Squamous cell carcinoma of head and cancer (SCCHN) constitutes about 21% of all cancer in this country, a significant number. Unfortunately, majority present with advanced stage or recur after initial definitive therapy. Despite significant advances in surgical, radiation and medical treatment, outcome and prognosis of recurrent SCCHN is poor. One field which is contributing significantly in the development of new drugs, is molecular biology. Better understanding of cancer pathogenesis, pathways involved, growth (inhibitory or stimulatory) factors, and knowledge of proteins involved in these activities have led to the concept of targeted therapy. Theoretically, these agents act on specific cellular pathways and receptor expressed on cancer cells and thereby are devoid of usual toxicity seen with cytotoxic chemotherapy. Ever since the success of Imatinib for chronic myeloid leukemia (CML) rituximab (anti CD 20 antibody) for non Hodgkin’s Lymphoma and transtuzumab (herceptin) for breast cancer which is known to express epidermal growth factor receptors (EGFR) also has been the focus for targeted therapy. Agents being studied are either monoclonal antibodies (cetuximab, panitumumab, matuzumab) or tyrosine kinase inhibitor (gefitinib or erlotinib etc.). Monoclonal antibody against EGFR, cetuximab has been found useful along with radiation therapy (RT) as first line therapy compared to RT alone, and along with platinum based chemotherapy in recurrent cancer. However, the true value of its usefulness will be seen only after results from ongoing studies are available. In this issue of IJMPO, Rao et al have reported their experience with gefitinib (a tyrosine kinase inhibitor) in the treatment of recurrent SCCHN. Authors have reported symptomatic improvement in about 63% of patients and radiological response (PR or disease stabilization) in 7 of 10 patients who were assessed. In this group of patients which authors have labeled as heavily pretreated though on looking at patients profile it appears that most of the patients have received just first line treatment similar responses could have been achieved with either single agent cisplatin, DDP+5FU or even with methotrexate. Hong et al in eighties have reported 3 months of response duration and 6.4 months of overall survival OS with cisplatin and 6.1 months with methotrexate. The median progression-free survival and overall survival of 3.7 months and 5.3 months are not beyond expectation. Cohen et al have reported time to progression of 3.4 months and of OS 8.1 months in similar patients in a phase II study using gefitinib.

Though it is welcome to try a new treatment in quest for better survival and quality of life it may be concluded that time is not yet ripe for routine use of gefitinib outside a clinical trial. Certainly more trials are required to confirm usefulness of small molecules and results from ongoing trials will be more confirmatory one way or other.
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