Prostate Cancer Radiotherapy

Chakrabarti et al. review and promote the adoption of **hypofractionated** and **ultra-hypofractionated (SBRT)** schedules for localized prostate cancer, citing radiobiological rationale and recent clinical trials [1)].

Neurosurgical Relevance (Superficial at Best)

While superficially related to radiosurgical approaches in neuro-oncology, this review provides **no direct insights applicable to neurosurgical practice**. It is narrowly focused on prostate cancer and rooted in a radiotherapy culture far removed from neurosurgical clinical decision-making.

> The article's usefulness to a neurosurgeon is **limited to generic conceptual validation** of hypofractionation strategies — already well known in neuro-oncology.

⚠ Major Critical Points

1. Recycled Content Disguised as Review

The authors summarize trials like CHHiP, HYPO-RT-PC, and PACE-B, all widely disseminated. No new angle, critique, or hypothesis is introduced. This is **academic repackaging**, not a review.

> *Verdict:* **Redundant**. We knew all this five years ago.

2. Lack of Biological Depth

Despite citing radiobiological justification (low α/β), the article fails to:

- Address tumor heterogeneity.
- Discuss fractionation sensitivity at a molecular level.
- Extend these principles to other tumor types, such as gliomas or meningiomas.

> *Translation:* Missed opportunity to bridge toward neuro-oncology.

3. Rhetorical Inflation

Terms like “noninferiority,” “acceptable toxicity,” and “resource optimization” are used uncritically:

- **No nuanced discussion** of PROMs (Patient-Reported Outcome Measures).
- **No mention** of long-term cognitive, urinary, or sexual function deterioration.
- **No counterarguments** regarding overtreatment in low-risk disease.

> This is **marketing wrapped in medical terminology**.

4. ❌ No Application to Intracranial or Spinal Disease

No effort is made to extrapolate lessons learned to **brain tumors, skull base lesions, or spinal metastases** — all areas where SBRT is also evolving.

> *For neurosurgeons:* This is not a transferable model; it is **organ-specific siloeing**.

5. ❌ Efficiency Arguments That Mask Financial Conflicts

The article touts “efficiency” and “reduced burden” without exploring:

- The **true economic cost** of SBRT (planning, imaging, QA).
- **Billing incentives** behind fraction reduction.
- **Access inequalities**, especially in low-resource environments.

> Efficiency without transparency is just **cost-shifting**.

6. ❌ Stylistic Sterility

A bland, consensus-driven voice with no dissent, no challenge, no clinical doubt. This is **institutional publishing** — not critical scholarship.

> “Safe, effective, efficient” — the academic equivalent of **elevator music**.

❌ Neurosurgical Bottom Line

This article has **minimal relevance** to neurosurgery beyond revalidating an already-known principle: fewer, larger doses can work — in some cancers, in some contexts. It does **not inspire, educate, or challenge** neurosurgical thinking.

> **Hypofractionation** in neuro-oncology deserves its **own mechanistic exploration** — not a borrowed script from prostate cancer.

❌ Useful Only As:

- A talking point in tumor boards when radiation oncologists push SBRT.
- A cautionary example of what **academic theater** looks like.
- A template of how **not to write** a cross-specialty impactful review.

Reviewed by: *Neurosurgery Wiki Editorial Board* **Date:** 2025-06-15

1)
Chakrabarti D, Green H, Tree A. Hypofractionation/Ultra-hypofractionation for Prostate Cancer Radiotherapy. Semin Radiat Oncol. 2025 Jul;35(3):333-341. doi: 10.1016/j.semradonc.2025.04.004. PMID: 40516968.