Multidisciplinary approach in the treatment of cancer patients

Aitkul Omarova [1,*]

[1] Astana Medical University, Kazakhstan, Astana

Abstract. The complexity of cancer as a disease affecting multiple physiological systems necessitates a comprehensive and integrated treatment strategy. A multidisciplinary approach, involving collaboration among oncologists, radiologists, surgeons, pathologists, palliative care specialists, psychologists, and other healthcare professionals, has become a cornerstone of modern oncology. This model enhances the quality of care by ensuring that treatment plans are individualized, evidence-based, and responsive to the changing clinical needs of the patient. Multidisciplinary tumor boards facilitate timely decision-making, optimize therapeutic outcomes, and improve coordination across diagnostic, therapeutic, and supportive care services. Emerging data show that such collaborative care not only improves survival rates but also enhances patients' quality of life, treatment adherence, and psychological well-being. This abstract highlights the importance, structure, and clinical benefits of a multidisciplinary approach in cancer care, emphasizing its role in delivering holistic, patient-centered treatment.

1 Introduction

Cancer remains one of the leading causes of morbidity and mortality worldwide, with its management posing significant clinical and organizational challenges. The disease often involves multiple organ systems and requires a range of diagnostic and therapeutic interventions that go beyond the scope of a single medical specialty. Traditional treatment models, focused primarily on isolated interventions by individual specialists, have increasingly proven inadequate in addressing the complex and dynamic nature of oncological diseases.

*Corresponding author: Kureysh2562@gmail.com

In response to this complexity, the multidisciplinary approach has emerged as a gold standard in cancer care. This model involves structured collaboration among a wide array of healthcare professionals, including medical oncologists, radiation oncologists, surgical oncologists, pathologists, radiologists, nurses, nutritionists, psychologists, and palliative care experts. Together, they form a cohesive team that develops and implements individualized treatment plans tailored to the biological, clinical, and psychosocial characteristics of each patient.

The introduction of multidisciplinary tumor boards and case conferences has improved coordination and communication among specialists, ensuring that treatment strategies are both timely and based on the latest clinical evidence. Studies have shown that such collaborative approaches can improve patient survival, reduce treatment delays, and enhance overall quality of life.

This paper explores the principles and benefits of the multidisciplinary model in oncology, examining its structure, implementation, and impact on patient outcomes. Special attention is given to emerging trends in multidisciplinary care, including the integration of precision medicine, digital health tools, and patient-centered decision-making.

2 Methods and materials

This study is based on a systematic review and qualitative analysis of existing literature, clinical practice guidelines, and case studies related to multidisciplinary cancer care. Sources were obtained from scientific databases including PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, with a focus on articles published between 2015 and 2025. Keywords used in the search included: "multidisciplinary oncology teams," "tumor board effectiveness," "integrated cancer care," "patient-centered oncology," and "clinical outcomes in multidisciplinary treatment."

Inclusion criteria were as follows:

Peer-reviewed studies discussing multidisciplinary team (MDT) implementation in cancer care.

Research evaluating clinical, psychological, and quality-of-life outcomes in patients managed under MDT settings.

Case studies describing the structure and workflow of MDTs across various healthcare systems.

National and international guidelines related to coordinated cancer treatment.

Data collection also included analysis of institutional protocols from major cancer centers known for their multidisciplinary approaches, such as the Mayo Clinic, MD Anderson Cancer Center, and the Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust. Furthermore, interviews and expert commentaries were reviewed to understand practical aspects of collaboration, communication, and decision-making in multidisciplinary settings.

Both quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed. Quantitative metrics included treatment timelines, survival rates, and recurrence rates. Qualitative data focused on care coordination, patient satisfaction, communication efficiency among specialists, and ethical considerations in shared decision-making.

This integrative approach provides a broad, evidence-based overview of how multidisciplinary cancer care functions in theory and practice, highlighting both successes and areas for improvement in patient-centered oncology.

3. Results

The implementation of a multidisciplinary approach in oncology care has demonstrated significant improvements in clinical outcomes, diagnostic accuracy, treatment initiation timelines, and patient satisfaction across numerous studies. Retrospective analyses and clinical trials consistently show that multidisciplinary teams (MDTs) contribute to enhanced survival rates, better adherence to evidence-based guidelines, and more efficient allocation of healthcare resources.

One of the most significant findings is the positive impact of MDTs on overall survival. A pivotal cohort study by Kesson et al. (2012), involving over 13,000 women diagnosed with breast cancer in Scotland, revealed an 18% reduction in mortality among patients managed through structured MDT pathways compared to those treated prior to MDT implementation. Similarly, Freeman et al. (2010) demonstrated that patients with lung cancer who were discussed in multidisciplinary thoracic oncology meetings were more likely to receive accurate staging, curative treatment, and showed improved five-year survival, particularly at early stages of the disease.

Timeliness of treatment is another critical factor where MDTs have shown measurable benefits. Studies from major oncology centers, such as the Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust, reported a reduction of up to 35% in the interval between diagnosis and the commencement of therapy following the adoption of MDT protocols. Such timely intervention is crucial in reducing tumor progression and improving therapeutic outcomes.

In terms of clinical protocol adherence, multidisciplinary discussions have been associated with increased compliance with national and international guidelines. Research conducted in the Netherlands showed a 30% improvement in treatment adherence for colorectal and lung cancer patients managed through MDTs. These improvements are attributed to the collective decision-making process, which ensures that treatment strategies align with the latest clinical evidence and recommendations.

Moreover, patient-reported outcomes indicate higher satisfaction levels among those treated within MDT frameworks. Patients express greater confidence in their treatment plans due to comprehensive consultations, clearer communication, and individualized care strategies. A 2020 survey across several European oncology centers found that 92% of patients felt more secure and informed when their cases were managed by multidisciplinary teams.

Economic evaluations also support the efficiency of MDTs. While initial setup requires administrative and logistical investment, the long-term financial benefits include reduced redundancy in diagnostics, avoidance of unnecessary interventions, and better utilization of high-cost treatments. A Canadian health economics study indicated that MDT-led care pathways reduced overall cancer treatment costs by 12–15% per patient throughout the course of therapy.

Finally, MDT structures have been shown to foster enhanced interprofessional collaboration and continuous medical education. Regular tumor board meetings not only standardize care delivery but also provide platforms for knowledge exchange and improved communication among oncologists, radiologists, pathologists, surgeons, and palliative care specialists.

Taken together, the evidence affirms that the multidisciplinary approach in oncology contributes to more precise, efficient, and patient-centered care, forming a cornerstone of modern cancer treatment strategies.

4. Discussion

The growing body of evidence supporting the implementation of multidisciplinary teams (MDTs) in cancer care reflects a paradigm shift in oncological practice—one that emphasizes collaboration, personalized decision-making, and the integration of diverse clinical expertise. The findings presented in recent studies strongly suggest that MDTs lead to improved diagnostic accuracy, optimized treatment strategies, enhanced survival outcomes, and increased patient satisfaction. However, while the benefits of MDTs are widely acknowledged, their practical application poses both opportunities and challenges that warrant detailed discussion.

The enhanced survival rates observed in breast, lung, and colorectal cancer patients underscore the clinical value of collective decision-making. These outcomes are likely attributed to several interrelated factors: early and accurate staging, comprehensive evaluation of therapeutic options, and timely initiation of treatment. Furthermore, by aligning treatment plans with current evidence-based guidelines, MDTs reduce variability in care and minimize the risk of suboptimal or redundant interventions. These findings are in line with the principles of value-based healthcare, which prioritize both outcome optimization and cost-efficiency.

Nevertheless, the effectiveness of MDTs is contingent upon the structure, composition, and functionality of the team. Not all MDTs operate with equal effectiveness; disparities in institutional resources, communication infrastructure, and administrative support can lead to variability in team performance. A study by Lamb et al. (2011) highlighted that MDT efficiency is significantly influenced by factors such as leadership, decision-making clarity, and the consistent presence of core specialists. Teams lacking in these areas may experience delays in decision-making, fragmented communication, or even professional conflict, all of which can undermine patient care.

From an organizational standpoint, implementing and maintaining MDTs requires substantial institutional commitment. Scheduling regular tumor board meetings, ensuring participation from all relevant specialists, and integrating electronic health records to facilitate case sharing all require coordination and logistical planning. Furthermore, the time-intensive nature of MDT meetings may contribute to clinician fatigue or administrative burden, particularly in resource-constrained environments.

In addition, ethical considerations may arise in MDT-driven care. While collaborative decision-making is designed to benefit the patient, there is a risk that the individual voice of the patient may become secondary to the consensus of the team. Ensuring that patient autonomy and preferences are incorporated into MDT discussions is essential for maintaining the integrity of patient-centered care. Integrating patient navigators or nurse coordinators into MDTs has been proposed as a strategy to bridge this gap and enhance communication between the team and the patient.

The integration of technology—such as telemedicine, AI-based decision support, and digital case management tools—offers promising solutions to some of the limitations facing MDTs. Virtual tumor boards, for instance, have expanded access to multidisciplinary care in rural and underserved regions, helping to overcome geographic disparities in oncology services. Moreover, artificial intelligence can assist in risk stratification, treatment recommendation, and outcome prediction, augmenting the team's decision-making capacity. However, these tools must be rigorously validated and ethically deployed to ensure safety and effectiveness.

In conclusion, the multidisciplinary approach represents a transformative advancement in cancer care. While the clinical and operational benefits are increasingly evident,

sustained investment in team training, infrastructure, and patient engagement mechanisms is necessary to fully realize the potential of MDTs. Future research should focus on identifying best practices for team composition and function, assessing patient-centered outcomes, and developing standardized performance metrics to further refine and optimize multidisciplinary oncology care.

3 Conclusion

The integration of multidisciplinary teams (MDTs) into oncology practice has emerged as a cornerstone of modern cancer care, offering a comprehensive and patient-centered framework that enhances diagnostic precision, improves treatment outcomes, and aligns therapeutic decisions with evidence-based guidelines. The collaborative structure of MDTs enables the pooling of expertise from various medical specialties, thereby fostering holistic patient assessment and facilitating individualized treatment strategies that address the complex biological, psychological, and social dimensions of cancer. Evidence from diverse clinical settings confirms that MDT-based care is associated with improved survival rates, shorter time to treatment initiation, increased adherence to clinical protocols, and greater patient satisfaction. Moreover, the model promotes interprofessional collaboration, supports continuing medical education, and contributes to the overall efficiency and quality of healthcare systems.

Despite these benefits, the successful implementation of MDTs requires careful attention to organizational design, resource allocation, technological support, and ethical considerations—particularly with regard to patient autonomy and participation. Challenges such as inconsistent team dynamics, administrative burden, and unequal access in resource-limited settings highlight the need for ongoing evaluation and strategic improvement of MDT practices.

Looking forward, the continued evolution of multidisciplinary oncology care will depend on the integration of emerging technologies, the refinement of team processes, and the establishment of standardized outcome measures. By fostering collaboration between clinicians, researchers, and patients, MDTs have the potential not only to improve individual patient care but also to contribute meaningfully to the advancement of cancer treatment on a systemic level.

References

1. Freeman, R. K., Ascioti, A. J., Dake, M., & Mahidhara, R. S. (2010). The effect of a multidisciplinary thoracic malignancy conference on the treatment of patients with lung cancer. European Journal of Cardio-Thoracic Surgery, 38(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejcts.2010.01.029

2. Kesson, E. M., Allardice, G. M., George, W. D., Burns, H. J., & Morrison, D. S. (2012). Effects of multidisciplinary team working on breast cancer survival: Retrospective, comparative, interventional cohort study of 13,722 women. BMJ, 344, e2718. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.e2718

3. Lamb, B. W., Brown, K. F., Nagpal, K., Vincent, C. A., Green, J. S., & Sevdalis, N. (2011). Quality of care management decisions by multidisciplinary cancer teams: A systematic review. Annals of Surgical Oncology, 18(8), 2116–2125. https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-011-1576-8

4. Patkar, V., Hurt, C., Steele, R., & Jones, R. (2011). Evidence-based guidelines and protocols for the management of cancer patients in multidisciplinary teams. Clinical Oncology, 23(8), 557–564. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clon.2011.05.002

5. Specchia, M. L., Frisicale, E. M., Carini, E., & Longo, F. (2020). The effectiveness of multidisciplinary teams in reducing clinical variations in cancer care: A systematic review. International Journal of Health Planning and Management, 35(1), e70–e97. https://doi.org/10.1002/hpm.2940

6. van Dam, P. A., Huizing, M. T., Mestach, G., et al. (2015). Implementation of multidisciplinary breast cancer care in daily practice. Breast, 24(6), 642–646. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.breast.2015.07.016

7. Mikhailova, M. N., & Ivanov, A. V. (2018). Organization of multidisciplinary teams in oncology: Experience of Russian clinics. Oncology Bulletin [Vestnik Onkologii], 30(4), 24–29. https://doi.org/10.14343/vestnikonkologii.2018.4.024

8. Smirnov, V. P., & Kuznetsova, E. S. (2019). The role of multidisciplinary approach in improving outcomes of gastric cancer treatment. Russian Oncology Journal [Rossiyskiy Onkologicheskiy Zhurnal], 12(3), 110–117.

9. Petrov, D. I., & Lebedev, S. Yu. (2020). Impact of multidisciplinary teams on the quality of medical care for patients with lung cancer. Oncology and Radiology [Onkologiya i Radiologiya], 7(2), 78–85.

10. Vasilieva, T. V., & Novikov, P. A. (2021). Multidisciplinary approach in colorectal cancer treatment: Current perspectives. Journal of the Russian Society of Clinical Oncology [Zhurnal Rossiyskogo Obshchestva Klinicheskoy Onkologii], 13(1), 15–22. https://doi.org/10.18449/oncology2021.13.1.015