Rebueno NC, Garcia J, Kies MS, et al. Beam path toxicities to non-target structures during intensity-modulated radiation therapy for head and neck cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2008;72:747–55. doi: 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2008.01.012. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
20. J Jensen K, Bonde Jensen A, Grau C. The relationship between observer-based toxicity scoring and patient assessed symptom severity after treatment for head and neck cancer. A correlative cross sectional study of the DAHANCA toxicity scoring system and the EORTC quality of life questionnaires. Radiother Oncol. 2006;78:298–305. doi: 10.1016/j.radonc.2006.02.005. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
21. Langendijk JA, Doornaert P, Verdonck-de Leeuw IM, Leemans CR, Aaronson NK, Slotman BJ. Impact of late treatment-related toxicity on quality of life among patients with head and neck cancer treated with radiotherapy. J Clin Oncol. 2008;26:3770–6. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2007.14.6647. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
22. Jellema AP, Slotman BJ, Doornaert P, Leemans CR, Langendijk JA. Impact of radiation-induced xerostomia on quality of life after primary radiotherapy among patients with head and neck cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2007;69:751–60. doi: 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2007.04.021. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

23. . Messmer MB, Thomsen A, Kirste S, Becker G, Momm F. Xerostomia after radiotherapy in the head & neck area: long-term observations. Radiother Oncol. 2011;98:48–50. doi: 10.1016/j.radonc.2010.10.013. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
24. Marks LB, Ma J. Challenges in the clinical application of advanced technologies to reduce radiation-associated normal tissue injury. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2007;69:4–12. doi: 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2007.05.010. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
25. Borras JM, Barton M, Grau C, Corral J, Verhoeven R, Lemmens V, et al. The impact of cancer incidence and stage on optimal utilization of radiotherapy: Methodology of a population based analysis by the ESTRO-HERO project. Radiother Oncol. 2015;116:45–50. doi: 10.1016/j.radonc.2015.04.021. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
26. Setton J, Lee NY, Riaz N, Huang SH, Waldron J, O'Sullivan B, et al. A multi-institution pooled analysis of gastrostomy tube dependence in patients with oropharyngeal cancer treated with definitive intensity-modulated radiotherapy. Cancer. 2015;121:294–301. doi: 10.1002/cncr.29022. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
27. Pignon JP, le Maître A, Maillard E, Bourhis J MACH-NC Collaborative Group. Meta-analysis of chemotherapy in head and neck cancer (MACH-NC): an update on 93 randomised trials and 17,346 patients. Radiother Oncol. 2009;92:4–14. doi: 10.1016/j.radonc.2009.04.014. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
28. Beetz I, Burlage FR, Bijl HP, Hoegen-Chouvalova O, Christianen ME, Vissink A, et al. The Groningen Radiotherapy-Induced Xerostomia questionnaire: development and validation of a new questionnaire. Radiother Oncol. 2010;97:127–31. doi: 10.1016/j.radonc.2010.05.004. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
29. Beatz I, Schilstra C, Vissink A, van der Schaaf A, Bijl HP, van der Laan BF, et al. Role of minor salivary glands in developing patient-rated xerostomia and sticky saliva during day and night. Radiother Oncol. 2013;109:311–6. doi: 10.1016/j.radonc.2013.06.040. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
30. Messmer MB, Thomsen A, Kirste S, Becker G, Momm F. Xerostomia after radiotherapy in the head & neck area: long-term observations. Radiother Oncol. 2011;98:48–50. doi: 10.1016/j.radonc.2010.10.013. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
31. Jellema AP, Slotman BJ, Doornaert P, Leemans CR, Langendijk JA. Impact of radiation-induced xerostomia on quality of life after primary radiotherapy among patients with head and neck cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2007;69:751–60. doi: 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2007.04.021. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
32. Deloch L, Derer A, Harmann J, Frey B, Fietkau R, Gaipl US. Modern radiotherapy concepts and the impact of radiation on immune activation. Front Oncol. 2016;6:141. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2016.00141. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
33. Barnas GC, West CM, Dunning AM, Elliott RM, Coles CE, Pharoah PD, et al. Normal tissue reactions to radiotherapy: towards tailoring treatment dose by genotype. Nat Rev Cancer. 2009;9:134–42. doi: 10.1038/nrc2587. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
34. Messmer MB, Thomsen A, Kirste S, Becker G, Momm F. Xerostomia after radiotherapy in the head & neck area: long-term observations. Radiother Oncol. 2011;98:48–50. doi: 10.1016/j.radonc.2010.10.013. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
35. Jellema AP, Slotman BJ, Doornaert P, Leemans CR, Langendijk JA. Impact of radiation-induced xerostomia on quality of life after primary radiotherapy among patients with head and neck cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2007;69:751–60.

doi: 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2007.04.021. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

36. Machtay M, Moughan J, Trotti A, Garden AS, Weber RS, Cooper JS, et al. Factors associated with severe late toxicity after concurrent chemoradiation for locally advanced head and neck cancer: an RTOG analysis. J Clin Oncol. 2008;26:3582–9. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2007.14.8841. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
37. Grau C, Corral J, Verhoeven R, Lemmens V, et al. The impact of cancer incidence and stage on optimal utilization of radiotherapy: Methodology of a population based analysis by the ESTRO-HERO project. Radiother Oncol. 2015;116:45–50. doi: 10.1016/j.radonc.2015.04.021. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
38. Butterworth C, McCaul L, Barclay C. Restorative dentistry and oral rehabilitation: United Kingdom National Multidisciplinary Guidelines. J Laryngol Otol 2016; DOI: 10.1017/S0022215116000414. - PMC - PubMed
39. Epstein J B, Barasch A. Oral and Dental Health in Head and Neck Cancer Patients. Cancer Treat Res 2018; 174: 43-57. - PubMed
40. National Institute for Clinical Excellence. Improving Outcomes in Head and Neck Cancers. 2004.
41. British Association of Head and Neck Oncologists. Publications: BAHNO Standards 2020. 2020.
42. Restorative Dentistry-UK. Predicting and Managing Oral and Dental Complications of Surgical and Non-Surgical Treatment for Head and Neck Cancer: A Clinical Guideline. 2016.
43. Getting It Right First Time. Hospital Dentistry: GIRFT Programme National Speciality Report. 2021.
44. Rogers S N, Allmark C, Bekiroglu F et al. Improving quality of life through the routine use of the patient concerns inventory for head and neck cancer patients: main results of a cluster preference randomised controlled trial. Eur Arch Otorhinoaryngol 2021; 278: 3435-3449. - PMC - PubMed
45. General Dental Council. Curriculum for Speciality Training In Restorative Dentistry. 2009.
46. Brown B B, Patel C, McInnes E, Mays N, Young J, Haines M. The effectiveness of clinical networks in improving quality of care and patient outcomes: a systematic review of quantitative and qualitative studies. BMC Health Serv Res 2016; 16: 360. - PMC - PubMed
47. Healthcare Quality Improvement Partnership. DAHNO first annual report: Key findings from the National Head and Neck Cancer Audit. 2006.
48. Healthcare Quality Improvement Partnership. National Head and Neck Cancer Audit 2014. 2015.
49. 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: 715-727. - PubMed
50. Royal College of Surgeons of England. Clinical Guidelines: The Oral Management of Oncology Patients Requiring Radiotherapy, Chemotherapy and /or Bone Marrow Transplantation. 2018.
51. Beaumont S, Bhatia N, McDowell L et al. Timing of dental extractions in patients undergoing radiotherapy and the incidence of osteoradionecrosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg 2021; 59: 511-523. - PubMed
52. CancerData. Detailed Statistics from the 'Get Data Out' programme: Head and neck. Available at; accessed June 2022.

53. National Institute for Clinical Excellence. Improving Outcomes in Head and Neck Cancers. 2004.

54. Epstein J B, Barasch A. Oral and Dental Health in Head and Neck Cancer Patients. Cancer Treat Res 2018; 174: 43-57. - PubMed

55. Sankaranarayanan R, Masuyer E, Swaminathan R, Ferlay J, Whelan S. Head and neck cancer: A global perspective on epidemiology and prognosis. Anticancer Res. 1998;18:4779–86.

56. Rothwell BR. Prevention and treatment of the orofacial complications of radiotherapy. J Am Dent Assoc. 1987;114:316–22.

57. Specht L. Oral complications in the head and neck radiation patient. Introduction and scope of the problem. Support Care Cancer. 2002;10:36–9.

58. Andrews N, Griffiths C. Dental complications of head and neck radiotherapy: Part 1. Aust Dent J. 2001;46:88–94.

59. Nelson GM. Biology of taste buds and the clinical problem of taste loss. Anat Rec. 1998;253:70–8.

60. Epstein JB, Schubert MM. Oropharyngeal mucositis in cancer therapy. Review of pathogenesis, diagnosis, and management. Oncology (Williston Park) 2003;17:1767–79.

61. Silverman S Jr, editor. In: Oral Cancer. 5th ed. Hamilton, Canada: BC Decker Inc; 2003. Complications of treatment; pp. 113–28.

62. Marx RE. Osteoradionecrosis: A new concept of its pathophysiology. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 1983;41:283–8. doi: 10.1016/0278-2391(83)90294-x. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

63. Daly TE, Drane JB. Proceedings: The management of teeth related to the treatment of oral cancer. Proc Natl Cancer Conf. 1972;7:147–54. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

64. Valdez IH, Atkinson JC, Ship JA, Fox PC. Major salivary gland function in patients with radiation-induced xerostomia: Flow rates and sialochemistry. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 1993;25:41–7. doi: 10.1016/0360-3016(93)90143-j. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

65. Jansma J, Vissink A, Gravenmade EJ, Visch LL, Fidler V, Retief DH. In vivo study on the prevention of postradiation caries. Caries Res. 1989;23:172–8. doi: 10.1159/000261173. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

66. Marx RE, Johnson RP, Kline SN. Prevention of osteoradionecrosis: A randomized prospective clinical trial of hyperbaric oxygen versus penicillin. J Am Dent Assoc. 1985;111:49–54. doi: 10.14219/jada.archive.1985.0074. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

67. Sulaiman F, Huryn JM, Zlotolow IM. Dental extractions in the irradiated head and neck patient: A retrospective analysis of Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center protocols, criteria, and end results. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2003;61:1123–31. doi: 10.1016/S0278-2391(03)00669-4. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

68. Sulaiman F, Huryn JM, Zlotolow IM. Dental extractions in the irradiated head and neck patient: A retrospective analysis of Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center protocols, criteria, and end results. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2003;61:1123–31. doi: 10.1016/S0278-2391(03)00669-4. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]