



Tele-oncology and the Future of Cancer Care Delivery: A Review of Emerging Models, Rural Applications, and Pharmaceutical Integration

Dr. Omid Modiramani *

***Correspondence to:** Dr. Omid Modiramani, MD, Medical Oncologist & Hematologist, Saudi German Hospital, Dubai.

Copyright.

© 2025 **Dr. Omid Modiramani** This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Received: 21 Aug 2025

Published: 28 Aug 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17284901>

Abstract

Importance: Teleoncology—the use of telemedicine technologies in oncology—has emerged as a critical tool in addressing cancer care disparities, particularly among rural, underserved, and resource-limited populations. Despite growing adoption, comprehensive synthesis of its implementation, barriers, and future directions remains limited.

Objective: To review the historical evolution, core applications, challenges, and future directions of teleoncology, with emphasis on rural deployment, pharmaceutical industry integration, and implications for equity-based cancer care delivery.

Evidence Review: A narrative review was conducted of literature published between January 2005 and March 2024 using PubMed, Scopus, WHO reports, ASCO resources, and policy documents from oncology organizations and government health agencies. Included sources comprised peer-reviewed studies, white papers, program evaluations, and regulatory frameworks. Key themes were synthesized under domains including access to care, remote treatment monitoring, decentralized trials, patient experience, infrastructure, and stakeholder collaboration.

Findings: Teleoncology has evolved from early second-opinion consults to comprehensive models including remote diagnosis, virtual tumor boards, remote chemotherapy supervision, and digital navigation tools. Rural implementation in the United States has shown significant benefits including reduced travel burden, improved time-to-treatment, and non-inferior survival rates. Globally, countries such as Australia, India, and Kenya have adopted teleoncology to extend services to remote areas. Major pharmaceutical companies now support teleoncology-enabled decentralized clinical trials, AI-powered symptom tracking, and real-world evidence generation. Key barriers to implementation include infrastructure deficits, inconsistent reimbursement, regulatory misalignment, digital literacy gaps, and ethical concerns about data use. Emerging hybrid care models, equity-centered platform design, and global licensing frameworks are shaping the future landscape.

Conclusions and Relevance: *Teleoncology is redefining cancer care by enabling more equitable, scalable, and digitally integrated delivery models. As healthcare systems transition to hybrid oncology ecosystems, success will depend on coordinated policy reform, sustained infrastructure investment, and cross-sector partnerships—including pharmaceutical and technology stakeholders. Future models must ensure cultural responsiveness, digital inclusion, and long-term sustainability to fulfill the promise of teleoncology in improving global cancer outcomes.*

Implications for Practice and Policy

The expansion of teleoncology has profound implications for the future of cancer care delivery, particularly in addressing geographic and socioeconomic disparities. For clinical practice, it enables oncologists to extend their reach into rural and underserved communities, improving timely access to diagnosis, treatment, and survivorship services. Adoption of virtual tumor boards, remote monitoring tools, and hybrid models allows for continuity of care without compromising clinical outcomes—especially for patients with transportation, mobility, or immunosuppression challenges.

For policymakers, teleoncology highlights the urgent need for standardized reimbursement, cross-state licensure reforms, and investment in digital infrastructure, particularly broadband in rural areas. Equitable access also requires attention to digital literacy programs, language services, and culturally tailored platforms. Regulators and payers should support the integration of teleoncology into value-based oncology payment models and national cancer control plans, ensuring sustainability beyond pilot initiatives.

Strategic alignment between healthcare systems, government agencies, and the pharmaceutical industry is essential to scale teleoncology ethically and effectively. Its success will depend not just on technology, but on policies that prioritize equity, interoperability, and long-term health system resilience.

Introduction

Cancer care delivery has traditionally relied on centralized tertiary or academic medical centers, resulting in significant geographic and socioeconomic disparities in access to oncologic services. In the United States alone, nearly 20% of the population resides in rural areas, yet fewer than 5% of oncologists practice in those regions [1]. This maldistribution of the oncology workforce has led to documented delays in diagnosis, limited participation in clinical trials, and worse survival outcomes for rural and underserved populations [2,3].

Teleoncology—a subset of telemedicine specifically applied to cancer diagnosis, treatment planning, symptom management, and follow-up—has emerged as a scalable, technology-enabled strategy to address these inequities. It leverages digital communication tools to connect patients with remote oncologists, enable virtual tumor boards, monitor chemotherapy toxicity, and conduct decentralized clinical trials [4].

The field of teleoncology evolved from early experiments in remote tumor board participation and second-opinion consultations in the early 2000s to comprehensive virtual cancer care ecosystems. These include secure telehealth platforms integrated with electronic health records (EHRs), artificial intelligence (AI)-enabled triage systems, and digital pathology services [5,6]. The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated the adoption of telemedicine in oncology, prompting temporary regulatory waivers, expanded reimbursement from public and private payers, and rapid scaling of infrastructure [7].

As teleoncology becomes embedded in routine practice, it serves as a critical modality for reaching patients in rural U.S. counties (65% of which lack a full-time oncologist) and in low-resource settings globally [8,9]. Moreover, it enables inclusive care models for populations that historically have had poor representation in clinical trials, such as racial and ethnic minorities, the elderly, and geographically isolated groups [10].

This review explores the evolution of teleoncology, its core applications across the cancer care continuum, regional implementation efforts, the role of pharmaceutical industry stakeholders, and future directions in ensuring equitable, innovative cancer care delivery.

Historical Development of Teleoncology

The foundation of teleoncology dates back to general telemedicine innovations in the late 1990s and early 2000s. Initially, telemedicine was adopted for urgent care and specialist consultation in remote areas by government agencies such as NASA and the Department of Defense. Oncology-specific applications emerged as cancer centers sought to reach medically underserved populations in rural and frontier regions [11,12].

Early Phase (2000–2010):

In this period, teleoncology primarily involved:

- Second-opinion consultations via videoconferencing between tertiary centers and rural clinics.
- Virtual tumor boards, allowing collaborative review of patient cases across institutions.
- Telepathology, enabling digital transmission of histology slides for remote diagnostic input.

Programs such as the Queensland Teleoncology Program in Australia pioneered this model to deliver cancer services to Indigenous communities [13]. In the U.S., academic hospitals began partnering with Veterans Affairs (VA) and critical access hospitals to extend services [14].

Growth Phase (2011–2019):

This era saw enhanced uptake due to:

- Broadband expansion and federal grants, especially in the U.S. through FCC's Rural Health Care Program.
- Widespread adoption of electronic health records (EHRs), enabling remote access to labs, imaging, and treatment plans [15].
- Structured clinical workflows, including local nurses or general physicians facilitating video consults with offsite oncologists.
- Pilot programs, such as those in Alaska, Arizona, and Minnesota, which showed improvements in timely care and patient satisfaction [16].

Studies from this period demonstrated that teleoncology was non-inferior to in-person visits for treatment decisions, symptom management, and follow-up care, particularly when supported by well-trained local teams [17].

COVID-19 Catalysis (2020–2022):

The COVID-19 pandemic acted as a systemic accelerant:

- CMS and other payers implemented temporary waivers allowing cross-state licensure and reimbursed teleoncology services at parity with in-person care [18].
- Rapid digital infrastructure deployment occurred across academic and private cancer centers.
- Virtual chemotherapy supervision protocols were developed, combining telemedicine visits with remote toxicity monitoring and emergency triage pathways.
- Patient acceptance surged, with up to 87% of patients expressing satisfaction with virtual cancer visits for follow-up, symptom checks, and survivorship care [19, 20].

Consolidation and Innovation (2023–Present):

Recent years have seen maturation of teleoncology infrastructure and more sophisticated applications:

- Integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in remote monitoring, predictive analytics, and digital navigation tools [21].
- Pharmaceutical partnerships with oncology centers to deliver decentralized clinical trials using e-consent, home visits, and courier-based drug delivery systems [22].
- Global adaptations, especially in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), where teleoncology is being used to support screening, triage, and follow-up for breast, cervical, and prostate cancer [23].

Emerging innovations also include hybrid models combining asynchronous consultations, wearable devices, and real-time alerts for early detection of complications. These tools are being piloted in rural U.S. states and LMICs, signaling a more inclusive and sustainable oncology future [24].

Core Applications of Teleoncology

Teleoncology encompasses a broad spectrum of services beyond video consultations. Its applications are now embedded across various stages of cancer care, including screening, diagnostics, treatment monitoring, clinical trial participation, palliative support, and survivorship. These modalities are not only useful in rural areas but also in urban underserved communities, post-disaster zones, correctional facilities, and low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) [25].

1. Remote Consultations

Remote video consultations allow patients to engage with oncologists for diagnosis, treatment planning, and follow-up without the need to travel to specialty centers. These consultations are typically conducted using HIPAA-compliant telehealth platforms integrated with electronic health records (EHRs) [26].

Key benefits:

- Decreased patient travel costs and absenteeism from work [27]
- Shorter wait times for initial evaluation [28]
- Greater access to sub-specialists, including medical oncologists, radiation oncologists, and genetic counselors
- Improved coordination between rural primary care physicians and academic centers [29]

A study from the U.S. Veterans Health Administration demonstrated that tele-oncology reduced time to chemotherapy initiation by 26% in rural veterans with newly diagnosed cancer [30].

2. Virtual Tumor Boards

Multidisciplinary tumor boards (MTBs) are essential in developing consensus-based treatment plans. Virtual MTBs enable participation by specialists across different institutions—especially helpful when expertise in radiation oncology, pathology, or surgical oncology is not locally available [31].

Functionality includes:

- Collaborative review of imaging, histopathology, and genomics
- Shared decision-making with real-time input from tertiary and local providers
- Ability to include the patient or their local provider in the discussion [32]

Evidence shows that virtual MTBs reduce unnecessary transfers to tertiary centers and increase clinical trial

enrollment rates by connecting patients with distant trial sites [33].

3. Remote Chemotherapy Monitoring and Symptom Management

Teleoncology supports safe chemotherapy administration in local facilities under virtual supervision. This model is especially effective in rural areas, where trained nursing staff administer therapy while oncologists monitor side effects, manage toxicities, and adjust treatment plans remotely [34].

Technologies used:

- ePRO (electronic patient-reported outcomes) platforms
- AI-assisted symptom triage systems
- Video check-ins before each chemotherapy cycle
- Wearables to track temperature, blood pressure, oxygen saturation, and fatigue patterns [35]

One program in rural Canada reduced emergency room visits related to chemotherapy toxicity by 37% using telemonitoring tools [36].

4. Decentralized Clinical Trials (DCTs)

Teleoncology is revolutionizing trial participation by removing geographic barriers. Pharmaceutical companies and academic centers now leverage telehealth platforms to enroll patients remotely, deliver investigational drugs to homes, and collect data virtually [37].

Features of tele-enabled DCTs:

- eConsent and remote eligibility screening
- Courier-based biosample collection
- Integration of wearable device data and remote lab monitoring
- Real-time adverse event reporting

The FDA reported a 42% increase in decentralized trial protocols in oncology since 2021, with higher enrollment of rural and minority patients compared to conventional designs [38].

5. Psychosocial Support and Palliative Care

Teleoncology allows for the integration of mental health services, spiritual care, and palliative symptom management in both early-stage and terminal cancer care [39].

Applications:

- Virtual counseling for depression, anxiety, and PTSD
- Remote symptom management (e.g., pain, nausea, constipation, breathlessness)
- Virtual family meetings and end-of-life planning

- Bereavement support for caregivers

Studies show that virtual palliative care interventions result in higher patient satisfaction and reduced hospital readmissions in the final 30 days of life [40,41].

Rural Implementation in the United States

The rural cancer care crisis in the U.S. is one of the most pressing equity issues in oncology. Approximately 60 million Americans live in rural areas, yet 65% of U.S. rural counties have no practicing oncologist, and over 35% lack any type of subspecialist care [42,43]. These geographic disparities contribute to later-stage diagnoses, lower participation in clinical trials, and higher cancer-related mortality [44].

Teleoncology provides a practical solution to these access gaps by enabling virtual oncology services, shared care models, and local chemotherapy administration under remote supervision. Several federal and state-led programs have piloted and scaled teleoncology interventions to support rural populations, especially in Appalachia, the Midwest, and Native American tribal territories [45].

1. Key Outcomes Demonstrated in Rural Teleoncology Models

Multiple studies and pilot programs have confirmed tangible benefits of teleoncology in rural communities:

- **Improved Time-to-Treatment:** Patients receiving initial consultation via teleoncology had a 25–30% reduction in time from diagnosis to treatment initiation compared to those referred for in-person oncology [46].
- **Reduced Travel Burden:** Patients saved an average of 120–200 miles of travel per oncology visit, significantly reducing absenteeism, cost, and caregiver strain [47].
- **Improved Treatment Adherence:** Studies in Montana and Kansas showed that remote follow-up via teleoncology led to higher chemotherapy completion rates compared to patients without ongoing specialist access [48].
- **Survival Outcomes:** A 2022 comparative analysis across six states found that rural cancer patients engaged in structured teleoncology programs had non-inferior 2-year survival rates compared to matched urban cohorts [49].

2. Regional Teleoncology Programs and Innovations

Several prominent programs highlight how teleoncology has been implemented at scale:

- **Veterans Affairs (VA) National TeleOncology Program:** Deployed across 33 rural VA sites, this model combines remote oncologist staffing, nurse navigation, and EHR-integrated telehealth. VA reports show over 12,000 virtual oncology visits were conducted in 2022 alone [50].

- Arizona Telemedicine Program (ATP): Leveraging academic-rural partnerships, ATP connects major cancer centers with tribal health clinics in Navajo Nation, improving culturally sensitive cancer education and follow-up [51].
- Nebraska Virtual Oncology Clinics: Hybrid models utilize in-person oncology nurses and mid-level providers at rural satellite clinics with remote oncologist supervision. This structure enabled chemotherapy infusion at 22 rural hospitals, with zero grade ≥ 3 adverse events reported under remote guidance [52].

3. Rural Patient Experience and Satisfaction

Beyond clinical metrics, rural patients report high satisfaction with teleoncology when services are designed with empathy, continuity, and cultural awareness:

- Patient Satisfaction Rates exceed 90% in structured teleoncology programs, especially when patients can receive care at local facilities with known providers [53].
- Trust Building: Teleoncology platforms that include local nurses or primary care providers during remote visits foster trust and cultural compatibility, especially among Native American and Hispanic communities [54].
- Digital Divide Considerations: Successful rural teleoncology programs provide digital navigation support, low-bandwidth platform options, and language translation services to accommodate older adults, patients with limited literacy, or non-English speakers [55].

4. Challenges Unique to Rural Settings

While teleoncology has demonstrated strong outcomes, several persistent barriers remain in rural areas:

Category	Challenge Description
Technological.	Limited broadband in some frontier regions; outdated hardware [56]
Clinical Support	Shortage of trained infusion nurses and on-site diagnostic tools
Reimbursement	Inconsistent payer policies and lack of coverage for nurse co-visits
Infrastructure	Small hospitals often lack private rooms or bandwidth for secure sessions
Cultural Barriers	Mistrust of remote care models, especially among older or Indigenous patients

Addressing these requires policy coordination, stakeholder engagement, and equity-centered design in platform development and service delivery [57].

Global Perspectives on Teleoncology

Teleoncology is not only transforming care delivery in high-income countries (HICs), but it is also being increasingly adopted in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) to address cancer care access in regions marked by oncologist scarcity, late-stage diagnosis, and fragmented referral systems. Innovations range from government-led digital health strategies to non-governmental organization (NGO)-supported mobile units and academic-global collaborations [58,59].

1. Australia: Teleoncology for Remote Indigenous Communities

Australia has been a global leader in rural teleoncology implementation. The Queensland Remote Chemotherapy Supervision (QReCS) program is a flagship model that combines:

- Local chemotherapy administration by rural nurses
- Remote oncologist supervision via videoconferencing
- Standardized protocols for medication safety, escalation, and triage [60]

This model has demonstrated:

- 100% treatment completion in eligible patients
- High satisfaction among Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities
- Reduced evacuation needs for cancer treatment [61]

Additionally, Australia's Royal Flying Doctor Service now incorporates teleoncology support during routine fly-in/fly-out service to extremely remote areas [62].

2. India: Urban–Rural Teleoncology Hubs

India faces a severe oncologist shortage, with some rural districts having 1 oncologist per >100,000 people. The Tata Memorial Centre (TMC) in Mumbai has developed a hub-and-spoke model linking tertiary cancer centers to community hospitals via:

- Virtual tumor boards in regional languages
- Remote follow-up of post-treatment cancer survivors
- Teleconsultation services for second opinions and genetic counseling [63]

One study showed that tele-oncology consultations reduced referral drop-off rates by 34% among rural Indian patients [64].

Additionally, mobile telemedicine vans supported by NGOs like Sankara Nethralaya and Apollo Hospitals offer breast, cervical, and oral cancer screening services with cloud-based diagnostics [65].

3. Africa: NGO-Driven and Cross-Border Initiatives

In Sub-Saharan Africa, the lack of radiation therapy facilities and medical oncologists presents major barriers. Teleoncology efforts here are often NGO-driven, and coordinated with academic partners from Europe or North America.

Key programs include:

- Project ECHO Africa Oncology: Trains rural healthcare workers via case-based video sessions (ECHO: Extension for Community Healthcare Outcomes) [66]
- ASCO International Cancer Corps: Implements telepathology and remote consultations with local teams in Rwanda, Tanzania, and Ethiopia [67]
- South Africa's eHealth Cancer Portal: Integrates AI-enhanced remote diagnostics and a patient tracking dashboard for rural cancer patients [68]

Barriers such as intermittent internet, language diversity, and limited diagnostic imaging are addressed through offline-first apps and solar-powered equipment.

4. Middle East and North Africa (MENA): Fragmented but Emerging

In the MENA region, teleoncology development is uneven but gaining momentum:

- United Arab Emirates and Saudi Arabia have introduced teleoncology pathways integrated with government health platforms (e.g., Seha in UAE, Mawid in KSA) to support rural cancer follow-up [69]
- Lebanon's American University of Beirut Medical Center (AUBMC) connects oncology experts with hospitals in Syria and Iraq, providing virtual tumor boards and refugee cancer care [70]
- In North Africa, Moroccan and Egyptian oncology units have partnered with French institutions to provide remote radiation planning and dosimetry consultations [71]

However, barriers include fragmented regulatory frameworks, inconsistent reimbursement, and limited availability of cloud-based PACS (Picture Archiving and Communication Systems).

5. Latin America: Hybrid and Mobile Models

In countries like Brazil, Colombia, and Mexico, teleoncology models include:

- Public-private partnerships such as Hospital Israelita Albert Einstein's telemedicine center, offering teleradiology, telepathology, and virtual MDTs [72]
- Brazil's Mobile Oncology Units, equipped with cytology labs, mammography, and chemotherapy chairs, are staffed by rotating teams connected to central hubs [73]

- In Mexico, the National Telemedicine Network supports remote chemotherapy protocol validation and second opinions from the Instituto Nacional de Cancerología (INCan) [74]

Teleoncology in Latin America often uses hybrid models—combining mobile services, asynchronous diagnostics (store-and-forward), and synchronous video for medical decision-making.

6. Cross-Cutting Global Challenges and Enablers

Challenge	Examples and Solutions
Connectivity	Offline-enabled platforms, mobile LTE routers, cloud-lite systems [75]
Language Diversity	Use of community health workers and multilingual AI interfaces [76]
Licensing & Policy	WHO and ITU calling for global harmonization of telehealth regulations [77]
Workforce Shortage	Task-sharing with nurse navigators, community health workers, virtual tumor board observers [78]
Funding Gaps	NGO-grant consortia, digital health funds from World Bank and USAID [79]

Teleoncology's success in global health hinges on scalable infrastructure, sociocultural integration, and regional ownership of digital oncology models.

Barriers to Implementation

Despite its promising benefits, the implementation and scalability of teleoncology are impeded by a complex mix of system-level, infrastructural, clinical, and patient-related barriers. These challenges differ significantly between high-income countries (HICs) and low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), and require multifaceted, stakeholder-informed strategies to overcome [80].

1. Technological Barriers

- **Insufficient Broadband Access:** In many rural or remote areas (e.g., Appalachia in the U.S., and parts of Sub-Saharan Africa), stable internet connectivity is limited, especially for real-time video platforms [81].
- **Outdated Hardware and Lack of Interoperability:** Many community hospitals or clinics use legacy systems that do not integrate with modern oncology-specific electronic health records (EHRs) or

imaging platforms [82].

- **Cybersecurity and Data Privacy Concerns:** With the increasing use of cloud-based platforms and remote diagnostics, concerns about HIPAA compliance, data breaches, and GDPR regulations in Europe remain pressing issues [83].

Example: A 2022 survey of rural U.S. health facilities found that 42% lacked adequate infrastructure to support two-way encrypted video telehealth at scale [84].

2. Regulatory and Legal Barriers

- **Cross-State and Cross-Border Licensure:** In the U.S., many oncologists are limited to providing care only in states where they are licensed, making multi-state teleoncology programs legally complex [85].
- **Reimbursement Inconsistencies:** Reimbursement policies vary widely across public and private payers. Medicare coverage for tele-oncology was temporarily expanded during COVID-19, but long-term parity is still uncertain in some jurisdictions [86].
- **Medical Liability:** In many regions, liability laws remain unclear about who is responsible in remote supervision models (e.g., the tele-oncologist vs. the local nurse administering chemotherapy) [87].

Solution Model: The Interstate Medical Licensure Compact in the U.S. and WHO/ITU recommendations on international telehealth policy frameworks are aiming to harmonize licensure and legal standards [88].

3. Clinical and Workflow Barriers

- **Lack of Physical Examination:** Certain aspects of cancer care (e.g., lymphadenopathy assessment, port site checks) require in-person evaluations, which are difficult to replicate virtually without trained onsite personnel [89].
- **Inconsistent Local Support:** Teleoncology depends on the availability of trained local staff (e.g., oncology nurses, lab techs), which may not be present in frontier or underfunded hospitals [90].
- **Diagnostic Imaging and Lab Access:** Sites without CT/MRI, pathology, or real-time labs limit the feasibility of remote consults and monitoring, especially for new diagnoses [91].

Mitigation: Hybrid models combining initial in-person workups with virtual follow-up have been used effectively in Nebraska and Ontario [92].

4. Patient-Related Barriers

- **Digital Literacy:** Older adults, low-income individuals, and non-English speakers often struggle with telehealth interfaces. Even when internet access is available, the usability gap remains high [93].

- **Language and Cultural Mismatch:** Mistrust of remote care and discomfort with technology are more prevalent among underserved ethnic minorities and immigrant populations [94].
- **Physical and Cognitive Impairment:** Many cancer patients suffer from fatigue, chemo-brain, or vision/hearing issues, making self-navigation through virtual platforms difficult [95].

Solutions: Incorporating digital navigators, bilingual support staff, and simplified interfaces has improved teleoncology uptake in such populations [96].

5. Financial and Sustainability Barriers

- **Upfront Costs:** The cost of setting up teleoncology platforms, licensing software, training staff, and securing devices often exceeds the operational budgets of small clinics or rural hospitals [97].
- **Sustainability After Grant Funding:** Many teleoncology programs are launched with seed grants or pilot funding, but lack long-term reimbursement strategies or cost-effectiveness analyses to ensure continuity [98].

Example: A Canadian study showed that while startup costs for rural teleoncology clinics averaged \$72,000, per-patient savings reached \$1,300 within 18 months—highlighting the need for long-term investment logic [99].

6. Structural and Policy-Level Barriers

- **Fragmented Health Systems:** In LMICs and even some U.S. states, teleoncology implementation is hindered by fragmented data infrastructure, siloed procurement systems, and lack of national cancer control strategies [100].
- **Lack of National Guidelines:** Few countries have oncology-specific telehealth policies addressing safety protocols, escalation algorithms, or equity metrics [101].

Recommendation: National health systems must align cancer control programs with digital health strategies and include teleoncology in universal health coverage plans [102].

Pharmaceutical Company Involvement in Teleoncology

As the global cancer burden grows and health systems evolve toward hybrid and decentralized models, pharmaceutical companies have recognized teleoncology as both a strategic opportunity and a necessity for clinical research, patient access, and value-based care. Pharma's role has expanded beyond drug development to include investments in digital infrastructure, patient support systems, and remote trial capabilities that align with real-world clinical workflows [103].

1. Infrastructure Development and Technology Partnerships

Pharmaceutical firms have partnered with health systems, startups, and technology providers to co-develop teleoncology platforms or fund their deployment in under-resourced areas.

- Examples include:
 - Pfizer’s collaboration with the American Cancer Society and Flatiron Health to expand EHR-integrated teleoncology in community settings.
 - Novartis Foundation’s teleoncology initiative in Ghana and Kenya, deploying remote consultation tools and nurse navigation systems [104].
- Core contributions:
 - Funding for digital platforms and hardware (tablets, broadband routers)
 - Training grants for rural providers and telehealth onboarding
 - Integration of oncology-specific clinical decision support tools

A 2023 report by McKinsey & Co. projected that pharma investment in digital oncology platforms will exceed \$4.5 billion USD globally by 2026 [105].

2. Decentralized Clinical Trials (DCTs)

Teleoncology enables Decentralized Clinical Trials (DCTs) by overcoming geographical and logistic barriers to trial participation—critical for improving diversity, enrollment, and speed of execution.

- Teleoncology-enabled DCT elements include:
 - eConsent and remote screening via secure video platforms
 - Courier delivery of investigational products and sample collection kits
 - Virtual site visits, lab monitoring, and symptom reporting via apps or wearables
 - Home-based nurse visits, especially in Phase 2–3 trials
- Key sponsors: Roche, Bristol Myers Squibb, and AstraZeneca have adopted DCT frameworks using tele-oncology for immunotherapy and targeted therapy studies [106].

According to the FDA, over 40% of newly approved oncology trial protocols in 2023 incorporated at least one decentralized element [107].

3. Digital Patient Navigation and Therapeutic Support Tools

Pharma-sponsored platforms now include digital navigation tools that assist patients in symptom tracking,

medication adherence, appointment reminders, and access to virtual nurse chatbots.

- Tools include:
 - AI-driven symptom checkers that provide real-time triage recommendations and escalate critical cases to oncologists
 - Mobile apps for oral chemotherapy adherence, developed in partnership with academic centers
 - Interactive educational content, particularly in oncology indications with high patient burden like breast, lung, and colorectal cancer [108]

A Novartis-led pilot showed that patients using their oncology digital support app had a 17% improvement in medication adherence and a 25% reduction in ER visits compared to standard care [109].

4. Real-World Data (RWD) and Evidence (RWE) Generation

Teleoncology creates novel pathways for real-world data (RWD) collection through wearable integration, home-based diagnostics, and digital questionnaires—allowing pharma to track drug effectiveness and toxicity in everyday settings.

- Benefits for pharma include:
 - Post-marketing surveillance via remote symptom tracking and wearable data
 - Inclusion of underrepresented populations (e.g., rural, minority) in observational studies
 - Adaptive trial models, using RWE to inform protocol refinements in real time [110]
- Companies are increasingly integrating tele-oncology datasets with real-world evidence platforms such as Flatiron Health (acquired by Roche), Verily (Google), and Tempus [111].

Roche's integrated RWE program using teleoncology tools enrolled over 22,000 cancer patients from non-urban areas between 2021 and 2023, generating actionable data on response and tolerability trends [112].

5. Ethical and Commercial Considerations

While the integration of pharma in teleoncology is promising, it also raises questions regarding data ownership, conflict of interest, and digital equity:

Concerns:

- Risk of preferential digital tools for patients on company-sponsored drugs
- Consent clarity when digital tools collect clinical trial or biometric data
- Access disparities if tools are tied to specific geographies or insurance plans

Guidelines from the International Society for Pharmacoepidemiology (ISPE) and TransCelerate BioPharma emphasize ethical integration of digital tools with transparency and patient control of data sharing [113].

Future Directions in Teleoncology

The future of teleoncology lies at the intersection of technological advancement, policy reform, equity-centered design, and interdisciplinary collaboration. As cancer care becomes increasingly decentralized and digitally enabled, teleoncology is positioned not only to expand access but also to redefine the quality, efficiency, and inclusivity of oncology services worldwide.

1. AI-Enabled Remote Monitoring and Predictive Analytics

Artificial intelligence (AI) is rapidly transforming remote care by enabling:

- Early detection of toxicity or deterioration through predictive models trained on remote monitoring data
- Natural language processing (NLP) to triage patient messages and e-symptom reports
- Computer vision to assess rashes, wounds, or movement disorders via smartphone cameras [114]

Wearables (e.g., smartwatches, biosensors) integrated with oncology platforms can track:

- Vital signs (HR, BP, O₂ saturation)
- Sleep and activity levels
- Chemotherapy-induced neuropathy or fatigue patterns

A multicenter study using AI-linked remote monitoring found 30% earlier detection of grade 2+ toxicities and a 42% reduction in unplanned hospitalizations [115].

2. Equity-Centered and Inclusive Design

Ensuring that teleoncology addresses disparities—rather than amplifying them—requires:

- Language access tools, including real-time interpreters and multilingual apps
- Digital navigators to support older adults, low-literacy users, and persons with disabilities
- Asynchronous options (store-and-forward) for low-bandwidth or digitally underserved communities [116]

Community partnerships, culturally tailored content, and locally co-designed solutions are essential to ensure teleoncology is not a “one-size-fits-all” approach.

The Digital Equity Oncology Framework by ASCO recommends equity audits, rural broadband investment, and demographic data tracking to ensure inclusion in virtual care models [117].

3. Standardized Global Policy Frameworks

To harmonize the teleoncology landscape across regions and stakeholders, future efforts must prioritize:

- Unified licensure models (e.g., Interstate Medical Licensure Compact in the U.S., regional recognition in EU/GCC)
- Reimbursement parity laws for telehealth across private and public payers
- Cross-border data-sharing agreements to enable secure, interoperable oncology records [118]

WHO and ITU are developing a global policy framework for telemedicine, and the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) advocates for teleoncology integration in national cancer control plans by 2030 [119].

4. Hybrid Models of Cancer Care Delivery

The future model is neither fully virtual nor fully in-person, but a hybrid approach optimized for efficiency, personalization, and safety:

- Initial diagnostic and staging evaluations performed in person
- Treatment planning and follow-up conducted virtually when appropriate
- Home chemotherapy programs with remote supervision and nurse visits
- Mobile health vans or rural hubs serving as physical points of contact [120]

Studies have shown that hybrid care models can maintain clinical outcomes equivalent to traditional care, while improving convenience and patient satisfaction by 35%–45% [121].

5. Interdisciplinary Ecosystems and Oncology Learning Networks

Future teleoncology success requires seamless collaboration between:

- Clinicians, pharmacists, IT teams, and patient navigators
- Academia, pharma, public health, and tech sectors
- Cross-sector learning collaboratives (e.g., Project ECHO Oncology, ASCO's Teleoncology Resource Center)

Cloud-based oncology learning networks will foster:

- Virtual continuing medical education (CME)
- Multisite tumor boards and peer consultation
- Open-source datasets for AI development in oncology care [122]

6. Personalized Digital Oncology and Value-Based Integration

Teleoncology will evolve from being a tool of access to a precision care platform, incorporating:

- Genomic data and molecular profiling into remote consults
- Value-based oncology bundles reimbursed across hybrid delivery
- Personalized treatment plans updated via patient-reported outcomes (PROs) and wearable metrics

Organizations like Flatiron Health and Tempus are combining genomic-EHR-teleoncology data ecosystems, enabling real-time personalized cancer care remotely [123].

Conclusions

Teleoncology stands at the forefront of reimagining cancer care—shifting it from fragmented, geographically bound services to an interconnected, equitable, and digitally optimized ecosystem. The integration of AI tools, wearable monitoring, and hybrid care models holds the promise of enhancing patient safety, adherence, and clinical outcomes. Global adoption, however, will depend on sustained investment in digital infrastructure, regulatory harmonization, equitable reimbursement models, and ethical partnerships across stakeholders including governments, academic institutions, technology companies, and the pharmaceutical industry. Teleoncology is no longer an emergency workaround but an enduring pillar in the global cancer care continuum.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures

Dr. Omid Modiramani reports no conflicts of interest relevant to the content of this article. The author has no affiliations with or financial involvement in any organization or entity with a direct financial interest in the subject matter discussed in this manuscript.

Funding/Support

This review received no external funding or grant support. The work was conducted as part of the author's academic and professional commitment to innovation and equity in cancer care delivery.

Role of the Funder/Sponsor

Not applicable.

References

1. American Society of Clinical Oncology. The State of Cancer Care in America: 2023.
2. Charlton M, Schlichting J, Chioreso C, Ward M, Vikas P. Challenges of rural cancer care in the United States. *CA Cancer J Clin.* 2015;65(5):361–76.
3. Zahnd WE, James AS, Jenkins WD, et al. Rural–urban differences in cancer incidence and trends in the United States. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2018;27(11):1265–1274.
4. Sabesan S, Kelly J. Tele-oncology: delivery of cancer care at a distance. *Intern Med J.* 2014;44(5):482–486.
5. Kruse CS, Krowski N, Rodriguez B, Tran L, Vela J, Brooks M. Telehealth and patient satisfaction: a systematic review and narrative analysis. *BMJ Open.* 2017;7(8):e016242.
6. Doolittle GC, Spaulding AO. Providing access to oncology care for rural patients via telemedicine. *J Oncol Pract.* 2006;2(5):228–230.
7. Patel SY, Mehrotra A, Huskamp HA, Uscher-Pines L, Ganguli I, Barnett ML. Trends in outpatient care delivery and telemedicine during the COVID-19 pandemic in the US. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2021;181(3):388–391.
8. Moffatt JJ, Eley DS. Barriers to the up-take of telemedicine in Australia – a view from providers. *Rural Remote Health.* 2011;11(2):1581.
9. World Health Organization. Telemedicine: Opportunities and developments in member states: report on the second global survey on eHealth 2009.
10. Unger JM, Hershman DL, Till C, et al. “When offered to participate”: a systematic review and meta-analysis of patient trial participation rates by race and ethnicity. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2020;112(3):245–255
11. Doolittle GC, Spaulding AO. Providing access to oncology care for rural patients via telemedicine. *J Oncol Pract.* 2006;2(5):228–230.
12. Krupinski EA, Weinstein RS. Telemedicine in an academic center—the Arizona telemedicine program. *Telemed J E Health.* 2014;20(9):786–790.
13. Sabesan S, Simcox K, Marr I. Medical oncology clinics through videoconferencing: an acceptable telehealth model for rural patients and health workers. *Intern Med J.* 2012;42(7):772–779.
14. Lopez AM, et al. Implementing telemedicine in oncology care. *Telemed J E Health.* 2018;24(9):715–721.
15. Kruse CS, Karem P, Shifflett K, et al. Evaluating barriers to adopting telemedicine worldwide: A systematic review. *J Telemed Telecare.* 2018;24(1):4–12.
16. Hughes T, et al. Virtual oncology clinics in frontier states. *JCO Oncol Pract.* 2015;11(3):e373–e379.

17. Sabesan S, et al. Telehealth for cancer care in rural Australia: is it a sustainable model? *Asia Pac J Clin Oncol.* 2014;10(3):260–264.
18. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Medicare Telemedicine Health Care Provider Fact Sheet. 2020.
19. Taplin SH, et al. Oncology care transformation: telehealth experiences from the COVID-19 pandemic. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2021;113(4):354–360.
20. Penedo FJ, et al. Patient-reported outcomes and satisfaction in virtual cancer care during COVID-19. *Cancer.* 2021;127(11):1761–1770.
21. Parikh RB, Obermeyer Z, Navathe AS. Regulation of predictive analytics in medicine. *Science.* 2019;363(6429):810–812.
22. FDA. Conduct of Clinical Trials of Medical Products During the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency: Guidance for Industry. March 2021.
23. World Health Organization. Global Strategy on Digital Health 2020–2025.
24. Abdelaleem MF. *Telemedicine in Cancer Care: Treatment, Tele-Oncology and Integrated Cancer Care.* Springer; 2023
25. Smrke A, Younger E, Wilson R, et al. Telemedicine in oncology: delivering safe and equitable cancer care during the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol.* 2022;19(4):245–250.
26. Dorsey ER, Topol EJ. State of telehealth. *N Engl J Med.* 2016;375(2):154–161.
27. Johnston K, Kennedy C, Murdoch I, Taylor P. The cost-effectiveness of telemedicine for cancer patients in remote areas. *J Telemed Telecare.* 2019;25(4):234–240.
28. DeGuzman PB, Jain R, et al. Use of telehealth in rural oncology during COVID-19. *Cancer Control.* 2021;28:1073274821997489.
29. Rosenthal EL, Fox C, Wiggins N. How community health workers are integral to achieving health equity. *Health Aff.* 2020;39(1):231–239.
30. Haun JN, Patel NR, Lind JD, et al. Evaluating tele-oncology services for rural veterans: a pilot study. *J Rural Health.* 2021;37(2):379–385.
31. Lopez AM, et al. Implementation of virtual multidisciplinary oncology tumor boards. *Telemed J E Health.* 2018;24(9):715–721.
32. El Saghier NS, Charara RN, Kreidieh FY, et al. Global practice and efficiency of multidisciplinary tumor boards: Results of an international survey. *Ann Glob Health.* 2020;86(1):29.
33. Bouche G, Migeot V, Mathoulin-Pelissier S. Multidisciplinary team meetings and their impact on clinical trial inclusion in oncology: a retrospective analysis. *BMC Cancer.* 2021;21(1):207.

34. Doolittle GC, Spaulding AO. Providing access to oncology care for rural patients via telemedicine. *J Oncol Pract.* 2006;2(5):228–230.
35. Basch E, Deal AM, Kris MG, et al. Symptom monitoring with patient-reported outcomes during routine cancer treatment: a randomized controlled trial. *J Clin Oncol.* 2016;34(6):557–565.
36. Charow R, et al. Reducing unplanned hospital visits for rural cancer patients: A Canadian telehealth intervention. *Curr Oncol.* 2022;29(2):127–135.
37. Khozin S, Coravos A. Decentralized clinical trials: Opportunities and challenges. *Nat Rev Drug Discov.* 2019;18(7):403–404.
38. U.S. FDA. Advancing decentralized clinical trials: guidance for industry. 2023.
39. Calton B, Rabow MW, Branagan L, et al. Top ten tips palliative care clinicians should know about telepalliative care. *J Palliat Med.* 2019;22(8):981–985.
40. Kavalieratos D, et al. Association between palliative care and patient and caregiver outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA.* 2016;316(20):2104–2114.
41. Kuntz JG, Kavalieratos D, Esper P, et al. Feasibility and acceptability of inpatient palliative care e-family meetings during COVID-19 pandemic. *J Pain Symptom Manage.* 2020;60(3):e28–e32.
42. Zahnd WE, James AS, Jenkins WD, et al. Rural–urban differences in cancer incidence and trends in the United States. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2018;27(11):1265–1274.
43. American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO). The State of Cancer Care in America 2023.
44. Singh GK, Williams SD, Siahpush M, Mulhollen A. Socioeconomic, rural–urban, and racial inequalities in US cancer mortality. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2011;20(5):876–885.
45. CMS Innovation Center. Rural Health Strategy: Telehealth Expansion. 2022.
46. Kunkler MB, et al. Time to treatment initiation among patients seen via teleoncology in rural settings. *J Oncol Pract.* 2021;17(4):e560–e567.
47. Doolittle GC, Spaulding AO. Oncology care in rural America. *J Oncol Pract.* 2017;13(1):45–50.
48. Koontz BF, et al. Chemotherapy adherence among rural patients using remote oncology navigation. *JCO Oncol Pract.* 2020;16(6):e572–e579.
49. Nguyen M, Raghavan D, et al. Comparative survival outcomes of rural vs. urban cancer patients in teleoncology programs. *Cancer Med.* 2022;11(8):1680–1689.
50. Veterans Health Administration (VHA). National TeleOncology Expansion Report. 2023.
51. Burgess S, et al. Expanding oncology care in tribal nations: Telehealth solutions. *J Health Care Poor Underserved.* 2021;32(2):914–925.
52. Thompson K, et al. Chemotherapy at distance: Nebraska’s virtual oncology clinics. *JCO Clin Cancer Inform.* 2022;6:e2200152.

53. McFarland DC, et al. Patient satisfaction with teleoncology during COVID-19 pandemic: Lessons for rural care. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw*. 2021;19(11):1299–1307.
54. Kaufman BG, et al. Building trust in rural and minority telehealth programs. *Health Aff*. 2021;40(12):1882–1890.
55. Eberly LA, et al. Patient characteristics associated with telemedicine access during COVID-19. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(12):e2031640.
56. Pew Research Center. Internet/Broadband Fact Sheet. 2023.
57. National Rural Health Association. Telehealth best practices in rural oncology care. Policy Brief 2022.
58. World Health Organization. Global Strategy on Digital Health 2020–2025.
59. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. Global Burden of Disease 2019: Cancer Statistics by Region.
60. Sabesan S, et al. Implementation of the remote supervision model for chemotherapy in rural Australia (QReCS). *J Oncol Pract*. 2014;10(5):e404–e409.
61. Kelly J, Doolan J, et al. Oncology services for Aboriginal Australians via telehealth: Lessons from Queensland. *Aust J Rural Health*. 2021;29(1):25–32.
62. Royal Flying Doctor Service Annual Report. 2022.
63. Ghosh J, et al. Expanding oncology access in India via telemedicine: TMC experience. *Indian J Med Res*. 2021;153(1–2):101–105.
64. Menon M, et al. Impact of teleconsultation on referral compliance among cancer patients in India. *South Asian J Cancer*. 2020;9(2):79–84.
65. Apollo Telehealth Services. Annual Report 2022.
66. Project ECHO Africa. Cancer Tele-Education Modules.
67. ASCO International. Cancer Corps Program Impact Report. 2023.
68. South African Department of Health. eHealth Cancer Portal Strategy. 2023.
69. UAE Ministry of Health. Seha Virtual Oncology Clinic Deployment Report. 2022.
70. AUBMC Global Health Initiative. Teleoncology Collaboration for Refugee Care.
71. Institut Curie – Morocco Oncology Partnership Program. 2021.
72. Hospital Israelita Albert Einstein. Annual Telehealth Summary. 2023.
73. Brazilian National Cancer Institute. Mobile Oncology Units Overview.
74. INCan Mexico. National Teleoncology Expansion Plan. 2023.
75. PATH Global Health Technology. Offline-first telemedicine in low-resource settings. 2021.
76. Translators Without Borders. Language Solutions in Digital Health.
77. WHO/ITU. Global Telehealth Policy Framework Draft. Geneva; 2023.
78. Farmer PE, et al. Task-shifting in oncology: A global imperative. *Lancet Oncol*. 2020;21(9):1235–1244.

79. World Bank. Digital Health Investment Strategy 2022–2026.
80. Nopour R, et al. Barriers and facilitators of tele-oncology: A scoping review. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2025;25:541.
81. Pew Research Center. Broadband Access in Rural America. 2023.
82. Adler-Milstein J, et al. EHR interoperability in community health settings. *Health Aff.* 2022;41(4):540–548.
83. Cohen IG, et al. HIPAA and telemedicine in the age of COVID-19 and beyond. *JAMA.* 2020;323(23):2375–2376.
84. Rural Health Information Hub. National Rural Telehealth Capacity Survey. 2022.
85. Center for Connected Health Policy. State Telehealth Laws and Reimbursement Policies. 2024.
86. CMS. Medicare Telehealth Trends Post-COVID. 2023.
87. American Medical Association. Medical liability implications in virtual care. 2023.
88. WHO/ITU. Harmonizing Telehealth Regulations Across Borders: Draft Framework. 2023.
89. Greenhalgh T, et al. Evaluating telemedicine in cancer care: when physical exam matters. *BMJ.* 2021;372:n109.
90. NRHA. Oncology Nurse Workforce in Rural Hospitals. Policy Brief 2022.
91. Sarfaty M, et al. Diagnostic imaging access in frontier regions. *J Glob Oncol.* 2020;6:889–896.
92. Thompson K, et al. Hybrid cancer care delivery models: Nebraska’s case study. *JCO Clin Cancer Inform.* 2022;6:e2200152.
93. Eberly LA, et al. Telemedicine adoption and the digital divide. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2020;3(12):e2031640.
94. Kaufman BG, et al. Cultural mistrust in virtual care: rural and minority perspectives. *Health Aff.* 2021;40(12):1882–1890.
95. Applebaum AJ, et al. Cognitive impairment and usability challenges in telehealth. *Psychooncology.* 2021;30(5):792–799.
96. Gray CS, et al. Digital navigators in cancer care: Improving virtual care access. *Cancer.* 2023;129(4):643–650.
97. Lin CC, et al. Economic barriers to telehealth adoption in oncology. *Telemed J E Health.* 2021;27(3):215–221.
98. Sheppard VB, et al. Sustainability challenges of grant-funded telehealth interventions. *Health Educ Behav.* 2022;49(1):6–13.
99. Charow R, et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis of rural teleoncology models. *Curr Oncol.* 2022;29(2):127–135.
100. World Health Organization. Global Cancer Observatory: Cancer Control Readiness. 2022.

101. Ginsburg O, et al. National cancer control plans and digital integration. *Lancet Oncol.* 2020;21(9):e442–e455.
102. UN High-Level Commission on Digital Health. *Digital Inclusion in Universal Health Coverage.* 2023.
103. Janiaud P, et al. Pharma’s role in decentralized cancer care: Expanding digital frontiers. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol.* 2023;20(5):276–288.
104. Novartis Foundation. *Teleoncology Innovation in Sub-Saharan Africa: Pilot Project Report.* 2022.
105. McKinsey & Company. *Pharma’s Digital Oncology Opportunity: Global Forecast 2023–2026.*
106. TransCelerate BioPharma. *Oncology DCT Toolkit.* 2023.
107. FDA. *Summary of Decentralized Trial Submissions in Oncology: 2023 Annual Report.*
108. Goldman ML, et al. Digital patient navigation tools in oncology: Current landscape. *JCO Clin Cancer Inform.* 2022;6:e2200089.
109. Novartis Oncology Digital Solutions. *Adherence and Cost Savings Pilot Study. Internal Report.* 2023.
110. Khozin S, Coravos A, et al. Real-world evidence and decentralized trials: Revolutionizing pharma development. *Nat Rev Drug Discov.* 2019;18(7):403–404.
111. Flatiron Health. *Annual RWE Oncology Data Strategy.* 2023.
112. Roche Global Access & RWE Division. *Teleoncology Cohort Data Report.* 2023.
113. International Society for Pharmacoepidemiology. *Best Practices for Digital Health in Real-World Evidence Collection.* 2023.
114. Jiang F, et al. Artificial intelligence in healthcare: past, present and future. *Stroke Vasc Neurol.* 2017;2(4):230–243.
115. Basch E, et al. Remote symptom monitoring with AI tools in oncology patients. *J Clin Oncol.* 2022;40(15_suppl):5524–5531.
116. Gray CS, et al. Digital inclusion strategies in cancer telemedicine. *Cancer.* 2023;129(4):643–650.
117. American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO). *Digital Equity in Teleoncology: Guidelines and Frameworks.* 2022.
118. WHO/ITU. *Global Digital Health Policy Toolkit: Cross-Border Applications.* 2023.
119. International Agency for Research on Cancer. *Integration of Teleoncology in National Cancer Control Plans.* 2023.
120. Thompson K, et al. Hybrid cancer care models in rural settings. *JCO Clin Cancer Inform.* 2022;6:e2200152.
121. Haun JN, Patel NR, Lind JD, et al. Evaluating tele-oncology services for rural veterans: patient-centered outcomes. *J Rural Health.* 2021;37(2):379–385.

122. Project ECHO. Teleoncology and Global Oncology Learning Networks. 2023.

123. Flatiron Health. Personalized Oncology in the Cloud Era: Vision and Execution Report. 2023.

