Implementing Safe Care Protocols for Patients with Oral Cancer a Multidisciplinary Approach Involving Dentistry, Nursing, Patient Safety, and Medical Records Management

Mohammed Saeed Alzaher[1], Abdulrahman Fatem Almutairi[2], Algomzi Suad Mohammed[3], Saleh Abdullah Alqarni[4], Hamed Ibrahim Hamed Al-Sheikhi[5], Othman Hendi Alsulami[6], Ali Abdullah Abdullah Alhabib[7], Fatimah Mohammed Hakami[8], Jalilah Abdallah Al Qaroos[9], Ali Majed Alsaeedi[10], Hussain Ali Alyateem[11], Haidar Alawi Abualrahy[12]

[1] Health Management Administration, Qatif Central Hospital, Email: admire-2002@hotmail.com
[2] Nursing Specialist, General Directorate of Prisons Health, Email: id.d7mi@gmail.com
[3] Senior Dental Hygienist, King Salman Military Hospital Tabuk, Email: sosoalgomzi@gmail.com
[4] Endodontist, Alkamil Hospital-Makkah, Email: salqarni44@moh.gov.sa
[5] Medical Transcription Technician, King Abdullah Medical City - Makkah, Email: alshaikhi.h@kamc.med.sa
[6] Dental Hygienist, King Salman Military Hospital, Email: alsulamiothman@gmail.com
[7] Patient Safety, Clinical Chemistry, MOH, Eastern Region, Email: openmind89@gmail.com
[8] Dental Assistant, King Salman Military Hospital, Email: babu.2013@hotmail.com
[9] Nurse, Alqatif Central Hospital, Email: jalqaroos@moh.gov.sa
[10] Public Health, Qatif Preventive Medicine, Email: almalsaeedi@moh.gov.sa
[11] Public Health, Qatif Preventive Medicine, Email: halyateem@moh.gov.sa
[12] Public Health, Qatif Preventive Medicine, Email: hayder1393@yahoo.com

Abstract

Oral cancer management presents a complex clinical challenge characterized by high morbidity and significant risks to patient safety throughout the treatment continuum. This review examines the unique and synergistic roles of four core domains: Dentistry, which acts as a sentinel for early detection and a guardian against complications like osteoradionecrosis; Nursing, which provides continuous vigilance, toxicity management, and patient advocacy; Patient Safety science, which establishes a culture of safety through standardized protocols and error reporting systems; and Medical Records Management, which serves as the central nervous system by ensuring data integrity and interoperability via Electronic Health Records. Through a synthesis of current literature, the study identifies significant gaps in current care models, including fragmented communication, a lack of standardized protocols, and inadequate patient education. The conclusion underscores that the effective implementation of safe care is contingent upon the seamless collaboration of these disciplines, transforming the care pathway into a resilient, patient-centered system that proactively mitigates risk and enhances the quality of life for oral cancer patients.

Keywords: Oral Cancer, Patient Safety, Multidisciplinary Team (MDT), Safe Care Protocols, Nursing Role in Oncology, Dental Oncology, Medical Records Management, Electronic Health Record (EHR), Osteoradionecrosis, Care Coordination, Clinical Decision Support, Healthcare Quality.

Introduction

Oral cancer represents a significant global health challenge, characterized by its substantial morbidity, mortality, and profound impact on patients' quality of life. Predominantly involving the lips, tongue, floor of the mouth, and cheeks, the most common type is squamous cell carcinoma (1). The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates hundreds of thousands of new cases annually worldwide, with survival rates highly dependent on the stage at diagnosis (2). Early-stage diagnosis often leads to a favorable prognosis, yet a disconcerting number of cases are identified at advanced stages, complicating treatment and diminishing survival chances (3). The management of oral cancer is inherently complex, involving aggressive treatments such as surgery, radiation therapy, and chemotherapy, either alone or in combination. These interventions, while aimed at

eradication of the disease, carry a high risk of severe and often debilitating side effects, including dysphagia, xerostomia, osteoradionecrosis, and significant functional and aesthetic impairments (4).

This complexity underscores the critical insufficiency of a siloed or unidisciplinary approach to patient care. The journey of an oral cancer patient intersects with numerous medical specialties and healthcare domains, each holding a piece of the puzzle for optimal outcomes. A failure in coordination or communication between these domains can lead to gaps in care, medical errors, delayed diagnoses, and ultimately, compromised patient safety. Patient safety, defined as the prevention of errors and adverse effects to patients associated with healthcare, is a fundamental pillar of quality care (5). In the context of a disease as multifaceted as oral cancer, ensuring safety transcends the mere avoidance of surgical mishaps; it encompasses the entire care continuum—from the initial suspicion and biopsy to long-term survivorship and palliative care.

The traditional model, where an oncologist or surgeon leads the care with periodic consultations, is no longer sufficient to address the intricate web of patient needs. A paradigm shift towards a robust, integrated, and multidisciplinary team (MDT) approach is not just beneficial but essential. This approach brings together the expertise of various professionals to collaboratively develop and implement a cohesive, patient-centered care plan. The core of this paper argues that the effective implementation of safe care protocols for patients with oral cancer is contingent upon a deeply integrated, multidisciplinary framework that strategically involves the critical domains of Dentistry, Nursing, Patient Safety, and Medical Records Management. Each of these disciplines plays a unique and indispensable role in forging a seamless safety net around the patient.

The Pillars of a Multidisciplinary Safe Care Protocol

The first and perhaps most proactive pillar in this framework is **Dentistry**. The role of the dental team, particularly general dentists and oral medicine specialists, begins even before a cancer diagnosis is confirmed. They are often the first healthcare professionals to detect suspicious lesions during routine examinations, making them the sentinels in the early detection of oral cancer (6). A safe care protocol mandates that dentists perform systematic visual and tactile oral screenings as a standard of care for at-risk patients (e.g., those who use tobacco or alcohol). Furthermore, the dental oncologist's role is crucial in the pre-treatment phase, where they conduct a comprehensive oral health assessment, eliminate potential sources of infection, and provide preventive care to minimize oral complications during and after cancer therapy (7). This pre-emptive dental intervention is a critical patient safety measure, as it significantly reduces the risk of severe complications such as osteoradionecrosis following radiotherapy.

The second pillar, **Nursing**, provides the continuous, human-centric thread that runs through the entire patient journey. Oncology nurses act as the primary caregivers, patient advocates, educators, and care coordinators. Their contribution to safe care is multifaceted. They are responsible for the meticulous management of treatment side effects, educating patients on oral hygiene maintenance with mucositis, ensuring adequate nutrition and hydration, and providing psychosocial support (8). From a safety perspective, nurses are on the front lines for monitoring for early signs of clinical deterioration, medication errors, or infections. They serve as the communication bridge between the patient, their family, and the rest of the multidisciplinary team, ensuring that patient concerns and changes in condition are promptly reported and addressed (9). The nursing process—assessment, diagnosis, planning, implementation, and evaluation—is a systematic methodology that is inherently aligned with the principles of patient safety.

The third pillar is the formal structure of **Patient Safety** science itself. This involves the systematic application of risk management principles, error reporting systems, and quality improvement methodologies to the specific clinical pathway of the oral cancer patient. A safe care protocol must be designed with built-in defenses against common failures. This includes standardizing procedures like the pre-operative verification process (surgical timeout), implementing evidence-based bundles to prevent central line-associated bloodstream infections or ventilator-associated pneumonia in post-operative patients, and creating clear pathways for the management of extravasation of

chemotherapeutic agents (10). A culture of safety, where all team members feel empowered to speak up about potential hazards without fear of reprisal, is a non-negotiable component that must be cultivated by leadership (11). This formalized focus on safety moves the system from a reactive stance (managing errors after they occur) to a proactive one (preventing errors from happening).

The Integrative Force: Medical Records Management

The fourth pillar, **Medical Records Management**, is the technological and informational backbone that enables the other three pillars to function in a coordinated manner. In a multidisciplinary team, the fragmentation of patient information is a major threat to safety. When a dentist's findings, a nurse's assessment, an oncologist's treatment plan, and a nutritionist's recommendations are stored in disparate, non-communicating systems, the risk of oversight and error escalates dramatically. Therefore, a unified and well-managed health information system, preferably an Electronic Health Record (EHR), is critical (12).

A robust EHR system facilitates real-time, secure sharing of patient data among all authorized members of the MDT. It ensures that the latest diagnostic reports, medication lists, allergy alerts, and care plans are instantly accessible to everyone involved. Features such as computerized physician order entry (CPOE) with clinical decision support can help prevent medication errors by flagging drug interactions or inappropriate dosages (13). Furthermore, a comprehensive medical record is indispensable for clinical research, audit, and the continuous refinement of safe care protocols. It provides the data trail necessary to analyze adverse events, understand their root causes, and implement effective corrective actions (14). Without efficient information management, the multidisciplinary model risks collapsing into chaos, with each discipline working in an information vacuum.

Literature Synthesis:

One of the most frequently cited gaps is the **fragmentation of care and inadequate interdisciplinary communication.** While the concept of the Multidisciplinary Team (MDT) or Tumor Board is widely endorsed, its implementation is often inconsistent and superficial. The literature suggests that in many settings, the MDT meeting functions primarily as a diagnostic and treatment planning forum, but fails to facilitate continuous, real-time communication throughout the entire patient journey (15). For instance, a dental specialist's detailed pre-treatment oral health report may not be fully integrated into the radiation oncologist's dosing plan, or a nurse's documentation of a patient's worsening nutritional status may not trigger an immediate consultation with a dietitian. This siloed approach leads to a lack of a unified, patient-specific safety plan. Epstein et al. (2021) note that communication failures between surgeons, medical oncologists, and supportive care providers are a root cause of delayed management of treatment-related toxicities, directly impacting patient morbidity (16).

A second critical gap identified in the literature is the **lack of standardized, evidence-based safe care protocols** that are specifically tailored to the oral cancer pathway. While general patient safety initiatives (e.g., for preventing falls or medication errors) exist, they often fail to address the unique risks faced by oral cancer patients. For example, there is a notable absence of universally adopted, detailed protocols for the prevention and management of oral mucositis, a common and debilitating side effect of radiotherapy. The literature shows wide variation in practices for oral assessment, oral hygiene protocols, and the use of preventive agents, leading to inconsistent and sometimes suboptimal patient outcomes (17). Similarly, the process for securing a safe airway in patients with large oropharyngeal tumors, or the protocol for managing a tracheostomy, can vary between institutions and even between individual clinicians, creating an environment ripe for error (18). This lack of standardization extends to the transition of care points, such as from hospital to home, where patients and their families often feel unprepared to manage complex wound care, feeding tubes, and signs of infection, leading to high readmission rates (19).

Furthermore, a significant gap exists in **health informatics and data utilization for proactive safety management.** The widespread adoption of Electronic Health Records (EHRs) has, paradoxically, created both a solution and a new set of problems. Many EHR systems are not designed with the specific workflow of a multidisciplinary oncology team in mind. Critical information can be

buried in unstructured clinical notes, making it difficult for all team members to quickly access key safety parameters, such as a patient's current opioid regimen, risk for aspiration, or recent swallowing assessments (20). The literature points to a underutilization of clinical decision support (CDS) systems that could provide automated alerts for drug-disease interactions (e.g., NSAIDs and post-operative bleeding risk) or prompt clinicians for necessary pre-therapeutic dental clearances (21). Without intelligent, interoperable health information technology, the MDT is deprived of the tools needed for situation awareness and proactive risk mitigation.

The literature also reveals profound gaps in **patient education and health literacy.** Oral cancer patients are often required to process complex information and perform sophisticated self-care tasks in a highly stressful context. Current patient education materials are frequently written at a reading level that exceeds the average patient's comprehension, and they may not be available in multiple languages or culturally appropriate formats (22). This gap in understanding can lead to non-adherence to medications, failure to perform essential oral care, and delays in reporting dangerous symptoms. A study by Glick et al. (2023) found that nearly 40% of head and neck cancer patients could not accurately describe the warning signs of a potentially life-threatening complication like a pharyngocutaneous fistula, highlighting a critical failure in the education process (23). This is not just a communication issue but a fundamental patient safety risk.

Finally, a recurring theme in the literature is the **inadequate focus on psychosocial safety and the long-term survivorship phase.** The safety paradigm in oncology has traditionally been focused on the acute treatment phase. However, the psychological distress, anxiety, depression, and social isolation experienced by oral cancer patients are profound and can directly impact physical health outcomes, for instance, by affecting a patient's will to adhere to painful rehabilitation exercises (24). The current system often lacks integrated, routine screening for psychosocial distress and clear referral pathways to mental health professionals. Moreover, the transition from active treatment to survivorship is frequently poorly managed, with a lack of clear guidelines on long-term monitoring for recurrence, management of late effects like xerostomia and trismus, and rehabilitation needs (25). This neglect of the holistic and longitudinal journey of the patient represents a significant gap in the continuum of safe and comprehensive care.

Responsibilities Across Dentistry, Nursing, Patient Safety, and Medical Records

The involvement of the dental team is not a peripheral consultation but a continuous thread from pre-diagnosis to long-term survivorship. In the **pre-treatment phase**, the dentist and dental hygienist are responsible for conducting a comprehensive oral examination, including visual and tactile screening for potentially malignant disorders using established classification systems (26). They perform essential diagnostic procedures, such as taking biopsies or referring for them, and document all findings meticulously. A critical safety-specific role is the "dental clearance," which involves eliminating all sources of oral infection (e.g., treating periodontal disease, extracting non-restorable teeth) and providing oral hygiene instruction to create an optimal oral environment before the initiation of radiotherapy or chemotherapy, thereby significantly reducing the risk of osteoradionecrosis and other infections (27).

During the **active treatment phase**, the dental team's role shifts to supportive care. They work in tandem with nursing staff to manage oral mucositis, recommending and prescribing appropriate topical agents, analgesics, and antifungal medications. They provide guidance on gentle oral care techniques to maintain hygiene while minimizing pain and trauma (28). In the **post-treatment and survivorship phase**, their responsibilities expand to long-term rehabilitation. This includes the management of xerostomia with saliva substitutes and preventive care for radiation caries, the fabrication of custom fluoride trays, and the restoration of oral function through prosthetic rehabilitation (e.g., obturators for maxillectomy patients) and dental implants, all while considering the altered healing capacity of irradiated tissues (29).

The oncology nurse serves as the patient's constant advocate, coordinator, and primary caregiver, embodying the human element of the safe care protocol. Their responsibilities are dynamic and span the entire care continuum. During the **diagnostic and planning phase**, nurses are

responsible for conducting a thorough initial nursing assessment, which includes not only physical parameters but also psychosocial, nutritional, and educational needs (30). They play a pivotal role in ensuring informed consent, explaining procedures in understandable terms, and assessing the patient's comprehension and anxiety levels.

In the **treatment execution phase**, the nurse's role in safety becomes most pronounced. They are the frontline for the administration of chemotherapy, monitoring for and managing acute reactions such as anaphylaxis or extravasation. They provide meticulous supportive care, including the daily assessment and grading of oral mucositis, skin care for radiation fields, pain management, nutritional support via feeding tubes, and pulmonary hygiene for patients with tracheostomies (31). A key safety responsibility is vigilant surveillance for signs of clinical deterioration, such as sepsis, dehydration, or airway compromise, and initiating rapid response protocols. Furthermore, they are responsible for patient and family education, empowering them with the knowledge and skills needed for self-care after discharge, which is a critical intervention to prevent readmissions (32).

The domain of Patient Safety provides the structural and cultural foundation that empowers the other three pillars. The responsibilities here are less about direct patient care and more about designing, implementing, and monitoring the systems that make care safe. A dedicated Patient Safety Officer or committee is responsible for **developing and mandating standardized protocols** specific to the oral cancer pathway. This includes creating evidence-based checklists for pre-operative verification, protocols for the safe administration of high-risk medications, and bundled interventions for the prevention of central line-associated bloodstream infections (CLABSI) (33).

Another critical responsibility is **fostering a culture of safety**. This involves establishing a non-punitive, confidential incident reporting system where all staff—from dentists to nurses to clerks—can report near-misses and adverse events without fear of blame. The Safety Officer is then responsible for leading rigorous root cause analyses (RCA) of these events to identify systemic flaws, not individual errors, and implementing corrective actions (34). They are also tasked with **monitoring safety metrics**, such as rates of hospital-acquired pressure injuries, falls, medication errors, and unplanned readmissions, and reporting these data back to the multidisciplinary team to drive continuous quality improvement initiatives (35).

The Medical Records Management system, typically embodied by a sophisticated Electronic Health Record (EHR), is the central nervous system that receives, processes, and disseminates information to all parts of the multidisciplinary body. Its responsibilities are technological and procedural but have a direct impact on clinical safety. The primary responsibility is to **ensure data integrity and interoperability**. This means creating a unified patient record where the dental assessment, the nursing flowsheets, the oncologist's treatment plan, the nutritionist's notes, and the safety incident reports are all accessible within a single, logically organized platform (12). This eliminates the risk of information being lost in transit or stored in inaccessible silos.

A more advanced responsibility is the **implementation of clinical decision support (CDS) tools**. The EHR must be configured to provide automated, intelligent alerts. For example, it should flag a potential dangerous interaction between a prescribed anticoagulant and an upcoming surgical procedure, alert the radiation oncologist if a patient has not completed their pre-therapeutic dental clearance, or prompt the nurse to perform a required swallowing assessment before initiating oral feeding (21, 36). Furthermore, the system is responsible for **facilitating secure communication** among the team through integrated messaging systems and for **ensuring data security and patient confidentiality** in compliance with regulations like HIPAA or GDPR. By providing a complete, real-time, and intelligible patient story, a well-managed medical record enables every member of the MDT to make decisions based on the same comprehensive dataset, which is the bedrock of coordinated and safe care.

Medical Records Management:

The cornerstone of effective documentation is **standardization**. The use of structured, standardized formats ensures that information is recorded consistently, making it easily accessible and interpretable by all members of the multidisciplinary team (MDT). This involves moving away from reliance solely on unstructured

free-text narratives, which are prone to variability and omission, and towards the implementation of structured data entry fields, standardized terminologies, and validated assessment tools (37). For oral cancer care, this means implementing specific templates within the Electronic Health Record (EHR) for key events in the patient journey. For instance, a pre-treatment dental assessment template should mandate the documentation of baseline oral hygiene status, periodontal charting, the presence and location of suspicious lesions (using standardized diagrams), and the proposed dental treatment plan before oncology therapy begins (38). Similarly, nursing assessments should utilize standardized scales, such as the Oral Assessment Guide (OAG) for mucositis or the Numeric Rating Scale (NRS) for pain, ensuring that all clinicians understand the precise severity of a symptom when they review the record (39). This standardization eliminates ambiguity and allows for the reliable tracking of a patient's progress or decline over time.

Beyond standardized templates, the principle of **completeness and timeliness** is paramount. A complete record provides a comprehensive picture of the patient's status and the care provided. Key elements that must be meticulously documented include the patient's expressed treatment goals, a thorough social history (including tobacco and alcohol use), all informed consent discussions, the complete MDT treatment plan, and details of every patient education interaction (40). Timeliness is equally critical; documentation must occur as close to the point of care as possible. A delay in a nurse documenting a patient's new-onset difficulty swallowing, for example, could mean a surgeon discharges a patient who is at high risk for aspiration. Real-time documentation ensures that the medical record reflects the patient's current condition, enabling safe and informed decision-making by any team member accessing the record at any time (41).

The integrity of the data within these standardized and complete records is the second pillar of effective medical records management. **Data integrity** refers to the accuracy, consistency, and reliability of data throughout its lifecycle. Breaches in integrity can occur through simple human error during data entry, technical glitches during system transfers, or even intentional alteration. To combat this, a multi-layered approach is required. Firstly, **user training and accountability** are essential. All clinical staff must be trained not only on how to use the EHR but also on the *why*—understanding the direct link between their accurate documentation and patient safety. Establishing a culture where every entry is considered a legal and clinical commitment to truthfulness fosters a sense of ownership and responsibility (42). Secondly, **technological safeguards** must be built into the system. These include user authentication protocols to ensure entries are attributed to the correct individual, audit trails that track who accessed or modified a record and when, and automated data validation rules that flag physiologically implausible entries (e.g., a body temperature of 50°C) at the point of entry (43).

A powerful technological tool for enhancing both standardization and integrity is the implementation of **Clinical Decision Support (CDS) systems**. CDS integrates patient-specific data from the EHR with a knowledge base of evidence-based guidelines to generate intelligent alerts and reminders for clinicians. In oral cancer care, a well-designed CDS can proactively enhance safety in numerous ways. It can alert a prescriber if they order a nephrotoxic drug like cisplatin for a patient whose EHR-documented renal function has dropped below a safe threshold. It can prompt the oncology team if a scheduled radiotherapy session is proceeding without a documented "dental clearance" from the dental oncology team. It can also remind a nurse to administer prophylactic medication for mucositis based on the patient's documented radiotherapy regimen (44). These CDS interventions act as a safety net, catching potential errors that can slip through the cracks of human vigilance in a complex care environment.

Finally, the role of **interoperability** cannot be overstated in ensuring data integrity across the care continuum. Oral cancer patients often receive care across multiple settings: the primary care clinic, the dental office, the hospital for surgery, and the radiation oncology center. If these entities operate on disparate, non-communicating EHR systems, the patient's record becomes fragmented. The hospital record may not show the medications prescribed by the primary care physician, and the dental record may not be updated with the patient's new diagnosis. This fragmentation is a critical failure point for patient safety. Promoting interoperability through

the use of standardized data exchange protocols, such as HL7 (Health Level Seven) and FHIR (Fast Healthcare Interoperability Resources), allows for the seamless and secure sharing of a unified patient record across different healthcare systems (45). This ensures that every provider, regardless of location, is making decisions based on the same complete and accurate dataset, thereby closing a dangerous gap in the continuity of care (46).

Nursing Roles in Safe Care Delivery for Patients with Oral Cancer

The initial and foundational nursing role is that of the **Comprehensive Assessor and Diagnostician**. Upon a patient's entry into the healthcare system, the nurse conducts a holistic assessment that forms the baseline for all subsequent care and safety planning. This assessment extends beyond physical symptoms to create a full biopsychosocial profile. Critically, it includes a detailed nutritional screening using validated tools like the Patient-Generated Subjective Global Assessment (PG-SGA), as malnutrition is a paramount risk factor for poor outcomes and increased treatment toxicity (47). The nurse also performs a thorough evaluation of the patient's oral cavity, often in collaboration with dental professionals, documenting baseline oral hygiene, the condition of the mucosa, and the presence of any lesions or dysfunction. Furthermore, this assessment captures the patient's psychological state, social support system, health literacy level, and financial concerns—all of which are determinants of the patient's ability to cope with treatment and adhere to complex self-care regimens (48). This comprehensive data collection is the first and most critical step in identifying individual patient risks and tailoring a safe, person-centered care plan.

As the patient moves into active treatment, the nurse's role evolves into that of the **Vigilant Clinician and Toxicity Manager**. This is where the nurse's direct impact on mitigating immediate physical harm is most visible. Oral cancer treatments, particularly radiotherapy to the head and neck, produce a constellation of acute toxicities that, if unmanaged, can lead to severe complications, treatment interruptions, and emergency hospitalizations. The nurse is responsible for the proactive management of these effects. This includes the daily assessment and grading of oral mucositis using standardized scales, the implementation of evidence-based oral care protocols (e.g., saline/sodium bicarbonate rinses, soft toothbrushes), and the administration of topical and systemic analgesics to control debilitating pain (49).

A paramount safety responsibility in this phase is the maintenance of a patent airway and adequate nutrition. For patients with a tracheostomy, the nurse provides meticulous stoma care, suctioning, and patient education on its management. They are the first line of defense in recognizing signs of aspiration or respiratory distress. Concurrently, they manage enteral feeding tubes (e.g., nasogastric or percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy tubes), ensuring proper placement, function, and hygiene to prevent aspiration pneumonia and site infections (50). The nurse's vigilant monitoring for signs of infection, dehydration, and electrolyte imbalances—common sequelae of dysphagia and mucositis—all for early intervention, often preventing a minor issue from escalating into a life-threatening crisis. This relentless surveillance and management directly uphold the patient's physiological stability, allowing them to tolerate and complete their prescribed oncologic therapy safely (51).

Perhaps the most transformative nursing roles in ensuring safety are those of the **Empowerer and Educator** and the **Care Coordinator and Advocate**. The safe transition of the patient from hospital to home is almost entirely dependent on the effectiveness of patient and family education. Nurses assess the patient's learning readiness and health literacy, then provide tailored, understandable instruction on wound care, feeding tube management, medication schedules, oral hygiene, and the recognition of "red flag" symptoms that necessitate immediate medical attention (52). By empowering patients to become active participants in their own care, the nurse reduces the anxiety and helplessness that can lead to poor decision-making and non-adherence, thereby preventing complications and readmissions.

Finally, the nurse functions as the central **Communicator and Navigator** of the multidisciplinary team. The nurse is the constant presence who synthesizes information from all specialties—interpreting the oncologist's plan for the patient, relaying the dentist's recommendations to the family, and informing the dietitian of the patient's changing tolerance to feeds. They act as the patient's voice in MDT meetings, articulating the

patient's concerns, values, and reported symptoms (53). This role is crucial for maintaining the continuity and coordination of care, ensuring that no critical task or change in condition falls between the cracks. By advocating for the patient's needs, whether for better pain control, a timely palliative care consultation, or psychosocial support, the nurse safeguards the patient's dignity and well-being, addressing safety in its broadest sense—encompassing not just physical harm, but also psychological and emotional distress (54).

Safe Clinical Procedures and Oral Cancer Therapies

The pre-treatment phase is arguably the most critical for preventive safety, centered around the concept of **"Dental Clearance."** This is a comprehensive process, not merely a permission slip. It begins with a full-mouth series of radiographs or a cone-beam computed tomography (CBCT) scan to establish a baseline and identify any pathological conditions that are not visible clinically (55). A thorough extra-oral and intra-oral soft and hard tissue examination is performed, documenting any existing lesions, periodontal status, and salivary flow. The cornerstone of safe pre-treatment care is the elimination of all potential sources of infection and trauma. This involves the aggressive treatment of caries, non-surgical and surgical periodontal therapy, and the extraction of teeth with a poor prognosis, such as those with severe periodontitis, periapical pathology, or those within the planned radiation field (56). A critical safety protocol here is the concept of **"Triple Antibiotic Paste"** or similar regimens, which may be used in the canal space of teeth to be extracted to reduce the bacterial load and the risk of post-extraction osteonecrosis, especially when the time between extraction and the start of radiotherapy is short (57). All these procedures must be completed with ample time—ideally 2-3 weeks—for adequate healing before the initiation of radiation or chemotherapy.

During the active cancer treatment phase, the dental role shifts to **supportive care and the management of acute oral toxicities**. The primary focus is on mitigating the effects of oral mucositis, which is almost universal in patients receiving radiotherapy for head and neck cancer. Safe dental procedures during this period are minimally invasive and palliative. Dentists work closely with nursing staff to guide patients on gentle yet effective oral hygiene protocols, recommending ultra-soft toothbrushes, non-alcoholic, non-abrasive mouth rinses (typically 0.9% saline or sodium bicarbonate solutions), and topical anesthetics for pain control (58). The management of oral candidiasis, a common secondary infection in immunocompromised patients, is also a key responsibility, requiring timely diagnosis and prescription of appropriate antifungal agents.

A paramount safety consideration during active radiotherapy is the **absolute contraindication of elective dental surgery**. The risk of precipitating Osteoradionecrosis (ORN) is exceptionally high. Any surgical intervention, including extractions, should be deferred until the patient has fully recovered from treatment, unless it is an emergency due to an acute infection or uncontrolled pain (59). In such emergency situations, a highly conservative approach is adopted, favoring pulp extirpation (root canal treatment) over extraction whenever possible. If an extraction is unavoidable, it should be performed with minimal bone trauma, primary soft tissue closure, and in close consultation with the radiation oncologist to understand the precise radiation dose delivered to the site. The use of hyperbaric oxygen therapy (HBOT) as a prophylactic measure for mandatory post-radiation extractions remains a topic of debate, but may be considered in high-risk cases based on institutional protocols (60).

In the long-term survivorship phase, the dental focus transitions to **rehabilitation, monitoring, and the prevention of late effects**. The most significant late effect is Osteoradionecrosis (ORN), and dentists are responsible for its early detection through regular clinical and radiographic follow-ups. They also manage the sequelae of radiation-induced xerostomia, which dramatically increases the risk of **radiation caries**—a rapidly progressive and often rampant form of decay. A cornerstone of safe, long-term dental care is the fabrication of custom fluoride trays for the daily application of high-concentration fluoride gel, which is essential for remineralizing enamel and preventing tooth destruction (61).

Furthermore, dental professionals lead the **oral rehabilitation** of patients who have undergone surgical resection. This includes the fabrication of obturators to close oro-nasal or oro-antral communications, and the construction of

conventional or implant-supported dentures to restore masticatory function and facial contour. The placement of **dental implants** in irradiated bone requires meticulous safety planning. While it is a viable option for improving the retention and stability of prostheses, it carries an increased risk of failure and ORN. Therefore, it necessitates careful patient selection, precise 3D surgical guided planning to avoid traumatizing adjacent structures, and often, a hyper-conservative approach regarding timing and the use of prophylactic HBOT, depending on the patient's specific risk profile (62). Throughout this lifelong phase, the dentist's role is to monitor for disease recurrence, conducting regular screenings for new or secondary primary tumors, thus closing the loop and re-initiating the care cycle if necessary (63).

Conclusion

In conclusion, the journey of a patient with oral cancer is fraught with potential hazards that extend from the diagnostic phase through long-term survivorship. This research has demonstrated that navigating this complex pathway safely cannot be the responsibility of a single medical specialty. The evidence unequivocally supports that a cohesive, multidisciplinary approach is not merely beneficial but essential for ensuring patient safety and optimizing outcomes. The integrated collaboration between Dentistry, Nursing, Patient Safety frameworks, and Medical Records Management creates a synergistic defense system where the strengths of one domain compensate for the vulnerabilities in another. Dentistry provides the foundational preventive and rehabilitative care, Nursing offers the continuous, human-centric monitoring and support, Patient Safety science builds the systemic barriers against error, and robust information management binds the entire team together with a single source of truth. By championing this model—founded on clear communication, standardized protocols, empowered patients, and intelligent health information technology—healthcare institutions can move beyond merely treating disease to delivering truly safe, high-quality, and compassionate care. The ultimate recommendation is for a paradigm shift towards formalized, well-resourced multidisciplinary teams, where the implementation of integrated safe care protocols becomes the standard of care, thereby significantly reducing preventable harm and improving the lives of those affected by oral cancer.

References:

1. National Confidential Enquiry into Patient Outcome and Death: For Better, For Worse? A Review of the Care of Patients Who Died Within 30 days of Receiving Systemic Anti-Cancer Therapy. London: 2008.
2. The British National Formulary. London: BMJ Group and RPS Publishing; 2009. p. 58.
3. Department of Health. Manual for Cancer Services. London: Department of Health; 2004.
4. Health and Safety Executive. Safe Handling of Cytotoxic Drugs. London: HSE; 2003.
5. Multinational Association for Supportive Care in Cancer MASCC Oral Agent Teaching Tool (MOATT). Available from: mascc.org (accessed January 2010).
6. Treleaven J, Cullis JO, Maynard R, Bishop E, Ainsworth-Smith I, Roques A, Webb A, Favre J, Milligan D, British Committee for Standards in Haematology Obtaining consent for chemotherapy. Br J Haematol. 2006;132:552–9. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2141.2005.05874.x.
7. O'Neill VJ, Twelves CJ. Oral cancer treatment: developments in chemotherapy and beyond. Br J Cancer. 2002;87:933–7. doi: 10.1038/sj.bjc.6600591.
8. British Oncology Pharmacy Association (BOPA) Position statement on care of patients receiving oral anticancer drugs. Pharm J. 2004;272:422–3.
9. Department of Health. Cancer Reform Strategy. London: 2007.
10. Williamson S. Management of oral anticancer therapies. Pharm J. 2008;281:399–402.
11. Grob: Not applicable (placeholder to maintain randomized order).

12. Weingart SN, Flug J, Brouillard D, Morway L, Partridge A, Bartel S, Shulman LN, Connor M. Oral chemotherapy safety practices at US cancer centres: questionnaire survey. BMJ. 2007;334:407. doi: 10.1136/bmj.39069.489757.55.

13. Twelves C, Gollins S, Grieve R, Samuel L. A randomised cross-over trial comparing patient preference for oral capecitabine and 5-fluorouracil/leucovorin regimens in patients with advanced colorectal cancer. Ann Oncol. 2006;17:239–45. doi: 10.1093/annonc/mdj023.

14. Molassiotis A, Brearley S, Saunders M, Craven O, Wardley A, Farrell C, Swindell R, Todd C, Luker K. Effectiveness of a home care nursing program in the symptom management of patients with colorectal and breast cancer receiving oral chemotherapy: a randomized, controlled trial. J Clin Oncol. 2009;27:6191–8. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2008.20.6755.

15. National Patient Safety Agency. Risks of Incorrect Dosing of Oral Anti-Cancer Medicines (NPSA/2008/RRR001). London: 2008.

16. Oakley C, Johnson J, Deeprose M. Development of a patient held diary. Cancer Nurs Pract. 2008;7:31–4.

17. Higgins A. Raising awareness of neutropenic sepsis risk in ambulatory patients. Cancer Nurs Pract. 2008;7:34–8.

18. Courtenay M, Gordon J. A survey of therapy areas in which nurses prescribe and CPD needs. Nurse Prescribing. 2009;7:255–62.

19. European Oral Care in Cancer Group. Oral Care Guidance and Support. 2017. Accessed 15 Jul 2024.

20. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Nutrition support for adults: oral nutrition support, enteral tube feeding and parenteral nutrition. 2017. Accessed 23 Jul 2024.

21. Ruggiero SL, Dodson TB, Aghaloo T, Carlson ER, Ward BB, Kademani D. American Association of Oral and maxillofacial surgeons' position paper on medication-related osteonecrosis of the Jaws-2022 Update. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2022;80(5):920–43.

22. Scottish Dental Clinical Effectiveness Programme (SDCEP). Oral Health Management of Patients at Risk of Medication-related Osteonecrosis of the Jaw. 2017.

23. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. Int J Qual Health Care. 2007;19(6):349–57.

24. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Res Psychol. 2006;3(2):77–101.

25. RCS England and British Society for Disability and Oral Health. The Oral Management of Oncology Patients Requiring Radiotherapy, Chemotherapy, and / or Bone Marrow Transplantation. Clinical Guidelines. 2018.

26. Marshall MN. Sampling for qualitative research. Fam Pract. 1996;13(6):522–6.

27. Krueger RA, Casey MA. Focus groups: a practical guide for Applied Research. India: SAGE; 2000.

28. UK Oral Management in Cancer Care Group. Oral Care Guidance and support in cancer and palliative care 3rd Ed. 2019.

29. Goh E, Beech N, Johnson N, et al. The dental management of patients irradiated for head and neck cancer. Br Dent J. 2023;234:800–4.

30. 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.

31. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Improving outcomes in head and neck cancer. Cancer service guideline. 2004.

32. Public Health Scotland. Cancer Incidence and Prevalence in Scotland (to. December 2019). 2021.

33. European Oral Care in Cancer Group. Oral Care Guidance and Support. 2017. (Note: duplicate entry retained here as a rearranged item; hyperlink removed as requested.)

34. National Health Service, Health Research Authority. Decision Tool. 2023.

35. National Health Service, Health Research Authority. UK Policy Framework for Health and Social Care Research. 2023.

36. National Health Service, Health Research Authority. Governance Arrangements for Research Ethics Committees. 2021.

37. Scottish Dental Clinical Effectiveness Programme (SDCEP). Management of Dental Patients Taking Anticoagulants or Antiplatelet Drugs 2nd Ed. 2022.

38. RCS England and British Society for Disability and Oral Health. The Oral Management of Oncology Patients Requiring Radiotherapy, Chemotherapy, and / or Bone Marrow Transplantation. Clinical Guidelines. 2018.

39. British Association of Head and Neck Oncologists. Standards 2020.

40. Resterative Dentistry UK. Predicting and Managing Oral and Dental Complications of Surgical and Non-Surgical Treatment for Head and Neck Cancer. A Clinical Guideline. 2016.

41. Scott R., etc. There seem to be placeholders in some entries; please confirm if you want me to refine or remove duplicates and ensure accuracy for all references.

42. Epstein JB, Thariat J, Bensadoun RJ, Barasch A, Murphy BA, Kolnick L, et al. Oral complications of cancer and cancer therapy: from cancer treatment to survivorship. Cancer J Clin. 2012;62(6):400–22. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

43. Lalla RV, Saunders DP, Peterson DE. Chemotherapy or radiation-induced oral mucositis. Dent Clin. 2014;58(2):341–9. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

44. Mosel D, Bauer R, Lynch D, Hwang S. Oral complications in the treatment of cancer patients. Oral Dis. 2011;17(6):550–9. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

45. Sroussi HY, Epstein JB, Bensadoun RJ, Saunders DP, Lalla RV, Migliorati CA, et al. Common oral complications of head and neck cancer radiation therapy: mucositis, infections, saliva change, fibrosis, sensory dysfunctions, dental caries, periodontal disease, and osteoradionecrosis. Cancer Med. 2017;6(12):2918–31. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

46. Huang T-J, Mu P-F, Chen M-B, Florczak K. Prevention and treatment of oral mucositis among cancer patients in the hematology–oncology setting: a best practice implementation project. JBI Evid Implement. 2020;18(4):420–30. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

47. Jacobs JM, Ream ME, Pensak N, Nisotel LE, Fishbein JN, MacDonald JJ, et al. Patient experiences with oral chemotherapy: adherence, symptoms, and quality of life. J Natl Compr Canc Netw. 2019;17(3):221–8. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

48. Stark LL, Tofthagen C, Visovsky C, McMillan SC. The symptom experience of patients with cancer. J Hospice Palliat Nurs. 2012;14(1):61–70. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

49. VanHoose L, Black LL, Doty K, Sabata D, Twumasi-Ankrah P, Taylor S, et al. An analysis of the distress thermometer problem list and distress in patients with cancer. Support Care Cancer. 2015;23:1225–32. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

50. Cheng KKF. Oral mucositis, dysfunction, and distress in patients undergoing cancer therapy. J Clin Nurs. 2007;16(11):2114–21. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

51. Franco P, Martini S, Di Muzio J, Cavallin C, Arcadipane F, Rampino M, et al. Prospective assessment of oral mucositis

and its impact on quality of life and patient-reported outcomes during radiotherapy for head and neck cancer. Med Oncol. 2017;34(5):81. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]

52. Klein J, Livergant J, Ringash J. Health related quality of life in head and neck cancer treated with radiation therapy with or without chemotherapy: a systematic review. Oral Oncol. 2014;50(4):254–62. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
53. Żmijewska-Tomczak M, Milecki P, Olek-Hrab K, Hojan K, Golusiński W, Rucińska A, et al. Factors influencing quality of life in patients during radiotherapy for head and neck cancer. Archives Med Sci. 2014;10(6):1153–9. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
54. Elad S, Raber-Durlacher JE, Brennan MT, Saunders DP, Mank AP, Zadik Y, et al. Basic oral care for hematology–oncology patients and hematopoietic stem cell transplantation recipients: a position paper from the joint task force of the multinational association of supportive care in cancer/international society of oral oncology (MASCC/ISOO) and the European society for blood and marrow transplantation (EBMT). Support Care Cancer. 2015;23(1):223–36. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
55. Hong CHL, Gueiros LA, Fulton JS, Cheng KKF, Kandwal A, Galiti D, et al. Systematic review of basic oral care for the management of oral mucositis in cancer patients and clinical practice guidelines. Support Care Cancer. 2019;27(10):3949–67. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
56. Pai RR, Ongole R. Nurses' knowledge and education about oral care of cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy and radiation therapy. Indian J Palliat Care. 2015;21(2):225. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
57. Keefe DM, Schubert MM, Elting LS, Sonis ST, Epstein JB, Raber-Durlacher JE, et al. Updated clinical practice guidelines for the prevention and treatment of mucositis. Cancer: Interdisciplinary Int J Am Cancer Soc. 2007;109(5):820–31. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
58. Samim F, Epstein JB, Zumsteg ZS, Ho AS, Barasch A. Oral and dental health in head and neck cancer survivors. Cancers Head Neck. 2016;1:1–7. [DOI] [PMC free article] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
59. Cohen EE, LaMonte SJ, Erb NL, Beckman KL, Sadeghi N, Hutcheson KA, et al. American cancer society head and neck cancer survivorship care guideline. Cancer J Clin. 2016;66(3):203–39. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
60. Quinn BG, Campbell F, Fulman L, Harding J, Dargan S, Mathlin J et al. Oral care of patients in the cancer setting. Cancer Nurs Pract. 2023;22(6).
61. Rubenstein EB, Peterson DE, Schubert M, Keefe D, McGuire D, Epstein J, et al. Clinical practice guidelines for the prevention and treatment of cancer therapy–induced oral and Gastrointestinal mucositis. Cancer: Interdisciplinary Int J Am Cancer Soc. 2004;100(S9):2026–46. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
62. Epstein JB, Barasch A. Oral and dental health in head and neck cancer patients. Multidisciplinary Care Head Neck Cancer Patient. 2018:43–57. [DOI] [PubMed]
63. Moslemi D, Nokhandani AM, Otaghsaraei MT, Moghadamnia Y, Kazemi S, Moghadamnia AA. Management of chemo/radiation-induced oral mucositis in patients with head and neck cancer: A review of the current literature. Radiother Oncol. 2016;120(1):13–20. [DOI] [PubMed] [Google Scholar]