








ORIGINAL ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Advanced Stage Head and Neck Cancer Diagnosis: HEADSpAcE Consortium Health Systems Benchmarking Survey

Grant Creaney^{1,2}  | Mariél de Aquino Goulart^{1,2}  | Alex McMahon¹ | Claire Paterson^{2,3}  | James McCaul⁴ | Sandra Perdomo⁵ | Laura Mendoza⁶ | Laia Alemany⁷ | Lidia Maria Rebolho Arantes⁸  | Paula Andrea Rodriguez Urrego⁹ | Tom Dudding¹⁰ | Mirana Pring¹⁰ | Marta Vilensky¹¹ | Cecilia Cuffini¹² | Silvia Adriana Lopez de Blanc¹³ | José Carlos de Oliveira¹⁴ | Shahid Pervez¹⁵ | Pierre Saintigny¹⁶ | Mauricio Cuello¹⁷ | Jaroslav Betka¹⁸ | Luis Felipe Ribeiro Pinto¹⁹ | Maria Paula Curado²⁰  | Kazem Zendehehdel²¹ | Lorenzo Richiardi²² | Maja Popovic²²  | José Roberto de Podesta²³ | Sandra Ventorin von Zeidler²⁴ | Ricardo Mai Rocha²³ | HEADSpAcE Consortium⁵ | Shaymaa Alwaheidi⁵ | Paul Brennan⁵ | Shama Virani⁵ | Al Ross²⁵ | David I Conway^{1,2} 

¹School of Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK | ²Glasgow Head and Neck Cancer (GLAHNC) Research Group, Glasgow, UK | ³Beatson West of Scotland Cancer Centre, Glasgow, UK | ⁴Queen Elizabeth University Hospital, Glasgow, UK | ⁵International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), Lyon, France | ⁶Universidad Nacional de Asunción, Asuncion, Paraguay | ⁷Institut Catala D'oncologia, Barcelona, Spain | ⁸Hospital de Câncer de Barretos, Barretos, Brazil | ⁹Department of Pathology and Laboratories, Fundacion Santa Fe de Bogota, Bogota, Colombia | ¹⁰Bristol Dental School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK | ¹¹Universidad De Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina | ¹²Virology Institute, School of Medicine, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Córdoba, Argentina | ¹³Facultad de Odontología, Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Cordoba, Argentina | ¹⁴Araujo Jorge Hospital Brasil Goiânia Cancer Registry, Goiania, Brazil | ¹⁵Aga Khan University, Karachi, Pakistan | ¹⁶Centre Leon Berard, Lyon, France | ¹⁷Service of Oncology, Manuel Quintela Hospital, Montevideo, Uruguay | ¹⁸Department of Otorhinolaryngology and Head and Neck Surgery, 1st. Faculty of Medicine, Charles University in Prague, Faculty Hospital Motol, Prague, Czechia | ¹⁹Brazilian Ministry of Health/Instituto Nacional De Cancer, Rio De Janeiro, Brazil | ²⁰A. C. Camargo Centre, Sao Paulo, Brazil | ²¹Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran | ²²Cancer Epidemiology Unit, Department of Medical Sciences, University of Turin, and CPO-Piemonte, Turin, Italy | ²³Serviço de Cirurgia de Cabeça e Pescoço, Associação Feminina de Educação e Combate ao Câncer, Vitória, Brazil | ²⁴Pathology Department, Federal University of Espírito Santo, Vitória, Brazil | ²⁵School of Health, Education, Policing and Sciences, Staffordshire University, Stafford, UK

Correspondence: Grant Creaney (grant.creaney@glasgow.ac.uk)

Received: 15 November 2024 | **Accepted:** 25 January 2025

Funding: This study was supported by European Union's Horizon 2020 Framework Programme (grant no. 825771).

Keywords: diagnostic pathway | head and neck cancer | health systems | stage at diagnosis

ABSTRACT

Background: Globally, most people with head and neck cancers (HNCs) are diagnosed with advanced-stage disease. HNC diagnostic stage has multifactorial explanations, with the role of health system factors not yet fully investigated.

Methods: HNC centres ($n = 18$) from the HEADSpAcE Consortium were surveyed via a bespoke health system questionnaire covering a range of factors. Centres were compared using the least square means for the presence/absence of each health system factor to their proportion of advanced-stage HNC.

Abbreviations: HEADSpAcE, Head and Neck Cancer in South America and Europe consortium; HIC, high income country; HNC, head and neck cancer; IARC, International Agency for Research on Cancer; ICBP, International Cancer Benchmarking Partnership; LMIC, low-middle income country; WHO, World Health Organization.

The members of HEADSpAcE Consortium Group are listed in Appendix A.

Provisional results from this study were presented at the International Association for Dental Research General Assembly, Bogota, June 2023.

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2025 The Author(s). *Head & Neck* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC.

Results: Health system factors associated with lower proportion in advanced-stage diagnosis were formal referral triaging (14%, 95% CI-0.26, -0.03), routine monitoring of time from referral to diagnosis (16%, 95% CI-0.27, -0.05), and fully publicly funded systems (17%, 95% CI-0.29, -0.06). Several health systems factors had no routinely available data.

Conclusions: Through identifying and monitoring health systems factors associated with lower proportions of advanced stage HNC, interventions could be developed, and systems redesigned, to improve early diagnosis.

1 | Background

Head and neck cancers (HNCs) comprising cancers of the oral cavity, pharynx, and larynx are the sixth most commonly diagnosed cancer group globally with 90% of HNCs being squamous cell carcinoma (SCC) [1]. Mortality rates are high [2], and extensive multi-modal treatment is usually required, but often results in significant morbidities [3]. Stage at diagnosis influences treatment planning and is a key prognostic factor [4, 5], with advanced disease (Stage III and IV as per TNM 7th and 8th editions) [6, 7] resulting in poorer survival. Estimates from large international cohort studies have shown the proportion of advanced HNC to range from 54% in Europe [8] to 75% in South America [9]. Cancer registry analysis has shown that 59% of newly diagnosed HNCs in the United Kingdom were recorded as TNM stage III or IV in the national cancer registries in 2016–2018 [10]. Despite advances in understanding the causes and risks of developing HNC [2], preventative and early detection measures [11], and progress in treatments for HNCs including technological advances in radiotherapy and new immunotherapy regimens [12], there has been minimal improvements in survival from HNC observed in recent decades [1, 2].

Health systems are known to be complex with many challenges arising from dynamic interactions between patient factors, operational procedures, and organizational demands [13]. Currently, the literature investigating factors associated with diagnosis of advanced HNC does not include health system factors, and is limited to findings on individual race, type of health insurance, and is based in the United States of America [5, 14, 15], or is for the oral cavity subsite only where the main finding was the role of patient and professional awareness of oral cancer [16]. Recent studies investigating the role of health systems and diagnosis of cancer (but not including HNC), identified the potential role of technology, gate-keeping, finance, and centralisation of services on diagnostic pathways and patient experience toward diagnosis [15, 17, 18]. This study aims to explore the potential role for health system factors on the stage at diagnosis of HNC's exploring the different pathways to diagnosis across HEADSpAcE centres.

2 | Methods

2.1 | Study Design and Setting

The HEADSpAcE (Head and neck cancer in South America and Europe) Consortium is an international multicentre research programme coordinated by the International Agency for Research on Cancer—World Health Organization (IARC-WHO) focused on investigating factors associated with advanced stage at diagnosis of HNCs including genomic, patient, socioeconomic,

and health system factors [19]. The HEADSpAcE Consortium includes 18 HNC tertiary treatment centres: 10 from South America, six from Europe, and two from the Middle East (Table 1).

This study utilized a systems survey approach through a self-completed questionnaire, specifically designed for the centre leads of the HNC centres within the HEADSpAcE Consortium. Data collection were focussed on the health system in the year prior to the COVID-19 pandemic (i.e., in 2019), questionnaires were returned between November 2020 and November 2022, with subsequent rounds of follow up with centres to check data quality and completeness. Each HEADSpAcE centre is linked in with local HNC clinical centres.

2.2 | Data Sources and Measurement

A bespoke questionnaire was developed with reference to the literature [17] and in consultation with clinicians, healthcare managers, and administrators and collaborators from the HEADSpAcE Consortium. The questionnaire included both closed and open-ended questions to assess the availability of data on health system domains and open-ended questions to gather detailed information on the healthcare pathway to diagnosis; alongside data on the number of HNC cases diagnosed in 2019 and the proportion of these that were advanced-stage at diagnosis. Additionally, local protocols or guidelines for referral and diagnosis of HNC where available were requested from each centre. Project leads in each of the 18 HNC centres were responsible for the completion of the questionnaire for their respective centre.

2.3 | Health System Domains

Health system domains covered in the questionnaire included items on the availability and nature of: referral systems (assessing electronic pathways and triaging); quality/performance indicators (monitoring time from referral to diagnosis); diagnostic processes (centralized diagnoses, use of guidance); multidisciplinary teams (assessing comprehensiveness of care); technology (in relation to communication across the diagnostic system); financial models (evaluating funding structures); centre activity (measuring case-load volume), and service structures (assessing degree of centralisation of services).

Following collation of the questionnaire responses; health system factors deriving from responses to each respective questionnaire domain with data available for benchmarking across all centres were identified (Table 2). Centres were categorized by the presence of the health system factor in their local HNC system (yes/no).

TABLE 1 | HEADSpAcE head and neck cancer centres.

HEADSpAcE centre	Location	Country	Region	United Nations Human Development Index	World bank economy ranking	HNC cases diagnosed in 2019 (n)
Tehran University of Medical Sciences (TUMS)	Tehran	Iran	South Central Asia	High	Low-middle income	56
Aga Khan University (AKU)	Karachi	Pakistan	South Central Asia	Low	Low-middle income	602
Santa Fe de Bogotá Foundation University Hospital (FSFB)	Bogota	Colombia	South America	High	Low-middle income	123
A.C. Camargo Cancer Centre (AC-CCC)	Sao Paulo	Brazil	South America	High	Low-middle income	823
Barretos Cancer Hospital (HCB)	Barretos	Brazil	South America	High	Low-middle income	704
University of the Republic (Udelar)	Montevideo	Uruguay	South America	Very high	High income country	110
National University of Cordoba (UNC)	Cordoba	Argentina	South America	very high	Low-middle income	20
Hospital Santa Rita de Cassia—Women's Association of Education and Fight against Cancer (AFECC)	Vitoria	Brazil	South America	High	Low-middle income	341
Goiania Cancer Registry (GCR)	Goiania	Brazil	South America	High	Low-middle income	650
University of Buenos Aires (IOAR)	Buenos Aires	Argentina	South America	Very high	Low-middle income	443
Brazilian National Cancer Institute (INCA)	Rio	Brazil	South America	High	Low-middle income	1296
National University of Asuncion (NUA)	Asuncion	Paraguay	South America	High	Low-middle income	155
Léon Bérard Center (CLB)	Lyon	France	Europe	very high	High income country	403
University of Bristol (UBRIS)	Bristol	UK	Europe	Very high	High income country	210
Catalan Institute of Oncology (ICO)	Barcelona	Spain	Europe	Very high	High income country	333
University of Turin (UNITO)	Turin	Italy	Europe	Very high	High income country	171
Charles University (CUNI)	Prague	Czechia	Europe	Very high	High income country	266
University of Glasgow (UGLA)	Glasgow	UK	Europe	Very high	High income country	543

TABLE 2 | Healthcare system questionnaire domains.

Health system domains	Topics in health system questionnaire	Benchmarking health system factor	Description of health system factor
Referral system	Referral guidance Referral volume Referral categories Referral methods and processes Triageing	Bespoke electronic Referral pathway Referral guidance Triageing system	Bespoke electronic referral system used as main method of referral into specialist care Guidance on referral processes and criteria is available for primary care/ community care teams Formalized referral triaging/vetting of received referrals by specialist team
Quality/performance indicators	Waiting time from referral to diagnosis Waiting time from referral to first appointment Diagnostic investigation reporting time targets Routinely monitored performance indicators	Referral to diagnosis waiting time targets/monitored	Routinely monitored and reported from date of referral through to diagnosis date in entirety
Diagnostic processes	Diagnostic confirmatory procedures	Diagnosis made exclusively by HEADSpAcE centre	Diagnosis is usually only made at the HEADSpAcE centre for all patients and not at another service prior to referral
Multidisciplinary teams	Frequency of meetings Multidisciplinary composition of members	Comprehensive multidisciplinary team (MDT)	MDT includes representation from wide variety of specialists and health professionals and meets regularly
Technology	Communication methods Common electronic medical records	Common medical record	Shared record accessible by all health practitioners across primary care and secondary care
Workforce	Numbers/full-time equivalent primary care clinicians in local system Numbers/full-time equivalent specialist/secondary care in local system	Specialist HNC pathologists and radiologists	Both radiology and pathology specialists are available locally
Financial models	Additional patient costs Public/private/mixed/insurance	Fully publicly funded HNC centre	Fully Publicly funded HNC diagnosis and treatment, including dental checks
Centre activity	New cases diagnosed Source of referrals Proportion of advanced HNC	Large HNC patient volume	Centre treats \geq mean number of cases per annum (402, from the 18 centres)
Service structure	Location of services "One-stop" clinics	All diagnosis and treatment undertaken at one location in HEADSpAcE centre	All aspects of diagnosis and treatment happen in one hospital/physical site

2.4 | Centre Health System Benchmarking Analysis

The centres were sorted by their proportion of advanced stage HNC diagnosed in 2019 (Table 3). Least square means tests were performed to calculate the absolute percentage difference and standard deviation in the proportion of advanced-stage HNC for each health system factor (along with 95% confidence intervals and *p*-values). Subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses were also performed to ensure robustness of the findings (Table 4). All statistical analyses were performed using R software (R version 2022.02.2).

2.5 | HNC Diagnostic Pathway Description and Harmonization

Open questions were included in the questionnaire which asked for descriptions of each centre's pathway to HNC diagnosis. These responses were clarified with follow up online discussions with centre leads where required. The interval approach that forms the Aarhus pathway for cancer research [20–22] was used as a framework to collate and harmonize the range of diagnostic pathways across centres for all HNC subsites with the aid of Lucidchart (lucid.co) digital mapping software.

3 | Results

3.1 | Centre Health System Benchmarking

The centres were ranked and benchmarked by the proportion of advanced stage HNC in 2019 which ranged from 27% (CLB, Lyon, France) to 90% (NUA, Asunción, Paraguay), along with the presence or absence of health system factors (Table 3). Nine out of 18 centres have electronic referral systems, while only five have integrated common primary-secondary care medical records. Eight centres manage a higher number of patients per year than the mean (mean $n=402$, range 20–1296), and nine operate from a single centralized site. Monitoring referral to diagnosis waiting times is undertaken in 12 centres. Eleven centres employ comprehensive multidisciplinary teams, and 12 have specialist HNC radiologists and pathologists. Formal triage of referrals occurs in 13 centres, but only seven have formal referral guidance. There were diverse funding models for the health systems with seven exclusively publicly funded centres. No centre exhibited all of the health system factors assessed and all centres had at least one of the assessed health system factor present.

The presence of several health systems factors within the HNC centres included in this analysis were associated with a lower proportion of advanced stage HNC (Table 4). Of all the factors analyzed, three were strongly associated with a lower proportion of advanced stage HNC diagnoses when they were part of a centre's HNC system: (i) routine monitoring of waiting times from referral to diagnosis had a 16% lower proportion in advanced stage HNC (95% confidence interval (CI) -0.27 , -0.05 ; *p*-value 0.007); (ii) having a formal referral triaging process showed a 14% lower proportion (95% CI -0.26 , -0.03 ; *p*-value

0.0179); and (iii) centres with a publicly funded patient finance model/universal health coverage had a 17% lower proportion (95% CI -0.29 , -0.06 ; *p*-value 0.008). Centres with higher patient volume (2% (95% CI -0.13 , 0.16)) and centralisation of centre services (*% (95% CI -0.19 , 0.19)) showed no evidence of a higher proportion of advanced stage HNC while the remaining health system factors showed no evidence of association with HNC stage at diagnosis.

Overall, centres in HICs (mean = 47%) had a 17% lower proportion of advanced-stage HNC than centres in LMICs (mean = 64%) (95% CI -0.30 , -0.03 *p*-value 0.022).

Several of the domains included in the questionnaire were found to have no routinely available data across HEADSpAcE centres, meaning that several gaps in health system factors were identified (Table 5). This may be important to contextualize the results of this study and aid discussion on the potential role of health systems factors and HNC diagnosis. For example, while the stage at diagnosis is recorded individually for each patient, it is not routinely aggregated and reported/monitored as a management system measure; there was also no formal routinely reported data on the source of suspected cancer referrals in any centre. Additionally, data on workforce composition and availability in both primary and secondary care is not routinely available. Quality Performance Indicators (QPIs) in HNC were primarily focussed on post-diagnostic events and treatment. In addition, total diagnostic time (from referral to diagnosis) is not commonly reported; instead, centres more commonly report sub-time points such as the first appointment at the HNC specialist centre and treatment initiation.

3.2 | Harmonized HNC Diagnostic Pathway

A simple HNC diagnostic pathway was harmonized from the HEADSpAcE HNC centre pathways to capture and collate the variation in diagnostic pathways across all HNC centres in the HEADSpAcE consortium (Figure 1). This pathway defines the various routes through which people are diagnosed with HNC, including direct presentation to specialist hospital services and acute presentations to emergency departments. The dominant pathway across centres was that of a hybrid model where diagnosis is made either at the centre itself or within primary care/community care before being referred on, which was more prominent in South American centres ($n=10$), with other centres having a specialist-only diagnostic model with patients presenting to primary/community health services and subsequently being referred to a hospital specialist for further investigation and diagnosis ($n=8$). Routes through primary care were split between patients who went to dental services and those who went to medical services. This pathway also captures the potentially varying routes that a patient might traverse to getting a diagnosis of HNC depending on the cancer subsite with some OCCs being initially detected by dental clinicians. This HEADSpAcE Head and Neck Cancer Diagnostic Pathway provides a formalized description of the contextual work system ("work as done" [23]) to capture the heterogeneity of pathways from the international health systems included in the consortium.

TABLE 3 | Benchmarking proportion of advanced stage HNC against presence of health system factor.

Health System Factor	HEADSpAcE Centre																	
	CLB	UBRIS	ICO	FSFB	AC-CCC	UNITO	TUMS	HCB	Udelar	CUNI	UNC	UGLA	AKU	AFECC	GCR	IOAR	INCA	NUA
	27%	38%	45%	46%	48%	50%	50%	50%	52%	55%	59%	65%	65%	69%	70%	76%	77%	90%
Estimated proportion of advanced stage HNC 2019	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Electronic referral system for HNC	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No
Common primary-secondary care medical record	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Higher patient volume (>Mean)	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Single centralised site	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Referral waiting times monitored	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Initial diagnosis made exclusively at centre	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Comprehensive MDT	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Specialist HNC radiologists and pathologists	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Referrals formally triaged	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Referral guidance	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
Exclusively publicly funded system	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No

TABLE 4 | Least square means analysis of healthcare system factors.

Health system factor	Y/N	Mean proportion advanced stage HNC 2019 (SD)	Difference in means (95% Cis)	<i>p</i>
HNC electronic referral system	N	0.59 (0.19)	—	—
	Y	0.56 (0.13)	−0.03 (−0.18, 0.13)	0.7023
Common primary/secondary medical record	N	0.60 (0.17)	—	—
	Y	0.51 (0.10)	−0.10 (−0.23, 0.03)	0.1221
Higher patient volume (> mean)	N	0.55 (0.15)	—	—
	Y	0.60 (0.17)	0.02 (−0.13, 0.16)	0.8111
Single site/location	N	0.57 (0.11)	—	—
	Y	0.58 (0.20)	0.00 (−0.19, 0.19)	0.9584
Routine monitoring of referral waiting times	N	0.68 (0.15)	—	—
	Y	0.52 (0.13)	−0.16 (−0.27, −0.05)	0.0069
Initial diagnosis within centre	N	0.60 (0.18)	—	—
	Y	0.53 (0.10)	−0.08 (−0.21, 0.06)	0.2357
Comprehensive MDT	N	0.63 (0.16)	—	—
	Y	0.55 (0.15)	−0.08 (−0.20, 0.04)	0.1564
Specialist HNC pathologists and radiologists	N	0.63 (0.24)	—	—
	Y	0.55 (0.11)	−0.07 (−0.24, 0.11)	0.4319
Referral triaging system	N	0.70 (0.18)	—	—
	Y	0.54 (0.13)	−0.14 (−0.26, −0.03)	0.0179
Referral guidance	N	0.60 (0.18)	—	—
	Y	0.53 (0.11)	−0.08 (−0.22, −0.06)	0.2458
Entirely publicly funded patient finance	N	0.64 (0.14)	—	—
	Y	0.47 (0.12)	−0.17 (−0.29, −0.06)	0.008

4 | Discussion

This study explored for the first time the role of health system factors associated with the diagnosis of advanced stage HNC across various international centres, encompassing both low/middle-income and high-income countries. Key findings indicate that three health system factors are associated with a lower proportion of advanced stage HNC diagnoses: routine monitoring of waiting times from referral to diagnosis, having a formal referral triaging process, and being fully publicly funded.

The findings align with previous research that highlights the importance of accessible and efficient healthcare systems in improving cancer outcomes [24–27]. The significant lower proportions in advanced stage HNC associated with monitoring waiting times, formal referral triaging, and publicly funded health systems underscore the potential benefits of these practices. However, the lack of impact from service centralisation and higher patient volumes suggests that these factors may not be as crucial in the context of HNC diagnosis. The impact of centralisation of services, which is closely linked with higher numbers of cases, has previously

been found to be associated with better survival outcomes in esophageal cancers at a regional level [28] but it is not clear whether this is through improved diagnostic pathways or in relation to other treatment/care services. An analysis of national trends in breast and ovarian cancers in France found centralisation to be associated with increased quality of care but increased inequalities in access to care [29]. A modeling of centralisation of specialist cancer services for rectal cancer in the UK at the national level showed the potential travel impacts on patients but showed limited impact on stage at diagnosis [30].

While there was a 17% lower proportion of advanced-stage HNC in centres located within HICs when compared to LMICs, care should be taken when interpreting this result as some centres as there was wide variation—for example within HIC, UoG in Glasgow, Scotland (65%), had a higher proportion of advanced-stage HNC than those in LMICS, such as those in AC-CCC, Sao Paulo, Brazil (48%). These differences could also relate to within country inequalities and the socioeconomic profile of people with HNC and other determinants of advanced stage disease at the centre level [31].

TABLE 5 | Gaps in healthcare system questionnaire responses.

Health system domain	Missing health system factor	Explanation of missing Data
Centre activity	Proportion of advanced stage HNC	Stage at Diagnosis recorded individually for each patient but not routinely reported as a system measure
	“One-stop” clinics	Only present in two centres and only for some subsites
	Source of suspected cancer referrals	No formal routinely reported data on referral source
Workforce	Number of primary care and specialist clinicians in local system	Data on workforce composition and availability is not formally routinely available
Referral system	Proportion of suspected cancer referrals with confirmed HNC diagnosis	Often audited but not formally routinely reported
	Guidelines for referral processes	Guidance for diagnostic procedures near universally available but seldom for referral
Quality performance indicators	QPIs relating to referral/pre-diagnosis	Few or none across centres, QPIs largely focussed on treatment/post-diagnosis events
	Referral waiting times	Total diagnostic time not commonly reported: sub-time points such as first appointment and time to treatment more commonly used
	Targets/waiting times reporting for specialist investigations	Not formally reported in most centres




FIGURE 1 | HEADSpAcE HNC diagnostic pathway. [Color figure can be viewed at [wileyonlinelibrary.com](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com)]

One of the key data gaps identified was the lack of routinely reported data on the proportion of advanced stage at diagnosis within each centre. This measure was not readily available or used in management/service monitoring. Centre proportion of advanced stage HNC had to either be calculated or clinically estimated from clinical records/lists. This was surprising given the important relationship of stage at diagnosis in determining

treatment (service) planning and in prognosis [8, 17, 32–34]. Similarly, stage of HNC is not a routinely reported measure in cancer registries. This has only recently been captured in the UK with analyses showing that 59% of HNC cases are diagnosed as stage III or IV [10] which puts the UK target of 75% of cancers being diagnosed at stage I or II by 2028 very unlikely to be achieved for HNC [35].

Additional important findings in this study were health system domains in which data were unavailable from any centre, these included routine information on workforce and source of referral. These domains had previously been identified as potential health systems factors in cancer diagnosis [17, 36]. The lack of these data highlight gaps in monitoring of the diagnostic pathway in all centres which could be utilized for health system quality improvement. These variations in structural and operational characteristics could impact the quality and efficiency of care.

The focus of research to date in health systems factors in cancer diagnosis has mainly been on other cancer groups such as breast, lung, and colon cancers [37–41]. These studies were a primary source of the health system domains that informed the questionnaire developed for this study. This prior research focus may be reflective of the higher disease burden and more ready availability of high-quality reported data for these cancer groups historically [42].

Our newly devised HEADSpAcE HNC Diagnostic Pathway, synthesized from the consortium centres' individual pathways to diagnosis, offers a novel lens through which future HNC research and intervention development can be undertaken. It provides a real-world framework that is likely to cover the majority of patients' diagnostic journeys and can aid in planning and evaluation of interventions aiming to address variation and inequalities in the pathway.

To our knowledge, this is the first study addressing centre-level health system factors on stage at diagnosis in HNC, and the results are strengthened by inclusion of data from a number of HNC systems from across the world. The centres included in this study were heterogeneous in their geography, healthcare system structure, World Bank economic ranking, and United Nations Human Development Index, allowing for a broader analysis of health system factors, but may not reflect the total range of HNC systems internationally.

This study has a number of limitations. As noted by Brown et al. [17] in their narrative review, attributing causality to an outcome due to any particular health system factor is challenging due to the significant complexity and socio-organizational environment in which healthcare systems exist. Our study has only begun to explore the potential influence these factors but had limited access to wider socioeconomic system data, however, further triangulation with other data and ongoing approaches within the HEADSpAcE consortium including analysis of prospective individual patient HNC cohort and qualitative centre case-studies (IARC) will enhance the literature on this subject. Similarly, not considering health/cancer policy related information is another limitation. The International Cancer Benchmarking Partnership (ICBP), which does not include HNC, has shown that policy has a crucial role to play in cancer outcomes [43]. The wider cancer/public health system could be defined as starting with the self-detection of a health problem and subsequent health seeking element of a patient's interaction with services was not fully captured here [44]. This could include screening services/activities, although, there is limited current evidence for formal screening programmes for HNC [45, 46] and improvements in early detection of HNC may have

come from opportunistic screening, for example in primary care dental services [46], and in better joined up primary and secondary/tertiary services and care pathways.

This study considers only the cancer system to the point of diagnosis, but investigation of the role of health system factors in HNC treatment and survivorship should also be a priority for future research in order to have a comprehensive whole-system approach to reducing the devastating burden of HNC.

5 | Conclusions

This study reveals the role that health system factors play in the burden of advanced stage HNC diagnosed; with processes that monitor referral to diagnosis waiting times and formally triage referrals, along with systems within a fully publicly funded model being associated with lower centre-level proportion of advanced HNC.

It is key that in order to shift the burden of disease from advanced to early stage, more attention should be given to routinely monitoring the burden of advanced disease. A diagnostic pathway for HNC has been proposed to allow better planning for future development of interventions or health system/policy change or innovation to improve the diagnostic care pathway for HNC.

Author Contributions

G.C.: data collection, collation, conceptualisation, analysis, primary manuscript draft and revisions, qualitative analysis. **D.C. and A.R.:** conceptualisation, manuscript reviews. **M.G. and A.M.:** analysis support, manuscript reviews. All authors reviewed, and approved manuscript.

Acknowledgments

Sincere thanks to the clinical colleagues across HEADSpAcE centres that helped supply the data used in this study. R Adam, A Agudo, W Ahrens, L Alemany, S Alibhai, M Angel-Pavon, N Anwar, L Arantes, P. E. Arantes, L Arguello, Y Avello, L Avondet, A. M. Baldión-Elorza, C Batista-Daniel, B Beraldi, B Berenstein, P Bernal, N Bernardino-Rodrigues, J Betka, K Bilic-Zimmermann, L Bouvard, M Botta, J Brenes, N Brenner, C Brentisci, C Burtica, M Cabañas, C Canova, E Cantor, G Carretero, A Carvalho, R Carvalho, L Chiusa, P Chopard, M Choulli, Q Chundrigger, O Clavero, S Coelho-Soares-Lima, I Costa, M Cuello, C Cuffini, M. P. Curado, A. C. de Carvalho, J. C. de Oliveira, T Dias, T Dudding, E Duccini de Souza, I. C. Durant, E Ebrahim, A Escallón, G. A. Fernandes, B Fervers, V Fiano, F Firme-Figueira, R Furbino-Villefort, V Gaborieau, R Gama, M Gangemi, P Garzino-Demo, R Giglio, A Guasch, J Graça Sant'Anna, M Grega, A Gregório-Có, M Hadji, J. A. Hakim, N Hayes, C. M. Healy, M Homero de Sá Santos, I Holcatova, K Hurley, M Insfran, G. C. Iorio, M Iqbaluddin Siddiqui, J Johannsen, M Kaña, J. P. Klusmann, L. P. Kowalski, A Lagiou, P Lagiou, E Legal, J Lenzi, F Luiz Dias, Lyra González, W Machado-Zorzaneli, G. J. Macfarlane, R Mai-Rocha, M Maños, P Marinho-de-Abreu, J Mckay, C Mena, L Mendoza, E. F. Mendonça, L Meza, B Michels, M. S. Mineiro, C Moccia, P Mongelos, A. L. Montealegre-Páez, F Morey-Cortes, A Muñoz, A Ness, A Neves, M Oliva, H Ortiz, J Ortiz, M Osorio, V Ospina, O Ostellino, M Palau, S Paytubi-Casabona, G Pecorari, S Perdomo, D. M. Pereira, O Pérol, S Pervez, A Pomata, J Polesel, M Popovic, A Poveda, C Prado, K Prager, M Pring, G Ramieri, H Rashidian, S Rasul, J Rego, R. M. Reis, H Renard, L. F. Ribeiro-Pinto, U Ricardi, L Richiardi, G Riva, P Rodriguez-Urrego, M Robinson, F Rodilla, I Rodriguez, M Rodríguez, P. E. Roux, T Saeed-Ali, P Saintigny, J. J. Santivañez, C Scapultampo-Neto, J Segovia, A Sena,

M Sepideh, R Serrano, S. J. Sharma, O Siefer, S Smart, B. P. Sorroche, C Sosa, J. D. Souza, A Stura, S Thomas, S Thoms, O Torres, S Tous, G Ucross, A Valenzuela, J. R. Vasconcelos-de-Podestá, M Vilensky, S Von-Zeidler, T Waterboer, A Whitmarsh, S Wright, K Zendeudel, A Znaor.

Disclosure

Where authors are identified as personnel of the International Agency for Research on Cancer/World Health Organization, the authors alone are responsible for the views expressed in this article and they do not necessarily represent the decisions, policy or views of the International Agency for Research on Cancer/World Health Organization.

Ethics Statement

The authors have nothing to report.

Consent

The authors have nothing to report.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Data Availability Statement

Data used for analysis are provided in the paper, qualitative data may be available on specific request to the main author.

References

1. F. Bray, M. Laversanne, H. Sung, et al., "Global Cancer Statistics 2022: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries," *Cancer Journal for Clinicians* 74 (2024): 229–263.
2. M. Gormley, G. Creaney, A. Schache, K. Ingarfield, and D. I. Conway, "Reviewing the Epidemiology of Head and Neck Cancer: Definitions, Trends and Risk Factors," *British Dental Journal* 233 (2022): 780–786.
3. C. J. Semple, G. McKenna, R. Parahoo, S. N. Rogers, and Y. TIBLOM Ehrsson, "Factors That Affect Quality of Life for Older People With Head and Neck Cancer: A Systematic Review," *European Journal of Oncology Nursing* 63 (2023).
4. M. B. Amin, S. B. Edge, F. L. Greene, et al., *AJCC Cancer Staging Manual* (Springer, 2017).
5. M. J. Worsham, "Identifying the Risk Factors for Late-Stage Head and Neck Cancer," *Expert Review of Anticancer Therapy* 11 (2011): 1321–1325.
6. J. D. Brierley, M. K. Gospodarowicz, and C. Wittekind, *The TNM Classification of Malignant Tumours 8th Edition* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2016).
7. J. D. Brierley, H. Asamura, E. Van Eycken, and B. Rous, *TNM Atlas, 7th Edition* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2021).
8. R. Abrahão, D. Anantharaman, V. Gaborieau, et al., "The Influence of Smoking, Age and Stage at Diagnosis on the Survival After Larynx, Hypopharynx and Oral Cavity Cancers in Europe: The ARCADE Study," *International Journal of Cancer* 143 (2018): 32–44.
9. R. Abrahão, S. Perdomo, L. F. R. Pinto, et al., "Predictors of Survival After Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma in South America: The InterCHANGE Study," *JCO Global Oncology* 6 (2020): 486–499.
10. G. Creaney, A. D. McMahon, A. J. Ross, L. A. Bhatti, C. Paterson, and D. I. Conway, "Head and Neck Cancer in the UK: What Was the Stage Before COVID-19? UK Cancer Registries Analysis (2011–2018)," *British Dental Journal* 233 (2022): 787–793.
11. P. Brocklehurst, O. Kujan, L. A. O'malley, G. Ogden, S. Shepherd, and A. M. Glenn, "Screening Programmes for the Early Detection and

Prevention of Oral Cancer," *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, no. 11 (2013): CD004150.

12. M. N. Amaral, P. Faisca, H. A. Ferreira, M. M. Gaspar, and C. P. Reis, "Current Insights and Progress in the Clinical Management of Head and Neck Cancer," *Cancers* 14, no. 24 (2022): 6079, <https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers14246079>.

13. P. E. Plsek and T. Greenhalgh, "Complexity Science: The Challenge of Complexity in Health Care," *British Medical Journal* 323 (2001): 625–628.

14. N. Osazuwa-Peters, J. M. Barnes, U. Megwalu, et al., "State Medicaid Expansion Status, Insurance Coverage and Stage at Diagnosis in Head and Neck Cancer Patients," *Oral Oncology* 110 (2020): 104870.

15. R. C. Schoonbeek, J. Zwertbroek, B. E. C. Plaat, et al., "Determinants of Delay and Association With Outcome in Head and Neck Cancer: A Systematic Review," *European Journal of Surgical Oncology* 47 (2021): 1816–1827.

16. A. M. Lima, I. A. Meira, M. S. Soares, P. R. Bonan, C. B. Mélo, and C. S. Piagge, "Delay in Diagnosis of Oral Cancer: A Systematic Review," *Medicina Oral, Patología Oral y Cirugía Bucal* 26 (2021): e815-e824.

17. S. Brown, M. Castelli, D. J. Hunter, et al., "How Might Healthcare Systems Influence Speed of Cancer Diagnosis: A Narrative Review," *Social Science & Medicine* 116 (2014): 56–63.

18. P. W. Rose, G. Rubin, R. PERERA-Salazar, et al., "Explaining Variation in Cancer Survival Between 11 Jurisdictions in the International Cancer Benchmarking Partnership: A Primary Care Vignette Survey," *BMJ Open* 5 (2015): e007212.

19. IARC, "HEADSpAcE Consortium" 2021, <https://headspace.iarc.fr/>.

20. D. Coxon, C. Campbell, F. M. Walter, et al., "The Aarhus Statement on Cancer Diagnostic Research: Turning Recommendations Into New Survey Instruments," *BMC Health Services Research* 18 (2018): 677.

21. J. Seoane, P. ALVAREZ-Novoa, I. Gomez, et al., "Early Oral Cancer Diagnosis: The Aarhus Statement Perspective. A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis," *Head and Neck* 38 (2016): E2182–E2189.

22. D. Weller, P. Vedsted, G. Rubin, et al., "The Aarhus Statement: Improving Design and Reporting of Studies on Early Cancer Diagnosis," *British Journal of Cancer* 106 (2012): 1262–1267.

23. J. E. Anderson, A. J. Ross, and P. Jaye, "Modelling Resilience and Researching the Gap Between Work-As-Imagined and Work-as-Done," in *Resilient Health Care, Volume 3* (CRC Press, 2016).

24. N. Panth, J. M. Barnes, M. C. Simpson, et al., "Change in Stage of Presentation of Head and Neck Cancer in the United States Before and After the Affordable Care Act," *Cancer Epidemiology* 67 (2020): 101763.

25. J. B. Smith, P. Jayanth, S. A. Hong, M. C. Simpson, and S. T. Massa, "The Medicare Effect on Head and Neck Cancer Diagnosis and Survival," *Head & Neck* 45 (2023): 1663–1675.

26. W. Sungwalee, P. Vatanasapt, K. Suwanrungruang, and S. Promthet, "Comparing Survival of Oral Cancer Patients Before and After Launching of the Universal Coverage Scheme in Thailand," *Asian Pacific Journal of Cancer Prevention* 17 (2016): 3541–3544.

27. J. Zhao, X. Han, L. Nogueira, et al., "Health Insurance Status and Cancer Stage at Diagnosis and Survival in the United States," *Cancer Journal for Clinicians* 72 (2022): 542–560.

28. A. P. Boddy, J. M. L. Williamson, and M. N. Vipond, "The Effect of Centralisation on the Outcomes of Oesophagogastric Surgery – A Fifteen Year Audit," *International Journal of Surgery* 10 (2012): 360–363.

29. M. Huguet, "Centralization of Care in High Volume Hospitals and Inequalities in Access to Care," *Social Science & Medicine* 260 (2020): 113177.

30. A. Aggarwal, L. Han, S. Van Der Geest, et al., "Health Service Planning to Assess the Expected Impact of Centralising Specialist Cancer

Services on Travel Times, Equity, and Outcomes: A National Population-Based Modelling Study,” *Lancet Oncology* 23 (2022): 1211–1220.

31. P. Braveman and L. Gottlieb, “The Social Determinants of Health: It’s Time to Consider the Causes of the Causes,” *Public Health Reports* 129, no. 2S (2014): 19S–31S.

32. K. Ingarfield, A. D. McMahon, C. M. Douglas, S.-A. Savage, D. I. Conway, and K. Mackenzie, “Determinants of Long-Term Survival in a Population-Based Cohort Study of Patients With Head and Neck Cancer From Scotland,” *Head and Neck-Journal for the Sciences and Specialties of the Head and Neck* 41 (2019a): 1908–1917.

33. K. Ingarfield, A. D. McMahon, C. M. Douglas, S.-A. Savage, D. I. Conway, and K. Mackenzie, “Inequality in the Survival of Patients With Head and Neck Cancer in Scotland,” *Frontiers in Oncology* 8 (2019b).

34. K. Ingarfield, A. D. McMahon, K. Hurley, et al., “Inequality in Survival of People With Head and Neck Cancer: Head and Neck 5000 Cohort Study,” *Head & Neck* 43 (2021): 1252–1270.

35. UK Government, “Government Announces Plans for Earlier Diagnosis for Cancer Patients,” 2018, accessed May 21, 2024, <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-announces-plans-for-earlier-diagnosis-for-cancer-patients>.

36. M. Harris, P. Vedsted, M. Esteva, et al., “Identifying Important Health System Factors That Influence Primary Care practitioners’ Referrals for Cancer Suspicion: A European Cross-Sectional Survey,” *BMJ Open* 8 (2018): e022904.

37. U. Menon, P. Vedsted, A. Zalounina Falborg, et al., “Time Intervals and Routes to Diagnosis for Lung Cancer in 10 Jurisdictions: Cross-Sectional Study Findings From the International Cancer Benchmarking Partnership (ICBP),” *BMJ Open* 9 (2019): e025895.

38. M. L. Torring, A. Z. Falborg, H. Jensen, et al., “Advanced-Stage Cancer and Time to Diagnosis: An International Cancer Benchmarking Partnership (ICBP) Cross-Sectional Study,” *European Journal of Cancer Care: The Official Journal of the European Oncology Nursing Society* 28 (2019): e13100.

39. P. Vedsted, D. Weller, A. Z. Falborg, et al., “Diagnostic Pathways for Breast Cancer in 10 International Cancer Benchmarking Partnership (ICBP) Jurisdictions: An International Comparative Cohort Study Based on Questionnaire and Registry Data,” *BMJ Open* 12 (2022): e059669.

40. D. Weller, U. Menon, A. Z. Falborg, et al., “Diagnostic Routes and Time Intervals for Patients With Colorectal Cancer in 10 International Jurisdictions: Findings From a Cross-Sectional Study From the International Cancer Benchmarking Partnership (ICBP),” *BMJ Open* 8 (2018): e023870.

41. D. Weller, P. Vedsted, C. Anandan, et al., “An Investigation of Routes to Cancer Diagnosis in 10 International Jurisdictions, as Part of the International Cancer Benchmarking Partnership: Survey Development and Implementation,” *BMJ Open* 6 (2016): e009641.

42. M. C. White, F. Babcock, N. S. Hayes, et al., “The History and Use of Cancer Registry Data by Public Health Cancer Control Programs in the United States,” *Cancer* 123, no. S24 (2017): S4969–S4976.

43. E. Nolte, M. Morris, S. Landon, et al., “Exploring the Link Between Cancer Policies and Cancer Survival: A Comparison of International Cancer Benchmarking Partnership Countries,” *Lancet Oncology* 23 (2022): e502–e514.

44. F. Walter, A. Webster, S. Scott, and J. Emery, “The Andersen Model of Total Patient Delay: A Systematic Review of Its Application in Cancer Diagnosis,” *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy* 17 (2012): 110–118.

45. P. R. Brocklehurst and P. M. Speight, “Screening for Mouth Cancer: The Pros and Cons of a National Programme,” *British Dental Journal* 225 (2018): 815–819.

46. T. Walsh, S. Warnakulasuriya, M. W. Lingen, et al., “Clinical Assessment for the Detection of Oral Cavity Cancer and Potentially Malignant

Disorders in Apparently Healthy Adults,” *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, no. 12 (2021): CD010173.

Appendix A

HEADSpAcE Consortium Group: Adam R²⁸, Agudo A³, Ahrens W³⁸, Alemany L³, Alibhai S¹³, Angel-Pavon M³, Anwar N³¹, Arantes L⁴, Arantes PE⁷, Arguello L²⁶, Avello Y¹⁶, Avondet L³⁰, Baldión-Elorza AM¹⁶, Batista-Daniel C³², Beraldi B¹⁹, Berenstein B²⁰, Bernal P¹⁶, Bernardino-Rodrigues N³², Betka J¹⁰, Bilic-Zimmermann K³, Bouvard L¹, Botta M⁷, Brenes J³, Brenner N²¹, Brentisci C²⁹, Burtica C¹⁶, Cabañas M³³, Canova C⁴¹, Cantor E¹⁶, Carretero G³, Carvalho A²³, Carvalho R⁴, Chiusa L²⁹, Chopard P¹, Choulli M³, Chundriger Q¹³, Clavero O³, Coelho-Soares-Lima S¹⁴, Costa I¹⁴, Cuello M⁵, Cuffini C⁴⁴, Curado MP⁷, de Carvalho AC¹, deOliveira JC⁴⁵, Dias T⁴, Dudding T⁸, Duccini de Souza E¹⁹, Durant IC²², Ebrahimi E¹, Escallón A¹⁶, Fernandes GA⁷, Fervers B¹⁷, Fiano V¹⁵, Firme-Figueira F³², Furbino-Villefort R³², Gaborieau V¹, Gama R²³, Gangemi M²⁹, Garzino-Demo P²⁷, Giglio R²⁰, Guasch A³, Graça Sant’Anna J³², Grega M²⁵, Gregório-Có A³², Hadji M²⁴, Hakim JA¹⁶, Hayes N⁹, Healy CM³⁹, Homero de Sá Santos M¹⁹, Holcatova I¹⁰, Hurley K⁸, Insfran M¹¹, Iorio GC²⁸, Iqbaluddin Siddiqui M¹³, Johannsen J¹⁸, Kaña M²⁵, Klussmann JP¹⁸, Kowalski LP²², Lagiou A³⁵, Lagiou P³⁶, Legal E¹¹, Lenzi J¹⁹, Luiz Dias F¹⁴, Lyra González², Machado-Zorzaneli W³², Macfarlane GJ⁴², Mai-Rocha R¹⁹, Maños M³, Marinho-de-Abreu P³², McKay J¹, Mena C¹¹, Mendoza L¹¹, Mendonça EF¹², Meza L¹¹, Michels B²¹, Mineiro MS¹², Moccia C¹⁵, Mongelos P¹¹, Montealegre-Páez AL⁴³, Morey-Cortes F3, Muñoz A¹⁶, Ness A⁸, Neves A⁷, Oliva M³, Ortiz H³³, Ortiz J¹¹, Osorio M¹¹, Ospina V¹⁶, Ostellino O²⁹, Palau M¹⁶, Paytubi-Casabona S³, Pecorari G²⁷, Perdomo S¹, Pereira DM²⁰, Pérol O¹⁷, Pervez S¹³, Pomata A³³, Polesel J³⁷, Popovic M¹⁵, Poveda A⁴³, Prado C7, Prager K²¹, Pring M⁸, Ramieri G²⁷, Rashidian H²⁴, Rasul S¹³, Rego J¹⁹, Reis RM⁴, Renard H¹, Ribeiro-Pinto LF¹⁴, Ricardi U²⁸, Richiardi L¹⁵, Riva G²⁷, Rodriguez-Urrego P¹⁶, Robinson M⁴⁰, Rodilla F3, Rodriguez I¹¹, Rodríguez M¹¹, Roux PE¹⁷, Saeed-Ali T¹³, Saintigny P¹⁷, Santivañez JJ¹⁶, Scapultampo-Neto C⁴, Segovia J¹⁶, Sena A¹⁹, Sepideh M²⁴, Serrano R¹¹, Sharma SJ¹⁸, Siefer O¹⁸, Smart S², Sorroche BP⁴, Sosa C³³, Souza JD⁷, Stura A²⁹, Thomas S⁸, Thoms S⁸, Torres O¹⁶, Tous S³, Ucross G¹⁶, Valenzuela A¹¹, Vasconcelos-de-Podestá JR¹⁹, Vilensky M²⁰, von-Zeidler S³², Waterboer T²¹, Whitmarsh A⁸, Wright S², Zendejdel K²⁴, Znaor A¹.

1. Genomic Epidemiology Branch, International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC/WHO), Lyon, France.
2. University of Glasgow, Glasgow, United Kingdom.
3. Catalan Institute of Oncology (ICO), Barcelona, Spain.
4. Molecular Oncology Research Center, Barretos Cancer Hospital, Barretos, Sao Paulo, Brazil.
5. Servicio de Oncología Clínica Hospital de Clínicas, Universidad de la República, Montevideo, Uruguay.
7. Group of Epidemiology and Statistics on Cancer, A.C. Camargo Cancer Center, Sao Paulo, Brazil.
8. Bristol Dental School, University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom.
9. UTHSC Center for Cancer Research, University of Tennessee Health Science Institute, Memphis, United States.
10. Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic.
11. Institute for Health Sciences Research, National University of Asunción (UNA), San Lorenzo, Paraguay.
12. Hospital Câncer Araújo Jorge, Goiania, Goiás, Brazil.
13. Aga Khan University Hospital, Karachi, Pakistan.
14. Brazilian National Cancer Institute (INCA), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
15. Department of Medical Sciences, Cancer Epidemiology Unit, University of Turin, Turin, Italy.
16. SantaFe de Bogotá Foundation University Hospital, Bogotá, Colombia.

17. Léon Bérard Center, Lyon, France.
18. University of Cologne, Cologne, Germany.
19. Women's Association for Cancer Education and Control Hospital Santa Rita de Cassia, Vitoria, Brazil.
20. Institute of Oncology Angel H. Roffo, University of Buenos Aires, Argentina.
21. Division of Infections and Cancer Epidemiology, German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ).
22. Head and Neck Surgery and Otorhinolaryngology Department, Oncology Surgery, A.C. Camargo Cancer Center, Sao Paolo, Brazil.
23. Department of Head and Neck Surgery, Barretos Cancer Hospital, Barretos, Sao Paolo, Brazil.
24. Cancer Research Center, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Teran, Iran.
25. University Hospital in Motol, Prague, Czech Republic.
26. National Institute of Cancer, National Cancer Institute, Ministry of Public Health and Social Welfare, Capiatá, Paraguay.
27. Department of Surgical Sciences, University of Turin, Turin, Brazil.
28. Department of Oncology, University of Turin, Turin, Brazil.
29. AOU City of Health and Science of Turin, Turin, Brazil.
30. University of Buenos Aires, Argentina.
31. Faculty of Science and Technology, University of Central Punjab.
32. Federal University of Espírito Santo, Vitoria, Brazil.
33. National Cancer Institute, Ministry of Health, Capiatá, Asunción, Paraguay.
34. Beatson West of Scotland Cancer Centre, NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde, Glasgow, UK.
35. School of Public Health, University of West Attica, Athens, Greece (GR).
36. School of Medicine, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece (GR).
37. National Cancer Institute, IRCCS (IT).
38. Leibniz Institute for Prevention Research and Epidemiology—BIPS, Bremen, Germany.
39. Trinity College School of Dental Science Dublin, Ireland.
40. Department of Cellular Pathology, Royal Victoria Infirmary, UK.
41. University of Padova (IT), Padova, Italy.
42. MRC Centre for Musculoskeletal Health and Work, University of Aberdeen, Scotland, UK.
43. Faculty of Medicine, El Bosque University, Bogotá, Colombia.
44. National University of Córdoba, Córdoba, Argentina.