

Analyzing Cancer Care Pathways across Clinical and Community-based Settings

Rachid Lamrani*

Department of Community Health and Oncology, Mohammed V University, Rabat, Morocco

Introduction

The evolving landscape of cancer treatment has prompted healthcare systems to explore more flexible and patient-centered models of care. Traditionally, cancer therapies particularly chemotherapy have been administered in hospital oncology departments under strict clinical supervision. However, increasing patient volumes, resource limitations and a growing emphasis on quality of life have encouraged the expansion of cancer care into community-based environments, such as General Practitioner (GP) clinics and patients' homes. These alternative models aim to improve accessibility, reduce hospital congestion and enhance patient comfort while maintaining safety and treatment efficacy. This shift reflects a broader movement toward decentralization in healthcare delivery, where treatment settings are adapted to better suit individual patient needs and logistical realities. A thorough analysis of these cancer care pathways is essential to identify their respective strengths, limitations and overall impact on patient outcomes [1].

Description

Several studies, including randomized trials and feasibility assessments, have investigated the delivery of cancer treatments across different settings. In one notable randomized trial, researchers compared the outcomes and patient satisfaction associated with receiving chemotherapy in hospital, at home, or in GP surgeries. The findings suggested that community-based care was not only feasible but often preferred by patients due to its convenience, reduced travel burden and more personalized attention. Importantly, clinical outcomes remained comparable across all settings, affirming the safety of decentralizing care. Similarly, domiciliary chemotherapy for advanced non-small-cell lung cancer patients demonstrated that home-based care is both safe and acceptable, with minimal complications and high levels of patient satisfaction. These results have challenged the long-held notion that complex cancer therapies must be confined to hospital environments, thereby opening the door to more flexible treatment protocols.

Despite the promising outcomes, the implementation of community-based cancer care models requires careful planning and system-level support. Factors such as staff training, equipment availability and standardized safety protocols are critical to ensuring the quality of care across all environments. Moreover, not all patients or cancer types are suitable for treatment outside a hospital setting; therefore, patient selection criteria must be rigorously defined. Communication and coordination among healthcare providers including oncologists, general practitioners and community nurses are also key to successful treatment outcomes. Economically, community-based models may

offer cost savings by reducing the need for inpatient services, though initial setup costs and ongoing logistical coordination can be substantial. As cancer care continues to evolve, an integrated approach that combines clinical oversight with the flexibility of community care may provide the most sustainable and patient-friendly solution [2].

Conclusion

In conclusion, analyzing cancer care pathways across clinical and community-based settings reveals that safe, effective and patient-centered treatment is not exclusive to hospitals. Both home-based and GP-managed care models have demonstrated their viability, particularly for select patient groups and treatment regimens. By integrating these alternatives into national cancer care strategies, healthcare systems can better address rising demand while enhancing patient autonomy and satisfaction. Future efforts must focus on refining these care models, expanding access and ensuring quality assurance, ultimately leading to a more adaptable and inclusive framework for oncology treatment.

Acknowledgement

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

1. Corrie, P. G., A. M. Moody, G. Armstrong and S. Nolasco, et al. "Is community treatment best? a randomised trial comparing delivery of cancer treatment in the hospital, home and GP surgery." *Br J Cancer* 109 (2013): 1549-1555.
2. Anderson, Heather, J. M. Addington-Hall, M. D. Peake and J. McKendrik, et al. "Domiciliary chemotherapy with gemcitabine is safe and acceptable to advanced non-small-cell lung cancer patients: results of a feasibility study." *Br J Cancer* (2003): 2190-2196.

*Address for Correspondence: Rachid Lamrani, Department of Community Health and Oncology, Mohammed V University, Rabat, Morocco; E-mail: rachidlamrani@um5.ac.ma

Copyright: © 2025 Lamrani R. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Received: 01 March, 2025, Manuscript No. jcast-25-168219; **Editor assigned:** 03 March, 2025, PreQC No. P-168219; **Reviewed:** 15 March, 2025, QC No. Q-168219; **Revised:** 21 March, 2025, Manuscript No. R-168219; **Published:** 29 March, 2025, DOI: 10.37421/1948-5956.2025.17.691

How to cite this article: Lamrani, Rachid. "Analyzing Cancer Care Pathways across Clinical and Community-based Settings." *J Cancer Sci Ther* 17 (2025): 691.