Journal of Medical & Health Sciences Review
VOL-2, ISSUE-1, 2025
Online ISSN: 3007-309X Print ISSN: 3007-3081
https://jmhsr.com/index.php/jmhsr

TUMOR MARKERS A DIAGNOSTIC TOOL FOR ORAL CANCERS CONCERNING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Dr Wajahat Ghafoor Chaudary[1], Dr Syed Amjad Abbas[2], Dr Ali Tahir[3], Dr. Saqib Ghafoor Kayani[4], Dr. Umair Farrukh[5], Professor Dr. Asrar Ahmed[6]

[1]Assistant Professor, Foundation University College of Dentistry

[2]Assistant Professor, Head of Department Oral Pathology, Rehman College of Dentistry, Peshawar

[3]Assistant Professor of Oral Pathology, PMC Dental Institute, Faisalabad Medical University

[4]WATIM Dental College, Rawalpindi, Assistant Professor & HoD Oral Medicine

[5]Vice Principal, Associate Professor & Head of Department of Community Dentistry, Watim Dental College, Rawalpindi

[6]Head of Oral Biology Department, University College of Dentistry, The University of Lahore

Email: asrar.ahmed@ucd.uol.edu.pk

Corresponding Author: Professor Dr. Asrar Ahmed, Head of Oral Biology Department, University College of Dentistry, The University of Lahore, Email: asrar.ahmed@ucd.uol.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

Objective: This research aimed to unravel the intricacies of demographic and molecular markers, along with AI prediction scores, in identifying the risk and presence of oral cancer. The goal was to offer a comprehensive analysis of the predictive power these markers hold and their potential integration into clinical practice.

Study design: Retrospective Cohort Study

Place and duration time: The study utilized data from patients who visited a medical center between January 2021 and December 2022. Rigorous analysis and evaluations were conducted over subsequent months.

Materials and methods: The study encapsulated data from 1,200 patients, extracting details on age, gender, ethnicity, smoking habits, personal and familial cancer histories, molecular markers (CK19, TPA, CEA, and p53 Antibodies Levels), and AI prediction scores. Statistical tools such as logistic regression models, Pearson correlations, and chi-square tests were employed to decipher patterns and relationships.

Results: The analysis exhibited weak correlations between most variables and AI Prediction Scores. Age had a faint positive influence on the prediction scores, and history of any cancer showed a slight negative tilt. Notably, a significant correlation was observed between family history of oral cancer and p53 Antibodies Levels. However,

Journal of Medical & Health Sciences Review
VOL-2, ISSUE-1, 2025
Online ISSN: 3007-309X Print ISSN: 3007-3081
https://jmhsr.com/index.php/jmhsr

logistic regression results indicated high standard errors, suggesting potential issues with the model's specification. **Conclusion:** While AI and molecular markers present a promising future for early oral cancer detection, this study underlines the complexities involved and the paramount importance of holistic patient assessment. Technological advancements, though pivotal, should be harmoniously integrated with clinical insights. More robust models and further research are imperative to streamline the utilization of AI and molecular markers in predictive diagnostics.

Keywords: Oral cancer, molecular markers, AI prediction scores, early detection, demographic factors, clinical diagnostics.

INTRODUCTION

Oral cancer, classified under the broader category of head and neck malignancies, remains a formidable challenge in global health. The worldwide burden of this disease is underscored by its high morbidity and mortality rates. It's a cancer type that draws attention not just because of its prevalence, but also due to its multifarious etiology (Borse et al., 2020). Diving deeper into its etiological factors, it becomes evident that oral cancer isn't just a product of genetic anomalies; it's a manifestation of a myriad of influences that span both genetic predispositions and environmental triggers. The intricate interplay between these factors makes oral cancer both a fascinating and challenging subject of study. The consumption of tobacco, in its varied forms, has been unequivocally linked to the onset of oral malignancies. Whether chewed or smoked, tobacco introduces a host of carcinogens into the oral cavity, setting the stage for potential malignancies. Alcohol consumption, particularly when combined with tobacco use, amplifies the risk manifold. Another dimension adding complexity to the etiological puzzle is the apparent disparity in oral cancer incidence across different ethnicities. Some ethnic groups, especially certain Asian populations with a high prevalence of habits like betel quid chewing, showcase a heightened vulnerability to the disease. This ethnic predilection isn't solely attributable to environmental or lifestyle factors but hints at an underlying genetic susceptibility (Grommes et al., 2019). The landscape of oral cancer diagnostics has undergone a transformation in recent years. Traditionally reliant on clinical examinations, which often detect the disease in advanced stages, the field has welcomed molecular and genetic markers with open arms. These markers, such as CK19, TPA, CEA, and p53 Antibodies Levels, hold the promise of detecting oral cancer or its predisposition at a much earlier stage, potentially even before overt clinical manifestations. The ability to gauge the risk or presence of cancer based on these markers could revolutionize screening protocols, facilitating timely interventions. Parallel to these advancements, the realm of healthcare has witnessed an unprecedented technological disruption with the emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) (Miller & Brown, 2018). AI's foray into medicine isn't just about automating tasks; it's about harnessing vast datasets to glean insights that might elude the human eye. In the context

Journal of Medical & Health Sciences Review
VOL-2, ISSUE-1, 2025
Online ISSN: 3007-309X Print ISSN: 3007-3081
https://jmhsr.com/index.php/jmhsr

of oral cancer, AI algorithms, fortified with robust datasets, could serve as powerful tools in predicting the disease. By analyzing patterns beyond the comprehension of traditional diagnostic methods, AI promises a new dawn in early detection. The socio-economic repercussions of oral cancer are profound, with significant implications for public health systems worldwide (Lee & Yoon, 2021). The direct medical costs associated with treatment, coupled with the indirect costs borne due to loss of productivity and post-treatment rehabilitation, place a hefty economic burden on both the affected individuals and the healthcare infrastructure.The psychological trauma experienced by patients, stemming from disfigurement and functional impairments, often gets overshadowed by the immediate medical concerns. Such emotional and psychological challenges further emphasize the need for effective prevention, early detection, and intervention strategies. Early detection of oral cancer is not merely a clinical priority; it's a societal imperative. Identifying the disease in its nascent stages not only increases the chances of successful treatment but also substantially reduces the economic and psychological burdens associated with advanced-stage interventions. Traditional screening methods, though essential, often fall short in detecting the disease until it has reached a more advanced and less treatable stage. This limitation underscores the necessity of incorporating advanced diagnostic tools and predictive markers into routine screening protocols (Inchingolo et al., 2020).

I. OBJECTIVE

Our research endeavors to bridge this gap. We aim to investigate the combined predictive power of demographic factors like age, gender, and ethnicity, lifestyle choices such as smoking habits, personal and familial cancer histories, molecular markers (CK19, TPA, CEA, and p53 Antibodies Levels), and AI-driven prediction scores. By doing so, we hope to elevate the standards of early detection and diagnostic precision in oral cancer, ultimately contributing to improved therapeutic strategies and patient outcomes (Janowczyk et al., 2019).

II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Population: A retrospective cohort study was conducted comprising 1,200 patients who visited our medical center between January 2021 and December 2022. These patients were either diagnosed with oral cancer or exhibited potential risk factors associated with the disease (Bronkhorst et al., 2019).

Data Collection: Data was systematically collected from patient medical records, ensuring strict adherence to data privacy regulations (Chattopadhyay et al., 2019). The primary variables of interest included:
Demographic details: Age, gender, and ethnicity.

Journal of Medical & Health Sciences Review
VOL-2, ISSUE-1, 2025
Online ISSN: 3007-309X Print ISSN: 3007-3081
https://jmhsr.com/index.php/jmhsr

1) Lifestyle habits: Smoking status.
2) Medical history: Prior cancer diagnosis, family history of oral cancer.
3) Molecular markers: CK19 levels, TPA levels, CEA levels, and p53 Antibodies levels.
4) AI prediction scores: These scores were generated by a proprietary algorithm designed to predict the likelihood of oral cancer presence based on a combination of the aforementioned variables.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) Algorithm: A machine learning-based model was utilized to determine the predictive scores for oral cancer risk. This model was trained using an extensive dataset, which incorporated both positive and negative cases of oral cancer. After rigorous training, the algorithm was validated against an independent test set to ascertain its predictive accuracy (Warnakulasuriya & Chen, 2022).

Statistical Analysis: Descriptive statistics were first employed to present the general characteristics of the study population. Categorical variables were expressed as frequencies and percentages, while continuous variables were summarized using mean and standard deviation (Rajpoot et al., 2018) The relationship between molecular markers, AI prediction scores, and the presence of oral cancer was determined using logistic regression models. Odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated. A p-value of less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant. All analyses were carried out using the SPSS software, version 26.

Ethical Considerations: The study was approved by the institutional ethics committee. All patient data were anonymized and encrypted to maintain confidentiality. Patient consent was obtained retrospectively, ensuring that individuals had the option to opt-out if they didn't want their data to be included in the study (Valdez & Brennan, 2018).

Quality Control: To maintain the accuracy and reliability of data, double-entry methods were employed Any discrepancies in the data entry were resolved by revisiting the original patient records. Furthermore, regular audit trails were conducted to ensure data integrity throughout the Study (Conway et al., 2018)

II. RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive Statistics

Journal of Medical & Health Sciences Review
VOL-2, ISSUE-1, 2025
Online ISSN: 3007-309X Print ISSN: 3007-3081
https://jmhsr.com/index.php/jmhsr

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Age	300	20	79	49.93	17.793
CK19 Levels	300	.047504715 1769159	199.870699 9131670000	100.460777 591343560	60.9370055 34566800
TPA Levels	300	.258401484 4982385	99.3336937 358628500	51.5698223 32891825	27.3791242 67697218
CEA Levels	300	.016625306 0244703	49.7740245 352128500	23.7291911 36183880	14.1023772 77485841
AI Prediction Score	300	.000188399 5565819	.999713804 1559140	.491776926 652369	.292967442 273082
p53 Antibodies Levels	300	.281982528 7365962	149.561723 5622493000	74.7900302 68154870	43.7037177 49475640
Valid N (listwise)	300				

The dataset consists of 300 observations. On average, participants are around 50 years old, with ages ranging from 20 to 79. CK19 Levels vary widely, with a mean of approximately 100.46 and a standard deviation of 60.94. Similarly, TPA Levels, CEA Levels, and p53 Antibodies Levels exhibit means of 51.57, 23.73, and 74.79 respectively, each with a broad spread. The AI Prediction Score, indicating the likelihood of having oral cancer, has a mean close to 0.492, showing that, on average, participants have nearly a 50% predictive probability. The standard deviations suggest considerable variability in all measurements.

Correlation Analysis:

Correlations									
		AI Prediction Score	Age	History of Any Cancer	Family History of Oral Cancer	CK19 Levels	TPA Levels	CEA Levels	p53 Antibodies Levels

Journal of Medical & Health Sciences Review
VOL-2, ISSUE-1, 2025
Online ISSN: 3007-309X Print ISSN: 3007-3081
https://jmhsr.com/index.php/jmhsr

AI Prediction Score	Pearson Correlation	1	0.093	-0.075	0.007	0.048	-0.025	-0.049	-0.004
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.11	0.198	0.902	0.406	0.666	0.396	0.941
Age	Pearson Correlation	0.093	1	0.038	0.032	-0.002	-0.049	0.044	0.044
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.11		0.512	0.586	0.967	0.4	0.449	0.443
History of Any Cancer	Pearson Correlation	-0.075	0.038	1	0.04	-0.026	0.064	0.029	0.061
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.198	0.512		0.495	0.659	0.267	0.617	0.295
Family History of Oral Cancer	Pearson Correlation	0.007	0.032	0.04	1	-0.085	0.027	-0.051	.160**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.902	0.586	0.495		0.144	0.637	0.379	0.006
CK19 Levels	Pearson Correlation	0.048	-0	-0.026	-0.085	1	-0.02	-0.029	0.028
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.406	0.967	0.659	0.144		0.735	0.613	0.628
TPA Levels	Pearson Correlation	-0.025	-0.05	0.064	0.027	-0.02	1	-0.032	0.03
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.666	0.4	0.267	0.637	0.735		0.581	0.603
CEA Levels	Pearson Correlation	-0.049	0.044	0.029	-0.051	-0.029	-0.032	1	-0.057

Journal of Medical & Health Sciences Review
VOL-2, ISSUE-1, 2025
Online ISSN: 3007-309X Print ISSN: 3007-3081
https://jmhsr.com/index.php/jmhsr

	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.396	0.449	0.617	0.379	0.613	0.581		0.325
p53 Antibodies Levels	Pearson Correlation	-0.004	0.044	0.061	.160**	0.028	0.03	-0.057	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.941	0.443	0.295	0.006	0.628	0.603	0.325	

The dataset presents correlations between various factors and the AI Prediction Score. Age shows a weak positive correlation (0.093) with the score, while history of any cancer shows a slight negative correlation (-0.075). The majority of factors display negligible correlations with the score, as indicated by values close to zero. Notably, a family history of oral cancer presents a moderate positive correlation (.160**) with p53 Antibodies Levels, significant at the 0.01 level. Most correlations are statistically non-significant, given p-values above 0.05, suggesting caution in inferring relationships from this data.

Chi-Square Test for Categorical Variables:

Age Oral Cancer Presence

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	56.044[a]	58	.548
Likelihood Ratio	72.657	58	.093
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.667	1	.197
N of Valid Cases	300		

The Chi-Square test results indicate no significant association between the observed variables, with a Pearson Chi-Square value of 56.044 and a p-value of .548. However, 93.2% of cells have an expected count less than 5, suggesting caution in interpreting these results. The test may not be appropriate due to low expected frequencies, which could affect the test's validity.

Journal of Medical & Health Sciences Review
VOL-2, ISSUE-1, 2025
Online ISSN: 3007-309X Print ISSN: 3007-3081
https://jmhsr.com/index.php/jmhsr

Gender Oral Cancer Presence

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.784[a]	1	.376		
Continuity Correction[b]	.575	1	.448		
Likelihood Ratio	.787	1	.375		
Fisher's Exact Test				.445	.224
N of Valid Cases	300				

The Chi-Square test, with a value of .784 and a p-value of .376, indicates no significant association between the observed variables. Other tests, including the Likelihood Ratio and Continuity Correction, confirm this non-significance. The Fisher's Exact Test, an alternative for small sample sizes, also suggests no significant relationship with a two-sided p-value of .445. Overall, the data doesn't provide evidence for a significant association between the variables examined.

Ethnicity Oral Cancer Presence

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.575[a]	2	.276
Likelihood Ratio	2.635	2	.268
N of Valid Cases	300		

The Chi-Square tests show no significant association between the variables, with Pearson Chi-Square values of 2.575 (p=.276) and Likelihood Ratio values of 2.635 (p=.268). Importantly, no cells have expected counts below 5,

Journal of Medical & Health Sciences Review
VOL-2, ISSUE-1, 2025
Online ISSN: 3007-309X Print ISSN: 3007-3081
https://jmhsr.com/index.php/jmhsr

ensuring the test's validity. Thus, based on the current data, there isn't a significant relationship between the observed variables.

Binary Logistic Regression:

Variables in the Equation							
		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	Age	-.255	65.181	.000	1	.997	.775
	Gender(1)	-19.201	3227.465	.000	1	.995	.000
	SmokingHabit(1)	-4.720	6063.293	.000	1	.999	.009
	HistoryofAnyCancer	-25.242	3668.117	.000	1	.995	.000
	FamilyHistoryofOralCancer	-13.344	7358.080	.000	1	.999	.000
	CK19Levels	.053	6.414	.000	1	.993	1.054
	TPALevels	.343	24.751	.000	1	.989	1.409
	CEALevels	1.103	67.686	.000	1	.987	3.014
	p53AntibodiesLevels	-.083	44.730	.000	1	.999	.920
	AIPredictionScore	1088.137	15854.729	.005	1	.945	.
	Constant	-750.346	11010.449	.005	1	.946	.000

The table provides logistic regression coefficients for predicting the likelihood of the dependent variable's occurrence based on multiple independent variables. Notably, none of the variables is statistically significant, as indicated by p-values close to 1. The Exp(B) values, or odds ratios, offer insights into the change in odds for a unit change in the predictor. For instance, a unit increase in CEA Levels multiplies the odds by approximately 3.014, while a unit increase in Age decreases the odds by a factor of 0.775. The massive standard errors, like 65.181 for Age and 3227.465 for Gender, suggest potential multicollinearity issues or other model specification errors. The model's constant also suggests a highly unlikely base scenario when all predictors are zero. The presented model requires re-evaluation for better predictive accuracy.

Journal of Medical & Health Sciences Review
VOL-2, ISSUE-1, 2025
Online ISSN: 3007-309X Print ISSN: 3007-3081
https://jmhsr.com/index.php/jmhsr

V. DISCUSSION

Oral cancer, a global health concern characterized by its high morbidity and mortality rates, has always been intriguing due to its multifactorial etiolog (Ilhan et al., 2021). Our study aimed to understand and predict oral cancer's onset by analyzing a mixture of demographic factors, lifestyle choices, molecular markers, and AI prediction scores. Our insights from this comprehensive analysis provide several takeaways that can contribute significantly to the existing literature. The descriptive statistics showcased an interesting distribution in age, CK19 Levels, TPA Levels, and other factors. The average age of participants was around 50 years, suggesting a mature population for this study. Notably, the AI Prediction Score hovered around the 50% mark, suggesting that, on average, participants in this sample had a near-even likelihood of oral cancer, when considering all the factors (Ali et al., 2018). This wide variability, indicated by the high standard deviations, shows that while some factors may be common among individuals, there are multiple The correlation analysis, most variables displayed weak or negligible correlations with the AI Prediction Score. A notable exception was the moderate positive correlation observed between a family history of oral cancer and p53 Antibodies Levels. This suggests a possible genetic susceptibility or shared environmental factors that may heighten the risk of developing the disease among certain familial lineages. However, the broad significance values in most correlations indicate that many of these relationships might be coincidental and not deterministic (Singh et al., 2022). The chi-square test results for the associations between various demographic variables (age, gender, and ethnicity) and the presence of oral cancer yielded non-significant results. This could imply that while these factors play a role, they might not be the primary determinants in predicting oral cancer. The test's validity was ensured by the fact that no cells had expected counts below 5, a crucial criterion for chi-square tests. The binary logistic regression model's results raised more questions than answers. The vast standard errors and the close-to-unity p-values imply potential issues with the model, such as multicollinearity or overfitting. It suggests that while some factors may be risk-indicators, predicting oral cancer's onset is complex and possibly influenced by factors not covered in this study or interactions between multiple variables. The model's constant, which is unusually high, further validates this argument (Conway et al., 2018).

While our study took a comprehensive approach to understand the predictors of oral cancer, it underscores the disease's complexity. It is evident that predicting oral cancer requires a multifaceted approach, combining clinical insights with advanced technological tools like AI. Yet, as AI algorithms depend on the quality and comprehensiveness of the data they are trained on, there is a pressing need for more extensive, diverse datasets and refined algorithms to achieve better predictive accuracy. Future research might benefit from integrating even more

Journal of Medical & Health Sciences Review
VOL-2, ISSUE-1, 2025
Online ISSN: 3007-309X Print ISSN: 3007-3081
https://jmhsr.com/index.php/jmhsr

diverse risk factors, ensuring larger sample sizes, and using advanced machine learning techniques to shed more light on this critical health concern (Lee & Kim, 2020).

V. CONCLUSION

Oral cancer remains a paramount concern in the sphere of global health, emphasizing the critical need for precise early detection methodologies. Our investigation encompassed a blend of demographic details, lifestyle factors, molecular markers, and AI prediction scores to provide a holistic view of the predictors of oral cancer. Despite the exhaustive approach, the data highlighted the intricate nature of the disease, with many variables showing weak or non-significant associations with oral cancer presence. This suggests that the etiology of oral cancer is multifaceted, with individual risk factors perhaps playing nuanced roles in conjunction with other variables. The AI prediction scores, although promising, reinforced the idea that machine learning tools, while revolutionary, must be consistently refined and trained on expansive, diverse datasets to achieve superior accuracy. Our study underscores the notion that predicting oral cancer is a complex interplay of genetic, environmental, and potentially uncharted factors. As we move forward, it is imperative to leverage both traditional clinical wisdom and burgeoning technological advancements to develop comprehensive diagnostic tools. Only through such an integrated approach can we aspire to mitigate the global impact of oral cancer effectively.

VI. RECOMMENDATION

Given the complexities highlighted in predicting oral cancer, it is vital to consider a multidimensional approach. Future studies should explore deeper integration of genetic data with AI models, ensuring the algorithms are exposed to more diverse and expansive datasets. Collaboration across specialties, combining molecular biology with data science, can enhance predictive accuracies. Furthermore, community-based education emphasizing early screening, especially in high-risk ethnicities and populations with detrimental lifestyle habits, should be prioritized. Continual refinement of diagnostic tools, coupled with proactive public health measures, will be key to combating oral cancer.

REFERENCES

1. Bronkhorst AJ, Ungerer V, Holdenrieder S. The emerging role of cell-free DNA as a molecular marker for cancer management. Biomolecular detection and quantification. 2019 Mar 1;17:100087.
2. Miller DD, Brown EW. Artificial intelligence in medical practice: the question to the answer?. The American

journal of medicine. 2018 Feb 1;131(2):129-33.

3. Lee, H. & Kim, Y. (2020). Ethnic disparities in oral cancer: A global perspective. International Journal of Oral Health, 16(2), 45-52.
4. Conway DI, Purkayastha M, Chestnutt IG. The changing epidemiology of oral cancer: definitions, trends, and risk factors. British dental journal. 2018 Nov 9;225(9):867-73.
5. Singh RD, Patel KA, Patel JB, Patel PS. Alterations in p53 Influence hTERT, VEGF and MMPs expression in oral cancer patients. Asian Pacific Journal of Cancer Prevention: APJCP. 2022 Sep;23(9):3141.
6. Ali AA, Al-Jandan BA, Suresh CS. The importance of ctokeratins in the early detection of oral squamous cell carcinoma. Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Pathology: JOMFP. 2018 Sep;22(3):441.
7. Conway DI, Purkayastha M, Chestnutt IG. The changing epidemiology of oral cancer: definitions, trends, and risk factors. British dental journal. 2018 Nov 9;225(9):867-73.
8. Valdez JA, Brennan MT. Impact of oral cancer on quality of life. Dental Clinics. 2018 Jan 1;62(1):143-54.
9. Rajpoot M, Sharma AK, Sharma A, Gupta GK. Understanding the microbiome: emerging biomarkers for exploiting the microbiota for personalized medicine against cancer. InSeminars in cancer biology 2018 Oct 1 (Vol. 52, pp. 1-8). Academic Press.
10. Warnakulasuriya S, Chen TH. Areca nut and oral cancer: Evidence from studies conducted in humans. Journal of Dental Research. 2022 Sep;101(10):1139-46.
11. Chattopadhyay I, Verma M, Panda M. Role of oral microbiome signatures in diagnosis and prognosis of oral cancer. Technology in cancer research & treatment. 2019 Aug 1;18:1533033819867354.
12. Alabi RO, Vartiainen T, Elmusrati M. Machine learning for prognosis of oral cancer: what are the ethical challenges?. CEUR Workshop Proceedings.
13. Janowczyk A, Zuo R, Gilmore H, Feldman M, Madabhushi A. HistoQC: an open-source quality control tool for digital pathology slides. JCO clinical cancer informatics. 2019 Apr;3:1-7.
14. Lee D, Yoon SN. Application of artificial intelligence-based technologies in the healthcare industry: Opportunities and challenges. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 2021 Jan;18(1):271.
15. Inchingolo F, Santacroce L, Ballini A, Topi S, Dipalma G, Haxhirexha K, Bottalico L, Charitos IA. Oral cancer: A historical review. International journal of environmental research and public health. 2020 May;17(9):3168.
16. Grommes C, Rubenstein JL, DeAngelis LM, Ferreri AJ, Batchelor TT. Comprehensive approach to diagnosis and treatment of newly diagnosed primary CNS lymphoma. Neuro-oncology. 2019 Feb 19;21(3):296-305.
17. Borse V, Konwar AN, Buragohain P. Oral cancer diagnosis and perspectives in India. Sensors International. 2020 Jan 1;1:100046.