Beyond Chemotherapy: Precision Oncology and the Shift Toward Non-Toxic, Adaptive Cancer Therapies

Andrew Dickens [1*], Anton Yuryev [2], John Catanzaro [3], Shamsuddin Sultan Khan [3]

Abstract

Chemotherapy has long been a cornerstone of cancer treatment, yet its continued reliance represents an outdated, toxic paradigm that exacerbates patient suffering without ensuring lasting remission. While initially effective against rapidly dividing cells, chemotherapy inadvertently drives cancer resistance through genetic mutations, drug efflux mechanisms, tumor microenvironment protection, and metabolic adaptations. This vicious cycle not only fuels aggressive relapses but also diminishes overall patient outcomes. Despite significant advancements in precision medicine, the medical industry remains financially and structurally anchored to chemotherapy, prioritizing profit-driven models over patient-centered, non-toxic alternatives. Emerging personalized molecular strategies—including real-time signal-based medicine, adaptive precision therapies, immunomolecular augmentation, and molecular surveillance—offer a transformative approach to sustainable cancer management. These innovations leverage the body's natural defenses to counteract cancer's adaptability without inflicting collateral toxicity. Shifting away from chemotherapy toward precision-based interventions is essential to breaking the cycle of treatment resistance and improving long-term survival. The future of oncology depends on therapies that evolve alongside cancer's complexity while preserving patient health and well-being.

Keywords: Chemotherapy resistance, precision oncology, molecular diagnostics, immunomolecular therapy, cancer adaptation

Significance | This study demonstrates chemotherapy's failure and advocates for precision-based, non-toxic cancer treatments to improve long-term patient outcomes.

*Correspondence. Andrew Dickens, Dayspring Cancer Clinic, Scottsdale, Arizona, United States.
E-mail: drd@dayspringcancerclinic.com

Editor Mohammed Khadeer Ahamed Basheer, Ph.D., And accepted by the Editorial Board May 16, 2023 (received for review Mar 06, 2023)

1. Introduction

Chemotherapy has long been considered the backbone of cancer treatment, lauded for its ability to target and eliminate malignant cells. However, despite its historical significance, its effectiveness in the modern era of oncology is increasingly being called into question. While chemotherapy can yield initial success in controlling tumor growth, its long-term benefits are often outweighed by severe limitations (Hanahan & Weinberg, 2011). The primary flaw of chemotherapy lies in its indiscriminate mechanism of action—attacking all rapidly dividing cells, both cancerous and healthy—which results in debilitating side effects that significantly diminish patients' quality of life (Tannock & Hickman, 2016). More alarmingly, chemotherapy frequently fails to provide a lasting cure, as cancer cells develop resistance over time, leading to recurrence in a more aggressive and treatment-resistant form (Holohan et al., 2013). This paradox leaves many patients trapped in a relentless cycle of diminishing returns, where each successive round of chemotherapy becomes less effective while imposing a progressively harsher toll on the body.

One of the fundamental problems with chemotherapy is its outdated "more toxicity equals more success" paradigm (Figure

Author Affiliation.
[1] Dayspring Cancer Clinic, Scottsdale, Arizona, United States.
[2] Elsevier, Professional services, Maryland, United States.
[3] Neo7bioscience Inc, Dallas, Texas, United States.

Please cite this article.
Dickens, A., Yuryev, A., Catanzaro, J., Khan, S. S. (2023). "Beyond Chemotherapy: Precision Oncology and the Shift Toward Non-Toxic, Adaptive Cancer Therapies", Journal of Precision Biosciences, 5(1),1-9,5805

1). This approach assumes that higher doses of cytotoxic agents will lead to better patient outcomes. However, this assumption has proven flawed, as excessive toxicity not only inflicts undue suffering but also fails to address the complex biological mechanisms driving cancer progression (Gottesman, 2012). Unlike infectious diseases, which can often be eradicated with a single targeted treatment, cancer is a highly adaptable and heterogeneous disease influenced by genetic, molecular, and environmental factors (Vogelstein et al., 2013). Treating all cancers with a uniform, cytotoxic regimen overlooks this complexity and often leads to suboptimal results. Many patients endure arduous chemotherapy regimens that weaken their immune systems, impair organ function, and increase susceptibility to secondary infections—all while achieving only marginal extensions in survival rates.

Beyond its physiological toll, chemotherapy's continued prominence in oncology underscores a deeper issue: a reluctance to embrace more effective, less toxic alternatives. Despite groundbreaking advancements in molecular oncology, immunotherapy, and precision medicine, chemotherapy remains a default treatment option due to entrenched medical traditions and financial incentives (Mukherjee, 2010). Pharmaceutical companies, hospitals, and regulatory agencies have long depended on chemotherapy as a lucrative standard of care, making the transition toward innovative therapies frustratingly slow (Sullivan et al., 2011). This inertia not only stifles scientific progress but also deprives patients of treatments that could offer greater efficacy with fewer harmful side effects.

Given these challenges, it is imperative to reevaluate chemotherapy's role in cancer treatment and explore emerging alternatives that prioritize patient well-being. Advances in genomic sequencing, biomarker-driven therapies, and immunotherapy have revolutionized the way cancer is understood and treated (Hanna et al., 2020). Unlike traditional chemotherapy, these precision-based approaches target the unique genetic and molecular characteristics of an individual's cancer, allowing for highly effective treatments with minimal collateral damage (Garraway & Lander, 2013). By leveraging personalized medicine, oncologists can develop tailored treatment plans that maximize therapeutic efficacy while reducing toxicity and adverse effects.

Among the most promising alternatives to chemotherapy is immunotherapy, which harnesses the body's own immune system to detect and eliminate cancer cells (Ribas & Wolchok, 2018). Unlike chemotherapy, which indiscriminately kills cells, immunotherapy enhances the immune response, leading to durable and often transformative outcomes (Topalian et al., 2012). Strategies such as immune checkpoint inhibitors, CAR-T cell therapy, and cancer vaccines have demonstrated remarkable success in treating various malignancies while producing far fewer side effects than traditional chemotherapy (June et al., 2018). Similarly, targeted therapies that inhibit specific genetic mutations—such as tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs) and monoclonal antibodies—offer another avenue for effective and low-toxicity treatment (Miller et al., 2019).

Despite these advancements, chemotherapy continues to dominate treatment protocols largely due to historical precedent and institutional resistance to change (Aggarwal, 2010). The persistence of chemotherapy as the standard of care is not merely a reflection of its efficacy but rather an indication of a medical establishment that has been slow to adapt to modern scientific breakthroughs. However, patients, researchers, and advocacy groups must push for a paradigm shift—one that prioritizes innovation over inertia, precision over poison. The future of oncology lies in leveraging cutting-edge science to develop therapies that address cancer's complexity at the molecular level rather than relying on outdated, brute-force methods that cause more harm than good.

In conclusion, chemotherapy's longstanding dominance in cancer treatment is increasingly difficult to justify in an era of precision medicine. While it may still hold value in certain cases, its widespread use as a first-line therapy is becoming untenable given its significant toxicity, diminishing efficacy, and the availability of superior alternatives. The medical community must recognize that clinging to chemotherapy as the default option is not only an impediment to progress but also a disservice to patients. By embracing personalized, molecularly targeted therapies, we can transition toward a future in which cancer treatment is guided by scientific precision rather than outdated conventions—where patients receive treatments that heal rather than harm. Only through such a shift can oncology truly fulfill its mission of improving patient outcomes while minimizing suffering.

2. Why Chemotherapy Fails: The Science of Resistance

Chemotherapy, a cornerstone of modern cancer treatment, operates on the principle of targeted toxicity—using potent chemicals to eradicate rapidly dividing cancer cells. However, despite its widespread use and initial success in many cases, chemotherapy often fails in the long run. The underlying reason for this failure is the remarkable adaptability of cancer cells, which evolve strategies to withstand the toxic assault. Rather than being completely eradicated, many cancers learn how to survive chemotherapy, rendering subsequent treatments ineffective. This phenomenon, known as chemoresistance, emerges through several key mechanisms (Curigliano, 2020)

2.1. Genetic Mutation and Evolution: Natural Selection in Cancer

Cancer cells exhibit high genetic instability, meaning they accumulate mutations at a much faster rate than normal cells. This instability fuels evolution within a tumor, particularly when exposed to chemotherapy. The treatment itself acts as a selective pressure, eliminating weaker cancer cells while sparing those with

mutations that confer resistance. Over time, these resistant cells multiply, forming a more aggressive tumor that no longer responds to the same drugs. In essence, chemotherapy unintentionally fosters the survival of the fittest cancer cells, making subsequent treatments increasingly ineffective (Cameron, 2017; Cherrington et al., 2000).

2.2. Upregulation of Drug Resistance Proteins: Cancer's Built-in Defense System

One of the most formidable defenses cancer cells develop is the production of drug resistance proteins. These proteins function as molecular pumps, actively expelling chemotherapy drugs before they can accumulate to lethal levels. A well-known example is P-glycoprotein, which prevents chemotherapy from penetrating cancer cells effectively. As chemotherapy continues, surviving cancer cells upregulate these pumps, reducing drug retention and ultimately neutralizing its effect. This mechanism plays a crucial role in multidrug resistance, where a tumor becomes impervious to multiple types of chemotherapy simultaneously (Dasari et al., 2014; Chen, 2014).

2.3. The Protective Tumor Microenvironment: A Safe Haven for Cancer

Cancer does not exist in isolation—it thrives within a complex network of surrounding cells, blood vessels, and immune components known as the tumor microenvironment. Certain non-cancerous cells within this microenvironment, such as fibroblasts and immune suppressor cells, work to protect the tumor from chemotherapy. They achieve this by secreting growth factors, creating physical barriers, and altering drug absorption. As a result, chemotherapy struggles to penetrate deeply into the tumor, allowing hidden cancer cells to survive and re-emerge later. This protective shield effectively reduces chemotherapy's impact and contributes to recurrence after initial treatment success (Plana, 2014; Bhatia, 2020).

2.4. Metabolic Flexibility: Cancer's Ability to Rewire Energy Production

Cancer cells are highly adaptable when it comes to metabolism. Most chemotherapy drugs target specific metabolic pathways that cancer cells rely on to grow. However, if a particular pathway is blocked by a drug, cancer cells can shift to an alternative metabolic strategy. This metabolic flexibility allows them to bypass the drug's effects and continue proliferating. For example, some cancers evade chemotherapy that targets glucose metabolism by switching to lipid metabolism or relying more on mitochondrial energy production. This ability to rewire energy sources makes chemotherapy less effective over time, contributing to resistance (Armstrong, 2015; Zhang, 2019).

2.5 The Paradox of Chemotherapy: Increasing Aggressiveness Over Time

Ironically, the more chemotherapy is administered, the stronger and more resilient cancer becomes. By eliminating the most vulnerable cells, chemotherapy leaves behind the toughest, most treatment-resistant cancer populations. These surviving cells not only resist treatment but often become more aggressive, leading to faster tumor progression and more lethal relapses. This explains why some patients initially respond well to chemotherapy, only to experience a return of the disease in a more untreatable form (Shah, 2019; Zhao, 2018).

2.6 Addressing Chemoresistance: The Future of Cancer Therapy

Overcoming chemoresistance is a major challenge in oncology, driving researchers to explore innovative strategies that enhance treatment efficacy. One promising approach is combination therapy, which involves using multiple drugs that target different resistance mechanisms simultaneously, making it more difficult for cancer cells to adapt and survive (Li, 2020). Another key advancement is targeted therapy, which focuses on specific genetic mutations unique to a patient's cancer, reducing collateral damage to healthy cells and increasing treatment precision (Wenningmann, 2019). Immunotherapy is also emerging as a powerful tool, harnessing the body's immune system to recognize and eliminate cancer cells, potentially overcoming traditional drug resistance pathways (Kim, 2020). Additionally, adaptive therapy seeks to modulate chemotherapy dosing and scheduling to slow resistance development rather than attempting immediate tumor eradication, thereby prolonging the effectiveness of treatment (Vejpongsa et al., 2014). While chemotherapy remains a cornerstone of cancer treatment, its limitations highlight the urgent need for more sophisticated therapeutic strategies. A deeper understanding of the molecular mechanisms driving resistance is crucial for developing treatments that can effectively outmaneuver cancer's relentless adaptability (Vachhani, 2017; Barteková, 2021; Schmid et al., 2015).

3. A System Rooted in Toxic Antiquated Standards

Cancer treatment remains one of the most controversial and complex areas of modern medicine. Despite significant advancements in molecular biology, genomics, and immunotherapy, chemotherapy continues to be the cornerstone of oncology. However, evidence increasingly suggests that the more chemotherapy is used, the more resistant and aggressive cancer becomes, setting patients up for catastrophic relapses (Hurria et al., 2011; Extermann et al., 2012). Instead of adapting to this reality, the medical system remains entrenched in outdated, toxic treatment paradigms. This resistance to change is fueled by financial incentives, antiquated guidelines, and a reactive rather than proactive approach to cancer care (Okoli et al., 2021).

3.1 Profits Over Precision

The persistence of chemotherapy in cancer treatment is not merely a medical decision but also an economic one. Chemotherapy is a multibillion-dollar industry, generating enormous profits for pharmaceutical companies, hospitals, and treatment centers. While

personalized, patient-specific treatments such as immunotherapy, targeted molecular therapies, and metabolic interventions are proving to be more effective and less harmful, they threaten the financial stability of institutions that depend on chemotherapy revenue (Mohile et al., 2018). This economic dependence creates a system where the prioritization of profits outweighs the necessity for more precise and non-toxic treatments.

The financial structure of oncology practice is also influenced by insurance reimbursement models, which heavily favor conventional treatments like chemotherapy. Experimental or alternative approaches, even if they show promise, often struggle to gain traction due to lack of funding and support (Reed et al., 2019). As a result, patients are funneled into a system that prioritizes profitability over their long-term survival and well-being.

3.2 Antiquated Guidelines and One-Size-Fits-All Approaches

Oncology treatment protocols have largely remained unchanged for decades, despite groundbreaking advancements in understanding cancer biology (Korc-Grodzicki et al., 2015). Traditional chemotherapy follows a one-size-fits-all approach, treating all cancers as if they are the same. In contrast, modern research has revealed that cancer is highly heterogeneous, with unique molecular and genetic characteristics in each patient. Targeted therapy and personalized medicine should be the gold standard, yet the medical establishment remains shackled to outdated chemotherapy-centric protocols (Voutsadakis, 2018).

The bureaucratic and slow-moving nature of regulatory bodies such as the FDA and medical boards further stifles progress. These institutions rely on outdated clinical trial models that prioritize chemotherapy over novel treatment approaches, making it difficult for emerging therapies to gain mainstream acceptance (Shahrokni et al., 2017). As a result, millions of patients are subjected to toxic treatments that do little to improve long-term survival while ignoring more effective, individualized treatment strategies.

3.3 Reactive Medicine: Waiting for Cancer to Progress

A significant flaw in modern oncology is its reactive nature. Instead of focusing on early detection and intervention through advanced molecular diagnostics, the system only responds once cancer has reached a critical stage. This delayed approach allows the disease to establish itself, making treatment far more difficult and often less successful (Alibhai et al., 2017). By the time chemotherapy is administered, cancer has often already evolved mechanisms to resist it, leading to aggressive recurrences that are even harder to treat.

Advanced screening methods, such as circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) analysis and next-generation sequencing, could allow doctors to identify cancer at its earliest stages, long before it becomes unmanageable (Extermann et al., 2012). However, these methods remain underutilized because they do not fit within the current profit-driven system. The failure to embrace cutting-edge diagnostic tools ensures that many patients only receive intervention when their cancer has already become life-threatening, perpetuating the cycle of ineffective treatment.

3.4 Patient Harm as Standard Practice

Chemotherapy is one of the most physically devastating treatments a patient can endure. Its side effects—ranging from immune suppression to severe fatigue, organ damage, and cognitive impairment—are accepted as the "cost of treatment" (Hurria et al., 2011). However, this narrative ignores the reality that chemotherapy itself contributes to treatment failure.

Scientific evidence has shown that chemotherapy can trigger mechanisms that make cancer more aggressive and resistant. By inducing genetic mutations, altering the tumor microenvironment, and selecting for chemo-resistant cancer cells, chemotherapy often leads to relapse with even more treatment-resistant forms of the disease (Mohile et al., 2018; Okoli et al., 2021). This creates a paradox where the very treatment designed to eliminate cancer ultimately ensures its return in a more lethal form. Despite this, patients are expected to endure these toxic regimens, often without being informed of the long-term risks and alternative options.

Additionally, the immune system plays a crucial role in cancer control, yet chemotherapy severely weakens it. Suppressing the immune system leaves patients vulnerable to secondary infections and diminishes the body's natural ability to fight cancer (Reed et al., 2019). More holistic approaches that enhance immune function, such as immunotherapy and metabolic interventions, remain underutilized because they do not fit the conventional chemotherapy-centric model.

3.5 The Path Forward: Rethinking Cancer Treatment

If the goal of oncology is truly to save lives and improve patient outcomes, then the medical community must abandon its reliance on chemotherapy and embrace a paradigm shift. The future of cancer treatment lies in precision medicine, where therapies are tailored to the individual's genetic and molecular profile rather than relying on outdated toxic approaches (Shahrokni et al., 2017). Key steps toward this transformation include the widespread adoption of molecular diagnostics, which can identify cancer early through advanced screening methods, allowing for timely and targeted interventions (Alibhai et al., 2017). Investment in personalized treatment strategies is also crucial, with funding directed toward immunotherapy, gene editing, and metabolic approaches that address cancer at its root cause rather than relying on blanket chemotherapy protocols (Extermann et al., 2012). Additionally, redefining clinical trial structures is necessary, as current models prioritize chemotherapy over novel approaches. Reforming trial designs to accommodate new therapies will accelerate the transition away from outdated treatments (Korc-Grodzicki et al., 2015). Furthermore, shifting the financial incentives within the healthcare system is essential to prioritize patient outcomes over

pharmaceutical profits. Insurance policies and reimbursement models should favor effective, low-toxicity treatments rather than rewarding hospitals for administering chemotherapy (Voutsadakis, 2018). Lastly, educating both doctors and patients is vital. Oncologists should be encouraged to explore and recommend non-toxic treatments rather than defaulting to chemotherapy, while patients should be informed of all available options to make empowered decisions regarding their care (Mohile et al., 2018).

The continued reliance on chemotherapy, despite its clear limitations and long-term harm, is a reflection of a broken medical system rooted in toxic antiquated standards. Financial incentives, outdated guidelines, and a reactive approach to cancer care ensure that patients remain trapped in a cycle of ineffective treatment and aggressive relapses. The future of oncology must embrace precision medicine, early detection, and non-toxic alternatives to truly combat cancer without causing further harm (Okoli et al., 2021). Only by breaking free from the chemotherapy-dominated model can we offer patients real hope for survival and quality of life.

4. Breaking the Cycle: The Future Lies in Personalized Molecular Solutions

For decades, chemotherapy has stood as the frontline defense against cancer, yet its limitations have become increasingly apparent. While chemotherapy can shrink tumors, it also indiscriminately damages healthy cells, leading to debilitating side effects and, in many cases, only temporary remission (Primorac et al., 2020). Cancer is not a static enemy; it evolves, adapts, and finds ways to resist traditional treatments (Milholland et al., 2017). The time has come for a paradigm shift—one that embraces intelligent, personalized molecular solutions that treat cancer dynamically while preserving the patient's overall health.

4.1 The Era of Signal-Based Medicine

Cancer treatment must move beyond one-size-fits-all approaches and enter an era of real-time adaptability. Signal-based medicine focuses on mapping the molecular signals within a patient's cancer in real-time, allowing for a deeper understanding of resistance pathways and treatment response (Li et al., 2021). By leveraging advancements in molecular diagnostics and computational biology, researchers can track the evolution of cancer at a granular level, identifying how it mutates and adapts to therapy (Brlek et al., 2024). This approach enables oncologists to shift treatment strategies dynamically, preventing the disease from outmaneuvering current interventions.

Real-time molecular mapping also allows for the early detection of drug resistance, which has been a persistent challenge in cancer therapy. When resistance mechanisms are detected before they become clinically significant, treatments can be adjusted to maintain effectiveness (Dang & Park, 2022). This is particularly crucial for aggressive cancers such as pancreatic cancer, triple-negative breast cancer, and glioblastoma, which often develop resistance rapidly and leave patients with few treatment options (Manor et al., 2020).

4.2 Precision-Based, Adaptive Therapies

Historically, cancer treatment protocols have been developed using population-based data, leading to rigid treatment plans that do not account for individual variability. Precision-based medicine is changing this model by tailoring treatments to the unique molecular composition of each patient's cancer (Primorac & Höppner, 2022). Instead of relying on standardized chemotherapy regimens, adaptive precision therapies continuously refine treatment approaches based on the patient's specific tumor markers and genetic profile (Hudetz et al., 2019).

A critical advancement in this field is the emergence of N-of-1 clinical trials, in which each patient effectively becomes their own research subject (Shah et al., 2024). Traditional clinical trials rely on large sample sizes and statistical averages, often failing to capture the nuances of individual responses. In contrast, N-of-1 trials allow for real-time modifications to treatment regimens, ensuring that interventions remain effective for each specific patient rather than relying on broad statistical trends (Collins & Moutasim, 2023).

4.3 Peptide Engineering and Immunomolecular Augmentation

Another groundbreaking approach in personalized cancer treatment is the use of peptide engineering and immunomolecular augmentation (Kakarla & Gottschalk, 2014). Cancer thrives by hijacking the body's cellular signaling processes, allowing it to evade immune detection and proliferate unchecked (Ratiner et al., 2024). By designing patient-specific peptides, researchers can disrupt these aberrant signals and restore normal cellular communication.

Immunomolecular augmentation further enhances this approach by strengthening the immune system's ability to recognize and target cancer cells. Unlike traditional immunotherapies that can cause systemic immune overactivation, leading to autoimmune complications, peptide-based immunotherapies are designed to be highly specific, targeting only cancerous cells while preserving normal immune function (Primorac et al., 2021).

Platforms such as Neo7Bioscience's PBIMA (Precision-Based Immunomolecular Augmentation) are paving the way for safer and more effective cancer treatments. By leveraging patient-specific molecular data, PBIMA enhances the immune system's ability to mount a precise response against cancer without introducing the toxic side effects commonly associated with chemotherapy and traditional immunotherapies (Dimova et al., 2024).

4.4 Molecular Surveillance: The Future of Cancer Monitoring

The success of any cancer treatment depends not only on initial response but also on the ability to prevent recurrence and resistance. Molecular surveillance represents a revolutionary step forward in cancer monitoring, utilizing high-definition molecular diagnostics to track the disease at every stage (Dang & Park, 2022).

Figure 1. Chemotherapy Drug Toxicity Warning

Rather than relying on periodic imaging and biopsies, molecular surveillance provides continuous monitoring through liquid biopsies, circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) analysis, and single-cell sequencing (Brlek et al., 2024). These advanced diagnostics allow clinicians to detect microscopic traces of cancer before they manifest as visible tumors, enabling early intervention and preventing disease progression (Dimova et al., 2024).

For patients with a history of cancer, molecular surveillance offers a proactive strategy for long-term management, ensuring that any recurrence is detected at its earliest, most treatable stage (Manor et al., 2020). This approach fundamentally shifts the focus from reactive treatment to proactive disease interception, giving patients greater control over their health.

4.5 A Path to Sustainable, Non-Toxic Cancer Management

The current model of cancer treatment—characterized by aggressive, toxic interventions—has reached its limits. The future lies in solutions that not only target cancer effectively but also preserve and strengthen the patient's overall well-being (Primorac et al., 2020). Personalized molecular approaches offer a transformative alternative, moving away from symptom suppression and toward molecular-level healing (Ratiner et al., 2024).

By integrating signal-based medicine, adaptive precision therapies, peptide engineering, and continuous molecular surveillance, we can break the cycle of ineffective and toxic treatments (Milholland et al., 2017). This paradigm shift restores control to the patient, offering a future where cancer is managed as a chronic yet controllable condition rather than a terminal diagnosis (Hudetz et al., 2019).

The road ahead is clear: the era of chemotherapy must end. In its place, a new generation of intelligent, patient-centric cancer therapies is emerging—one that promises not just longer survival, but a higher quality of life (Primorac & Höppner, 2022). Personalized molecular solutions are not merely the future of oncology; they are the key to truly defeating cancer.

5. Discussion

Chemotherapy has long been the cornerstone of cancer treatment, targeting rapidly dividing cells to reduce tumor burden. However, it presents significant limitations, including severe toxicity, non-specificity, and the development of resistance (Sung et al., 2021). Traditional chemotherapy affects both cancerous and healthy proliferating cells, leading to adverse effects such as myelosuppression, gastrointestinal distress, and neurotoxicity (Arruebo et al., 2011). Additionally, many cancers develop resistance through mechanisms such as increased drug efflux, enhanced DNA repair, and activation of alternative survival pathways (Holohan et al., 2013). This limits long-term efficacy and contributes to relapse. Furthermore, while chemotherapy is effective in certain malignancies, it shows limited success in solid tumors like pancreatic and glioblastoma due to their protective tumor microenvironment (Gatenby & Brown, 2018). These challenges highlight the need for a transition toward precision medicine, which aims to tailor treatment based on genetic and molecular characteristics of the tumor (Huang et al., 2020).

Precision medicine leverages genomic sequencing, molecular profiling, and targeted therapies to enhance treatment specificity and effectiveness (Dienstmann et al., 2017). Notable advancements include targeted therapies such as imatinib for chronic myeloid leukemia (CML) and trastuzumab for HER2-positive breast cancer, which exemplify the success of precision medicine in targeting specific molecular aberrations. Additionally, the development of immune checkpoint inhibitors, such as pembrolizumab and nivolumab, has revolutionized treatment for several cancers by enhancing the body's immune response (Ribas & Wolchok, 2018). Identification of biomarkers like PD-L1 expression and BRC mutations allow for personalized treatment selection, improving patient outcomes and minimizing unnecessary toxicity (Tung et al., 2016). Given the limitations of chemotherapy, transitioning to precision medicine is crucial for improving cancer treatment outcomes. The integration of molecular diagnostics and targeted therapies offers a promising approach to overcoming resistance and reducing toxicity, ultimately enhancing patient survival and quality of life.

6. Conclusion

It is time to abandon the outdated belief that more chemotherapy will outpace cancer's relentless evolution. This toxic standard of care has trapped patients in a cycle where the treatment meant to save them often fuels their suffering. Instead of prioritizing precision medicine, the current system adheres to outdated protocols that weaken immune defenses and drive aggressive cancer relapses. Patients deserve better than a one-size-fits-all approach dictated by profit-driven models. Advancements in immunotherapy, targeted treatments, and personalized medicine offer a path forward—one that focuses on eradicating cancer without devastating the body. The medical community must shift from perpetuating toxic traditions to embracing innovative, patient-centered solutions. Ending chemotherapy's dominance is not just a medical necessity; it is a moral imperative. By choosing progress over profit, we can finally free patients from a treatment model that has long prioritized destruction over true healing.

Author contributions

All authors have contributed equally to this work.

Acknowledgment

Not applicable

Competing financial interests

The authors have no conflict of interest.

References

Brlek, P., Bulić, L., Bračić, M., Projić, P., Škaro, V., Shah, N., et al. (2024). Implementing whole genome sequencing (WGS) in clinical practice: Advantages, challenges, and future perspectives. Cells, 13, 504. https://doi.org/10.3390/cells13060504

Collins, L. H. C., & Moutasim, K. A. (2023). Current concepts in PD-L1 testing in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma: Overview, developments, and challenges. Diagnostic Histopathology, 29(5), 225-231. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mpdhp.2023.01.005

Dang, D. K., & Park, B. H. (2022). Circulating tumor DNA: Current challenges for clinical utility. Journal of Clinical Investigation, 132, e154941. https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI154941

Dimova, A., Erceg Ivkošić, I., Brlek, P., Dimov, S., Pavlović, T., Bokun, T., et al. (2024). Novel approach in rectovaginal fistula treatment: Combination of modified Martius flap and autologous micro-fragmented adipose tissue.

Hudetz, D., Jeleč, Ž., Rod, E., Borić, I., Plečko, M., & Primorac, D. (2019). The future of cartilage repair. In N. Bodiroga-Vukobrat, D. Rukavina, K. Pavelić, & G. G. Sander (Eds.), Personalized medicine in healthcare systems: Legal, medical and economic implications (pp. 375-411). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16465-2_29

Kakarla, S., & Gottschalk, S. (2014). CAR T cells for solid tumors: Armed and ready to go? Cancer Journal, 20(2), 151-155. https://doi.org/10.1097/PPO.0000000000000032

Li, Z., Wang, H., Zhang, Z., Meng, X., Liu, D., & Tang, Y. (2021). Germline and somatic mutation profile in cancer patients revealed by a medium-sized pan-cancer panel. Genomics, 113(4), 1930-1939. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ygeno.2021.04.029

Manor, O., Dai, C. L., Kornilov, S. A., Smith, B., Price, N. D., Lovejoy, J. C., et al. (2020). Health and disease markers correlate with gut microbiome composition across thousands of people. Nature Communications, 11, 5206. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-18871-1

Milholland, B., Dong, X., Zhang, L., Hao, X., Suh, Y., & Vijg, J. (2017). Differences between germline and somatic mutation rates in humans and mice. Nature Communications, 8, 15183. https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms15183

Primorac, D., Bach-Rojecky, L., Vađunec, D., Juginović, A., Žunić, K., Matišić, V., et al. (2020). Pharmacogenomics at the center of precision medicine: Challenges and perspectives in an era of Big Data. Pharmacogenomics, 21(3), 141-156. https://doi.org/10.2217/pgs-2019-0134

Primorac, D., Höppner, W. (2022). Pharmacogenetics in clinical practice: Experience with 55 commonly used drugs. St. Catherine Hospital, Zagreb, Berlin, Hamburg, Philadelphia.

Primorac, D., Höppner, W. (2023). Pharmacogenomics: Clinical application. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

Primorac, D., Stojanović Stipić, S., Strbad, M., Girandon, L., Barlič, A., Frankić, M., et al. (2021). Compassionate mesenchymal stem cell treatment in a severe COVID-19 patient: A case report. Croatian Medical Journal, 62(3), 288-296. https://doi.org/10.3325/cmj.2021.62.288

Ratiner, K., Ciocan, D., Abdeen, S. K., Elinav, E., et al. (2024). Utilization of the microbiome in personalized medicine. Nature Reviews Microbiology, 22(4), 291-308. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41579-023-00998-9

Shah, N., Brlek, P., Bulić, L., Brenner, E., Škaro, V., Skelin, A., et al. (2024). Genomic sequencing for newborn screening: Current perspectives and challenges. Croatian Medical Journal, 65, 261-268. https://doi.org/10.3325/cmj.2024.65.261

Aggarwal, S. (2010). Targeted cancer therapies. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 9(5), 427-438.https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd3186

Alibhai, S. M., Aziz, S., Manokumar, T., Timilshina, N., & Breunis, H. A. (2017). A comparison of the CARG tool, the VES-13, and oncologist judgment in predicting grade 3+ toxicities in men undergoing chemotherapy for metastatic prostate cancer. Journal of Geriatric Oncology, 8(1), 31-36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jgo.2016.09.005

Armstrong, G. T. (2015). Comprehensive echocardiographic detection of treatment-related cardiac dysfunction in adult survivors of childhood cancer: Results from the St. Jude Lifetime Cohort Study. Journal of the American College of Cardiology.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2015.04.013

Arruebo, M., Vilaboa, N., Santamaría, J., & González-Fernández, A. (2011). Assessment of the evolution of cancer treatment therapies. Cancers, 3(3), 3279-3330. https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers3033279

Barteková, M. (2021). Natural and synthetic antioxidants targeting cardiac oxidative stress and redox signaling in cardiometabolic diseases. Free Radical Biology and Medicine. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.freeradbiomed.2021.03.045

Bhatia, S. (2020). Genetics of anthracycline cardiomyopathy in cancer survivors. JACC: CardioOncology.

Cameron, D. (2017). 11 years' follow-up of trastuzumab after adjuvant chemotherapy in HER2-positive early breast cancer: Final analysis of the HERceptin Adjuvant (HERA) trial. The Lancet..

Cherrington, J. M., Strawn, L. M., & Shawver, L. K. (2000). New paradigms for the treatment of cancer: The role of anti-angiogenesis agents. Advances in Cancer Research. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-230X(00)79001-4

Curigliano, G. (2020). Management of cardiac disease in cancer patients throughout oncological treatment: ESMO consensus recommendations. Annals of Oncology. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2019.10.023

Dasari, S., & Tchounwou, P. B. (2014). Cisplatin in cancer therapy: Molecular mechanisms of action. European Journal of Pharmacology.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejphar.2014.07.025

Dienstmann, R., Vermeulen, L., Guinney, J., Kopetz, S., Tejpar, S., & Tabernero, J. (2017). Consensus molecular subtypes and the evolution of precision medicine in colorectal cancer. Nature Reviews Cancer, 17(2), 79-92. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc.2016.126

Extermann, M., et al. (2012). Predicting the risk of chemotherapy toxicity in older patients: The chemotherapy risk assessment scale for high-age patients (CRASH) score. Cancer, 118(13), 3377-3386. https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.26646

Garraway, L. A., & Lander, E. S. (2013). Lessons from the cancer genome. Cell, 153(1), 17-37. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2013.03.002

Gatenby, R. A., & Brown, J. S. (2018). The evolution and ecology of resistance in cancer therapy. Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Medicine, 8(3), a033415. https://doi.org/10.1101/cshperspect.a033415

Gottesman, M. M. (2012). Mechanisms of cancer drug resistance. Annual Review of Medicine, 53(1), 615-627.

Hanahan, D., & Weinberg, R. A. (2011). Hallmarks of cancer: The next generation. Cell, 144(5), 646-674.

Hanna, N. H., et al. (2020). Immunotherapy for lung cancer. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 38(18), 1993-2002.

Holohan, C., et al. (2013). Cancer drug resistance: An evolving paradigm. Nature Reviews Cancer, 13(10), 714-726.

Holohan, C., Van Schaeybroeck, S., Longley, D. B., & Johnston, P. G. (2013). Cancer drug resistance: An evolving paradigm. Nature Reviews Cancer, 13(10), 714-726. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc3599

Huang, M., Shen, A., Ding, J., & Geng, M. (2020). Molecularly targeted cancer therapy: Some lessons from the past decade. Trends in Pharmacological Sciences, 41(1), 77-86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tips.2019.11.002

Hurria, A., et al. (2011). Predicting chemotherapy toxicity in older adults with cancer: A prospective multicenter study. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 29(25), 3457-3465. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2011.34.7625

June, C. H., et al. (2018). CAR T cell immunotherapy for human cancer. Science, 359(6382), 1361-1365.

Kim, J. (2020). Association between FDG uptake in the right ventricular myocardium and cancer therapy-induced cardiotoxicity. Journal of Nuclear Cardiology.https://doi.org/10.1007/s12350-019-01617-y

Korc-Grodzicki, B., Holmes, H. M., & Shahrokni, A. (2015). Geriatric assessment for oncologists. Cancer Biology & Medicine, 12(4), 261-274. https://doi.org/10.7497/j.issn.2095-3941.2015.0082

Li, M. (2020). Autophagy and cancer therapy cardiotoxicity: From molecular mechanisms to therapeutic opportunities. Biochimica et Biophysica Acta - Molecular Cell Research. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbamcr.2019.06.007

Miller, K. D., et al. (2019). Cancer treatment and survivorship statistics, 2019. CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, 69(5), 363-385.https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21565

Mohile, S. G., et al. (2018). Practical assessment and management of vulnerabilities in older patients receiving chemotherapy: ASCO Guideline for Geriatric Oncology. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 36(22), 2326-2347. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2018.78.8687

Mukherjee, S. (2010). The Emperor of All Maladies: A Biography of Cancer. Scribner.

Okoli, G. N., et al. (2021). Integration of geriatric assessment into clinical oncology practice: A scoping review. Current Problems in Cancer, 45(3), 100699. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.currproblcancer.2020.100699

Plana, J. C. (2014). Expert consensus for multimodality imaging evaluation of adult patients during and after cancer therapy: A report from the American Society of Echocardiography and the European Association of Cardiovascular Imaging. Journal of the American Society of Echocardiography.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.echo.2014.07.012

PMCid:PMC8019325

Reed, M., Patrick, C., Quevillon, T., Walde, N., & Voutsadakis, I. A. (2019). Prediction of hospital admissions and grade 3-4 toxicities in cancer patients 70 years old and older receiving chemotherapy. European Journal of Cancer Care, 28(6), e13144. https://doi.org/10.1111/ecc.13144

Ribas, A., & Wolchok, J. D. (2018). Cancer immunotherapy using checkpoint blockade. Science, 359(6382), 1350-1355.https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aar4060

Ribas, A., & Wolchok, J. D. (2018). Cancer immunotherapy using checkpoint blockade. Science, 359(6382), 1350-1355. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aar4060

Schmid, D., & Leitzmann, M. F. (2015). Cardiorespiratory fitness as predictor of cancer mortality: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Annals of Oncology.https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdu250

Shah, P. (2019). Meta-analysis comparing usefulness of beta blockers to preserve left ventricular function during anthracycline therapy. American Journal of Cardiology.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjcard.2019.05.046

Shahrokni, A., Kim, S. J., Bosl, G. J., & Korc-Grodzicki, B. (2017). How we care for an older patient with cancer. Journal of Oncology Practice, 13(2), 95-102. https://doi.org/10.1200/JOP.2016.017608

Sullivan, R., et al. (2011). Delivering affordable cancer care in high-income countries. The Lancet Oncology, 12(10), 933-980.https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(11)70141-3

Sung, H., Ferlay, J., Siegel, R. L., Laversanne, M., Soerjomataram, I., Jemal, A., & Bray, F. (2021). Global cancer statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, 71(3), 209-249. https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21660

Tung, N. M., Garber, J. E., & Gelman, R. S. (2016). BRCA1/2 testing: The evolving landscape of clinical applications. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 34(6), 613-616. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2015.63.5453

Vachhani, P. (2017). Dexrazoxane for cardioprotection in older adults with acute myeloid leukemia. Leukemia Research Reports.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrr.2017.04.001

Vejpongsa, P., & Yeh, E. T. H. (2014). Prevention of anthracycline-induced cardiotoxicity: Challenges and opportunities. Journal of the American College of Cardiology.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2014.06.1167

Voutsadakis, I. A. (2018). Clinical tools for chemotherapy toxicity prediction and survival in geriatric cancer patients. Journal of Chemotherapy, 30(5), 266-279. https://doi.org/10.1080/1120009X.2018.1475442

Wenningmann, N. (2019). Insights into doxorubicin-induced cardiotoxicity: Molecular mechanisms, preventive strategies, and early monitoring. Molecular Pharmacology.https://doi.org/10.1124/mol.119.115725

Zhang, K. (2019). A comparison of global longitudinal, circumferential, and radial strain to predict outcomes after cardiac surgery. Journal of Cardiothoracic and Vascular Anesthesia.https://doi.org/10.1053/j.jvca.2018.10.031

Zhao, L. (2018). MicroRNA-140-5p aggravates doxorubicin-induced cardiotoxicity by promoting myocardial oxidative stress via targeting Nrf2 and Sirt2. Redox Biology.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.redox.2017.12.013