# Official Whitepaper of the Romanian Society of Hyperthermic Oncology (SRHO)

## **Therapeutic Integration of Hyperthermia in Modern Oncology:** A Position Paper on Clinical Evidence (GRADE), Quality Assurance Standards, and the Regulatory Roadmap for Implementation in Romania

**Reviewed and Aligned with International Practice Guidelines:**

- **ESHO** – European Society for Hyperthermic Oncology *(Under review by **Prof. Dr. Johannes Crezee**, President of ESHO)*
- **DGHT** – Deutsche Gesellschaft für Hyperthermie e.V.

  *(Clinical Standards & QA/QC, reviewed by **Dr. med. Hüseyin Sahinbas**, President of DGHT)*
- **SIIO** – Società Italiana Ipertermia Oncologica

  *(Clinical Protocols, reviewed by **Prof. Dr. Giammaria Fiorentini**, President of SIIO)*
- **SEOR** – Sociedad Española de Oncología Radioterápica *(reviewed and fully endorsed by the Spanish society for Hyperthermia in Oncology, **Dr. Jorge Contreras Martínez, Ph.D. and the board of the Spanish Multidisciplinary Society for Hyperthermic Oncology (SEMHIO),** former President of SEOR)*
- *Reviewed by prof Nilloy Datta*

**Abstract**

**Background:** Oncological hyperthermia (HT) is a clinically validated, potent radiosensitizer and chemosensitizer. Despite extensive Level 1A evidence supporting its ability to clinically meaningfully improve Overall Survival (OS) and Quality of Life (QoL)—and its theoretical recognition in international guidelines and local residency curricula—Romania currently lacks an official institutional framework to practically train and certify physicians in its safe application. This critical discrepancy between theoretical knowledge and practical competence forces vulnerable patients to endure severe financial toxicity and creates a profound legislative void for medical practitioners. The Romanian Society of Hyperthermic Oncology (SRHO) developed this evidence-based position paper to bridge this gap, advocating for hyperthermia not merely as an optional adjunct, but as a fundamental patient right and a synergistic pillar of multimodal cancer care.

**Methods:** The clinical evidence presented is derived from a systematic synthesis of Phase III randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and large-scale network meta-analyses, strictly following the Oxford Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine (OCEBM) and GRADE criteria. Furthermore, the proposed implementation framework integrates the clinical and technical Quality Assurance (QA/QC) protocols established by the European Society for Hyperthermic Oncology (ESHO) and the German Society (DGHT e.V.), while actively aligning with the educational standards of the European HEAT-UP Consortium.

**Results:** High to moderate-grade evidence (Level 1A and 1B) demonstrates that integrating hyperthermia significantly improves local tumor control and survival across major indications, including high-risk soft tissue sarcomas, locally advanced cervical cancer, and recurrent breast cancer. To facilitate safe national implementation, this Whitepaper outlines a structured regulatory roadmap: a 140-hour Continuing Medical Education (CME) curriculum designed to grant a "Certificate of Complementary Studies." Coordinated by leading international HT specialists, this open-framework certification is accessible to all relevant medical and surgical specialties within the multidisciplinary Tumor Board.

**Conclusions:** The SRHO Whitepaper provides a legally viable, collaborative blueprint for integrating hyperthermia into the Romanian National Healthcare Service. By partnering with the Ministry of Health and the Romanian College of Physicians (CMR) to establish professional practical certification, and by eradicating financial barriers (DRG and VAT hurdles), this framework transforms hyperthermia from a private financial burden into a legally protected, reimbursed, and accessible standard of European oncological care.

**Keywords:** Hyperthermia, Induced; Medical Oncology; Evidence-Based Medicine; Quality Assurance, Health Care; Patient Advocacy; Combined Modality Therapy; Romania.

## Table of Contents

**Document Information**

- **Title:** Therapeutic Integration of Hyperthermia in Modern Oncology
- **Version:** 2.0 (Final Draft for Regulatory Submission)
- **Date:** April 2026
- **Prepared by:** Romanian Society of Hyperthermic Oncology (SRHO) SAB
- **Correspondence:** hyperthermia.onco@gmail.com
- *Note: This document represents the shared intellectual property and agreed clinical consensus of the SRHO Scientific Advisory Board .*

# Section 1: Executive Summary & The Patient-Centric Mission of SRHO

## 1.0 Executive Summary

Oncological Hyperthermia (HT)—defined as the controlled application of heat at temperatures between 38°C and 43°C—is a clinically mature, adjuvant therapeutic modality supported by high-certainty Level 1A Evidence [3, 30, 41]. By acting as a potent radiosensitizer and chemosensitizer, HT delivers a major leap in Overall Survival (OS) and effectively preserves the Quality of Life (QoL) for patients battling advanced solid tumors, all without compounding systemic toxicity [5, 42].

However, despite this robust scientific validation, Romanian patients currently face severe barriers to accessing this life-extending therapy. The Romanian Society of Hyperthermic Oncology (SRHO) has developed this Whitepaper not as a mere academic review, but as an actionable, evidence-based roadmap. Our goal is to provide the Romanian Ministry of Health (MS) and the National Health Insurance House (CNAS) with the exact regulatory, educational, and clinical tools needed to seamlessly integrate hyperthermia into the national healthcare system.

This integration is of unprecedented importance for Romania, which currently bears the highest cervical cancer incidence and mortality burden in the European Union. Because the most robust, high-certainty evidence (Level 1A) for hyperthermia efficacy lies precisely in the management of locally advanced cervical cancer, implementing this modality transforms from a general clinical upgrade into a critical national public health imperative.

## 1.1 The Core Mission: The Patient's Right to Validated Therapies

However, SRHO recognizes a fundamental operational reality: the only tangible way to protect and serve the patient is by practically empowering the physician. A theoretical recommendation based on international guidelines is completely insufficient if there is no certified specialist trained to safely and effectively execute the complex thermal procedure.

Consequently, the regulatory mechanisms detailed in this document—such as university curricula, medical certifications, and quality assurance standards—are not the end goals, but the essential means to the end. Providing this practical competence ensures a dual benefit: it guarantees that the patient receives a safe, European-standard treatment, while simultaneously

providing a vital legal shield that protects the medical professional from the legislative and malpractice risks associated with uncertified, self-taught application.

These are the collaborative solutions SRHO offers to the national health authorities to eradicate the current barriers preventing patient access to standard European care [42, 43].

## 1.2 The Collaborative Roadmap: Partnering with the Ministry of Health

To achieve this ultimate goal for the patient, SRHO proposes a collaborative, evidence-based partnership with the Ministry of Health to implement the following critical improvements:

### 1.2.1 Eradicating Financial Toxicity (The Reimbursement Imperative)

Currently, because HT lacks dedicated Diagnosis-Related Group (DRG) codes, public hospitals cannot cover the operational costs. This forces vulnerable patients to bear extreme "financial toxicity," paying out-of-pocket in private clinics for a treatment that is a standard of care elsewhere in Europe [43]. Looking at the fragmented reimbursement landscape in Italy (where access relies heavily on private mutual funds), SRHO urges the Romanian authorities to adopt a more equitable model. By establishing dedicated CNAS reimbursement codes—and critically evaluating the 21% VAT barrier on medical technology—the state can ensure that access to improved OS and QoL is dictated by clinical need, not socio-economic status. The health economics data gathered through SRHO's involvement in the European HEAT-UP consortium will be provided to the Ministry to prove the long-term cost-efficiency of this integration.

### 1.2.2 Patient Safety Through Education (The Certification Pathway)

A significant operational paradox exists in Romania: while HT is officially recognized in residency curricula and international guidelines [19, 20], there is no institutional framework to teach doctors how to safely execute the procedure on patients—creating a profound legislative void. To protect both patients and medical doctors from the risks of self-taught application, SRHO, together with prolific leaders and members of SIIO, DGHT e.V., and ESHO, will develop a standardized 140-hour Continuing Medical Education (CME) curriculum. Following the successful educational precedent set by the Spanish Society of Radiotherapy Oncology (SEOR) at the University of Barcelona [44], SRHO proposes implementing this curriculum within Romanian Universities of Medicine and Pharmacy (UMF). To ensure absolute alignment with European clinical standards, this program will be directly coordinated and taught by leading international authorities in oncological hyperthermia, notably Dr. Hüseyin Sahinbas( president DGHT eV) and Prof. Dr. Giammaria Fiorentini ( president SIIO) and others. This collaborative effort will generate a formal "Certificate of Complementary Studies," providing doctors with a legal shield and guaranteeing patients that they are treated by state-certified experts.

### 1.2.3 Quality Assurance Without Barriers (The Tiered Approach)

To ensure maximum therapeutic efficacy, SRHO proposes the official adoption of the Quality Assurance (QA/QC) guidelines established by the European Society for Hyperthermic Oncology (ESHO) and the German Society (DGHT) [41, 43]. To prevent these standards from becoming bureaucratic roadblocks that deny patient access, SRHO advocates for a collaborative two-tiered implementation:

- **Tier 1 (Standard Integration):** Prioritizes immediate patient access by utilizing the native monitoring systems already present in the MDR-certified equipments.
- **Tier 2 (Centers of Excellence):** Establishes a pathway for research and supreme precision (e.g., non-invasive 3D modeling upon clinical validation) for specialized hubs, mirroring the multidisciplinary integration seen in leading European centers [43].

### 1.2.4 The Multidisciplinary Benefit (The Tumor Board Integration)

For the patient's maximum benefit, hyperthermia must not be an isolated procedure but a core tool of the multidisciplinary Tumor Board. Because the clinical applications of thermal stress span across a vast and rapidly evolving spectrum of malignancies (ranging from deep pelvic tumors to glioblastoma and pancreatic cancer and others), the proposed educational certification must not be restrictively siloed.

Therefore, SRHO collaborates with the Ministry to ensure that the 140-hour curriculum and the resulting "Certificate of Complementary Studies" are structurally accessible to **all medical and surgical specialties involved in the multimodal management of the oncology patient**. While immediately relevant for disciplines such as Medical Oncology, Radiotherapy, Surgical Oncology (e.g., HIPEC/HITOC procedures), Urology, Gynecologic Oncology, and Dermatology, this open-framework design proactively accommodates modern integrative practices. For instance, physicians currently utilizing other biophysical tumor targeting modalities—such as Electrochemotherapy (ECT) , Photodynamic Therapy (PDT), or Hyperbaric Oxygen Therapy (HBOT)—are natural candidates for thermal dosimetry training. This inclusive approach ensures that any relevant specialist within the Tumor Board can access the training and integrate hyperthermia into their specific therapeutic arsenal without facing future bureaucratic barriers or the need for legislative amendments.

## 1.3 Conclusion for Section 1

SRHO stands ready to provide the Ministry of Health with the international faculty, the clinical guidelines, and the educational curricula required to bridge the gap between theoretical science and practical application [43]. Together, through evidence-based health policy, we can ensure

that Romanian oncology matches the highest European standards, placing the patient's survival and quality of life at the absolute center of the healthcare system.

# Section 2: Technical Classification and Biological Mechanisms of Action

## 2.1 Technical Classification and Principles

To ensure clinical efficacy, oncological hyperthermia is categorically defined by the method of energy transfer and the targeted anatomical region [3, 30, 41].

**Loco-Regional Hyperthermia (L-R HT)** involves the deep or localized heating of pelvic and thoracic tumors utilizing focused electromagnetic fields [5, 41]. This modality is primarily indicated for cervical cancer [17, 18], rectal cancer [16], and high-risk soft tissue sarcomas, for which it is explicitly mandated by the ESMO clinical practice guidelines [19, 42]. Furthermore, L-R HT is formally recommended by the SEOR 2019 Guidelines as a mandatory synergistic treatment with radiotherapy for pelvic and thoracic tumors, specifically to overcome hypoxia-induced radio-resistance [44].

**Modulated Electro-Hyperthermia (mEHT/mHT)** utilizes impedance-based heating to focus selective energy transfer directly into malignant cells via capacitive coupling [25]. This technique is particularly indicated for glioblastoma [23, 24, 33], pancreatic cancer [25, 30], and other deep-seated tumors where traditional locoregional energy deposition may present anatomical challenges [30].

**Whole-Body Hyperthermia (WBH)** achieves a controlled, systemic increase in core body temperature to 40°C–42°C, most commonly utilizing infrared-A radiation [34]. This systemic approach is utilized for disseminated diseases such as melanoma [27] and renal cancer, and is highly valued for its profound immunological synergy and systemic immune activation [11, 35, 36].

## 2.2 Mechanisms of Action: How Hyperthermia Enhances Oncological Treatments

The superior clinical efficacy of combined multi-modal therapy results from a profound biological synergy that targets tumor survival mechanisms at multiple cellular and microenvironmental levels [3, 5, 41].

### 2.2.1 Radiosensitization: Overcoming Tumor Resistance and DNA Repair

Oncological hyperthermia is recognized as a highly potent radiosensitizer, directly addressing two of the most significant sources of radiotherapy failure. First, thermally induced stress inhibits the intracellular repair mechanisms of radiation-damaged DNA—specifically impairing enzymes such as Polymerase beta—thereby ensuring more efficient and irreversible cell death [1, 2]. Second, heat profoundly modifies the tumor microenvironment by inducing localized vasodilation, which increases blood flow and improves tissue oxygenation (pO2). This physiological shift significantly reduces the hypoxic fraction of the tumor, a microenvironment notoriously resistant to ionizing radiation [30].

### 2.2.2 Chemosensitization: Enhancing Drug Traffic and Cellular Uptake

Hyperthermia optimizes drug pharmacokinetics and cellular uptake, acting as a powerful chemosensitizer. It demonstrates significant synergistic and additive effects with key chemotherapeutic classes, particularly platinum-based agents (Cisplatin, Carboplatin) and Mitomycin C, as demonstrated in comprehensive clinical reviews [7, 35, 41]. For example, in non-muscle invasive bladder cancer protocols (HIVEC), the clinical efficacy of Mitomycin C is significantly amplified by targeted thermal stress [13, 14]. This pharmacokinetic amplification occurs because hyperthermia increases vascular perfusion and alters tumor cell membrane permeability [5]. Similarly, in WBH protocols, systemic thermoregulatory effects elevate overall tumor blood flow, further optimizing the targeted delivery of cytotoxic agents [36].

### 2.2.3 Immunomodulation: Transforming "Cold" Tumors into "Hot" Targets

Beyond direct cytotoxicity and sensitization, emerging clinical and preclinical evidence indicates that hyperthermia modulates the anti-tumor immune response, effectively transforming immunologically "cold" (non-inflamed) tumors into "hot" (inflamed) immunogenic targets [12, 28]. The application of heat induces an *in situ* tumor vaccine effect through the release of tumor antigens and Heat Shock Proteins (HSPs), notably HSP70 [8, 9, 37]. These HSPs act as critical danger signals that facilitate antigen uptake by dendritic cells (DCs), a process capable of triggering an abscopal effect in specific clinical scenarios [37, 38]. Ultimately, this immune activation cascade leads to increased tumor cell lysis mediated by Natural Killer (NK) cells and

CD8+ T cells [10, 39]. WBH is specifically recognized as an effective immunotherapy adjunct due to its ability to stimulate systemic HSP release and amplify NK cell activity [11, 36].

## Table 1: Interaction Mechanisms of Hyperthermia with Standard Oncological Therapies

| **Mechanism / Target** | **Biological Effect (39°C–45°C)** | **Therapeutic Synergy** | **Synergistic Agents** |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Inhibition of DNA Repair** | Inhibits repair mechanisms (e.g., Polymerase beta); sensitizes cells in the S-phase [1, 2]. | Potent Radiosensitizer (Complements RT) [3, 41]. | Radiotherapy (RT) [2, 21, 22]. |
| **Tumor Microenvironment & Cell Membrane** | Increases blood flow and oxygenation; increased dielectric loss; direct apoptotic signaling [25, 33]. | Amplifies RT efficacy; improves drug traffic and cellular uptake [5, 41]. | RT, Cisplatin [7], Mitomycin C [13,14], Carboplatin [35], Bleomycin [41]. |
| **Immune System Activation** | HSP release [8, 9], Dendritic Cell (DC) activation, NK/CD8+ T cell activation [10, 39]. | Tumor Immunomodulator; Amplified Anti-Tumor Immunity [12, 28, 37]. | Immunotherapy [11, 12], RT, Chemotherapy (CHT) [3, 30]. |

# Section 3: Quantification of Clinical Evidence (Level 1A, 1B & Complementary)

## 3.1 Methodology and Evidence Selection (PRISMA Alignment)

The clinical evidence synthesized in this Whitepaper was selected in strict accordance with the principles of Evidence-Based Medicine (EBM), aligning with the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) conceptual framework. The literature search was conducted systematically across PubMed, Cochrane Central, and MEDLINE, utilizing the PICO framework (Population: solid tumors; Intervention: standard of care combined with hyperthermia; Comparator: standard of care alone; Outcomes: Overall Survival, Complete Response, Toxicity).

Inclusion criteria strictly prioritized Phase III Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs), extensive Network Meta-Analyses (NMAs), and Cochrane systematic reviews that evaluated hyperthermia as a definitive radiosensitizer or chemosensitizer. Conversely, preclinical data, *in vitro* studies, and Phase I/II safety trials were deliberately excluded from efficacy grading; such data are utilized within this document exclusively to establish biological plausibility (detailed in Annex B). Evidence grading was conducted utilizing the Oxford Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine (OCEBM) levels and the GRADE (Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation) framework, ensuring a transparent and rigorous assessment of certainty.

## 3.2 Thermotherapeutic Modality Definitions

To eliminate technological ambiguity and ensure precise data interpretation, the clinical evidence is strictly stratified according to the specific hyperthermia modality applied in the referenced trials.

**L-R HT** refers to the use of radiative microwave or capacitively coupled radiofrequency systems (e.g., operating at 13.56 MHz) to target deep pelvic, abdominal, or thoracic tumors, aiming for a thermal dose range of 39°C to 43°C. In contrast, **Superficial Loco-Regional Hyperthermia (sHT)** involves energy delivery specifically targeted at the skin or shallow subcutaneous depths, frequently utilized for indications such as chest wall recurrences in breast cancer.

For systemic applications, **WBH** involves the deliberate elevation of core body temperature—ranging from mild to extreme fevers (38.5°C to 42°C)—utilizing infrared-A radiation or specifically calibrated systemic chambers. This systemic approach is primarily indicated for systemic immune activation and the palliation of refractory bone pain.

Furthermore, specialized local delivery systems, such as **Intravesical Chemohyperthermia (HIVEC)**, involve the direct conductive heating of the bladder wall via fluid circulation (targeted at 43°C), a modality utilized specifically in the management of Non-Muscle Invasive Bladder Cancer (NMIBC)

## 3.3. Quantitative Synthesis of High-Level Clinical Evidence

### Table 2: Master Evidence Taxonomy, Quantitative Clinical Impact, and GRADE Assessment.

*This table demonstrates the significant clinical gap between standard therapy and the integration of Hyperthermia.*

| **Indication & Target Modality** | **Standard Contribution (Baseline)** | **HT Additive Contribution (95% CI & p-value)** | **QoL Impact (Focus)** | **OCEBM Level & GRADE** | **Justification & References** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Soft Tissue Sarcoma (STS)** | **Neoadj. CHT:** Median OS ~6.2 years. | **OS Tripled:** 15.4 yrs vs 6.2 yrs. **OS HR: 0.73 (95% CI: 0.54–0.98); p = 0.04.** Local PFS HR: 0.65; p = 0.002. | **Limb Preservation:** Limb-sparing surgery increase. | **Level 1A / HIGH** | Multicenter Phase III (EORTC 62961). [8,19, 71] |

| Indication & Target Modality | Standard Contribution (Baseline) | HT Additive Contribution (95% CI & p-value) | QoL Impact (Focus) | OCEBM Level & GRADE | Justification & References |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Cervical Cancer (LACC)** | **RT alone:** ~20% 5-year OS. Modern CCRT CR ~46%. | **Death Risk Reduced 33%:** 5-year OS 55% vs ~20%. **OS HR: 0.67 (95% CI: 0.45–0.99); p = 0.04.** CR RR: 0.56; p < 0.001. | **Pelvic Comfort:** Avoidance of recurrence. | **Level 1A / MODERATE-HIGH** | NMA (Datta) / Cochrane Phase III. [17, 18, 45]* |
| **Recurrent Breast Cancer** | **RT alone:** CR rate ~38% to 41%. | **CR Boost:** 59-66% vs 38-41%. **CR Odds Ratio: 2.64 (95% CI: 1.66–4.18); p < 0.0001.** | **Chest Wall Integrity:** Prevention of ulceration. | **Level 1A / MODERATE** | Meta-analysis (Datta, N=627). [20, 30, 46] |
| **Head & Neck Cancers** | **RT alone:** CR limited by hypoxia. IMRT CR: ~39.9%; SBRT CR: ~31.2% | **Significant CR Benefit: CR Odds Ratio: 2.92 (95% CI: 1.58–5.42); p = 0.001.** | **Function Preservation:** Swallowing/speech. | **Level 1A / MODERATE** | Systematic review (Datta, N=451). [47, 52] Datta NR, et al. Comparative |

| Indication & Target Modality | Standard Contribution (Baseline) | HT Additive Contribution (95% CI & p-value) | QoL Impact (Focus) | OCEBM Level & GRADE | Justification & References |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **HTRT Mean CR: 61.1%** (p < 0.001 vs IMRT/SBRT) | | | Meta-analysis of HTRT vs IMRT vs SBRT in Recurrent Head and Neck Cancers. (Submission in progress, presented at **Oncologic Hyperthermia Symposium ICON 2026**, June 2026). |
| **Esophageal Carcinoma** | **CCRT:** 3-year survival ~24.1%. | **OS Improvement: 3-year survival 44.2% vs 24.1%; p = 0.046.**<br>Significant OS gains at 1, 3, 5, and 7 years [79].<br>CR Odds Ratio: 2.00 | **Dysphagia Relief:** Improved swallowing.<br>Reduced esophagitis and leukocytopenia (p<0.0001) [79]. | **Level 1A** / **MODERATE-HIGH** | Meta-analysis of 19 RCTs, N=1,519 (Hu et al. 2017 [79])<br>Prospective RCTs (Kitamura / Sugimachi). [48, 51] |

| Indication & Target Modality | Standard Contribution (Baseline) | HT Additive Contribution (95% CI & p-value) | QoL Impact (Focus) | OCEBM Level & GRADE | Justification & References |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | (p<0.00001) [79] | | | |
| **Rectal Cancer (LARC)** | **CCRT:** 5-year OS ~74.5%. | **Major Leap in OS: 5-year OS 95.8% (95% CI: 0.89–0.98) vs 74.5%; p = 0.031.** pCR ~23%. | **Sphincter Preservation:** Avoidance of colostomy. | **Level 1B / LOW-MODERATE** | Prospective cohort (Ott, N=69). [16] |
| **Bladder Cancer (NMIBC)** | **MMC alone:** 10-year DFS 15%. | **RFS Doubled:** 10-Year DFS 53% vs 15%. **10-Year DFS HR: 0.35 (95% CI: 0.18–0.66); p = 0.001.** | **Organ Preservation:** Avoids cystectomy. | **Level 1B / MODERATE** | RCTs (Arends, Colombo). [13, 14, 50] |
| **Bone Mets (Local)** | **EBRT alone:** Pain CR ~7.1%. | **Pain CR:** 37.9% vs 7.1%. **Pain Odds Ratio: 7.9 (95% CI:** | **Localized Comfort:** Pain/opioid reduction. | **Level 1B / MODERATE** | Localized RCT cohort (Chi, N=57). [21] |

| Indication & Target Modality | Standard Contribution (Baseline) | HT Additive Contribution (95% CI & p-value) | QoL Impact (Focus) | OCEBM Level & GRADE | Justification & References |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **2.3–26.9); p < 0.002.** | | | |
| **Bone Mets (WBH)** | **EBRT alone:** Pain CR ~5.3%. | **Pain CR: 47.4% vs 5.3%; p < 0.05.** Complete relief in ~10 days. | **Systemic Comfort:** Rapid pain elimination. | **Level 1B** / **MODERATE** | Systemic Phase III (Sahinbas 2024). [22] |
| **Gastric Cancer (Advanced & Non-Metastatic)** | **CHT mOS:** ~14 months **[75]. Surgery 5-yr OS:** 30.1% [76]. | **Major Leap: mOS 23.5 mo (p=0.01) [75]. 5-yr OS 51.4% vs 30.1% (p<0.05) [76].** | Prolonged survival and superior disease control **[75, 76].** | **Level 1B / MODERATE** | Phase II & III RCTs (Fang et al. [75], Shchepotin et al. [76]) |
| **Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer (NSCLC)** | **RT alone 1-yr local PFS:** 29.0% **[77].** | **PFS Doubled: 1-yr local PFS** 67.5% vs 29.0% | Improved local control and symptom palliation [77, 78] | **Level 1B / MODERATE** | Multi-institutional Phase II/III RCTs (Mitsumori et |

| Indication & Target Modality | Standard Contribution (Baseline) | HT Additive Contribution (95% CI & p-value) | QoL Impact (Focus) | OCEBM Level & GRADE | Justification & References |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **(p=0.036) [77].** | | | al. [77], Shen et al. [78]). |
| **Glioblastoma (GBM)** | **Stupp Protocol:** 1-year survival ~37%. | **Survival Extension:** 1-year survival 73% vs 37% (gain of 36 p.p.). | **Neurological QoL:** Extension of survival. | **Level 2** / **LOW** | Phase II/Retrospective data. [23, 24, 33] |
| **Pancreatic Cancer** | **CHT:** Median OS ~9 months. | **Survival Extension:** Median OS ~20 months vs 9 months. | **Palliation:** Improvement in tumor pain. | **Level 2** / **LOW** | Phase II uncontrolled data. [25, 30] |
| **Melanoma** | **RT alone:** CR: ~35% [80]. 2-yr local control: 28% [80]. | **CR Boost:** 62% vs 35% (p<0.05) [80]. 2-yr local control: 46% vs 28% (p=0.008) [80]. | **Local Control:** Prevention of bleeding. | **Level 2** / **LOW-MODERATE** | Phase III RCT, N=70 (Overgaard et al., 1995 - Lancet [80]). |

| Indication & Target Modality | Standard Contribution (Baseline) | HT Additive Contribution (95% CI & p-value) | QoL Impact (Focus) | OCEBM Level & GRADE | Justification & References |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Hepatocellular (HCC)** | **TACE / CHT:** Limited response. | **Response Rate (ORR):** Improvement in tumor necrosis. | **Liver Function:** Symptom control. | **Level 2** / **LOW** | Phase II trials and meta-analyses. |

***Footnote:** Control arm for Cervical Cancer reflects pre-CCRT historical cohorts; direct comparison to modern CCRT is not comprehensively available in this dataset.

## 3.4: Level 1A Evidence- The Core

### 3.4.1. High-Risk Soft Tissue Sarcoma (STS) – Level 1A Evidence

The integration of Deep L-R HT in the management of high-risk Soft Tissue Sarcoma (STS) represents a "Gold Standard" multimodal protocol, definitively validated by long-term outcomes from the EORTC 62961 / ESHO 95 randomized trial [19, 71]. Conducted across nine specialized centers in the European Union and North America, the study maintained exceptional quality control, characterized by strict adherence to EORTC/ESHO quality assurance guidelines. Crucially, therapeutic precision was guaranteed through rigorous real-time thermometry, with

71.6% of patients monitored via intratumoral probes to achieve a mean target temperature of 41.8°C [41, 43].

The long-term survival divergence, updated and published in JAMA Oncology (2018), provides unequivocal evidence of hyperthermia's clinical benefit. The addition of L-R HT to standard chemotherapy resulted in a remarkable extension of Median Overall Survival (OS) from 6.2 years (standard arm) to 15.4 years (hyperthermia arm), representing an absolute survival gain of 9.2 years. Furthermore, the Local Progression-Free Survival (LPFS) at 5 years increased significantly from 61% to 76% in the hyperthermia cohort [71]. This durable benefit is reflected in the 10-year Overall Survival rates, which stood at 52.6% for the HT group compared to 42.7% for standard of care [71]. The overall Hazard Ratio for survival was 0.73 (p=0.04), indicating a sustained 27% reduction in the risk of death [19, 71].

Beyond survival metrics, the clinical impact of this trimodal approach includes a significant increase in limb-sparing surgery rates and functional preservation, drastically reducing the necessity for radical amputations [19, 71]. Consequently, this specific protocol is formally mandated in the European Society for Medical Oncology (ESMO) Guidelines for high-risk Soft Tissue Sarcoma [19] and is officially audited against the highest clinical benchmarks by the DGHT e.V. [43]. Moreover, the SEOR consensus specifically identifies Deep L-R HT as a Level 1 Evidence treatment for high-risk STS, explicitly emphasizing its critical role in achieving superior limb-sparing surgical outcomes [44].

### 3.4.2. Locally Advanced Cervical Cancer (LACC) – Level 1A Evidence

For the management of Locally Advanced Cervical Cancer (LACC), the integration of Deep L-R HT is supported by high-certainty Level 1A evidence. The highest standard of clinical validation is provided by a Cochrane Systematic Review, which pooled data from six Phase III randomized controlled trials, including the landmark study by Peters et al. [17, 18]. This comprehensive analysis reported a Hazard Ratio (HR) of 0.67, confirming a statistically significant 33% reduction in the risk of death when hyperthermia is combined with standard radiotherapy [18]. Furthermore, the addition of thermal stress significantly improves Complete Response (CR) rates in bulky FIGO IIIB/IV tumors, a clinical scenario where radiotherapy alone frequently fails due to severe intratumoral hypoxia [17, 30].

The clinical impact of this synergistic approach is most evident in the long-term survival metrics. While patients with advanced-stage disease receiving radiotherapy alone historically demonstrate a 5-year Overall Survival (OS) of approximately 20%, the integration of regional hyperthermia elevates the 5-year OS to 55.0%, representing a 2.5-fold increase in survival [18]. Consequently, the Cochrane review explicitly concludes that hyperthermia significantly improves both overall survival and local control without increasing treatment-related systemic toxicity [18].

These findings are profoundly reinforced by a subsequent comprehensive network meta-analysis conducted by Datta et al. (2019), which evaluated a massive cohort of 9,894 patients. This extensive analysis confirmed that the combination of hyperthermia and radiotherapy presents one of the highest efficacy and safety profiles for the management of locally advanced cervical cancer, firmly establishing L-R HT as an indispensable, Level 1A therapeutic modality in modern oncology [45].

### 3.4.3. Recurrent Breast Cancer – Level 1A Evidence

For the management of recurrent breast cancer, specifically targeting chest wall recurrences, Superficial Loco-Regional Hyperthermia (sHT) is supported by robust Level 1A evidence. The clinical validity of this approach is formally acknowledged by the National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) Clinical Practice Guidelines, which include the combination of radiotherapy and hyperthermia as a Category 2A/1 recommendation [20].

The therapeutic efficacy of this combined modality was clearly established by Datta et al. (2016) in a systematic review encompassing 627 patients. This comprehensive analysis demonstrated that the addition of superficial hyperthermia to standard radiation therapy significantly improves Complete Response (CR) rates, elevating them from a baseline of approximately 38–41% to between 59% and 66% [46].

Long-term clinical outcomes further substantiate the value of this integration. A landmark study by Jones et al. (2005) demonstrated that the 5-year local control rate increased dramatically from 24.1% with radiotherapy alone to 68.2% when radiotherapy was combined with hyperthermia [30, 41]. Ultimately, this substantial improvement in local control translates into a profound clinical impact: the successful prevention of severe chest wall ulcerations and the avoidance of highly morbid surgical re-interventions, thereby actively preserving patient quality of life.

### 3.4.4. Head & Neck Cancers (HNC) – Level 1A Evidence

For the management of Head and Neck Cancers (HNC), the application of Deep L-R HT is supported by Level 1A evidence demonstrating its profound efficacy as a radiosensitizer. A comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis conducted by Datta et al. (2016), which encompassed 451 patients, confirmed significant clinical benefits when hyperthermia is combined with standard radiotherapy [47]. In the complex and critical anatomy of the head and neck, L-R HT effectively overcomes hypoxia-induced radioresistance, thereby significantly increasing the Complete Response (CR) rate compared to baseline radiotherapy alone [47, 52].

The clinical implications of this synergy extend significantly beyond localized tumor eradication into vital Quality of Life (QoL) metrics. By achieving complete local control without compounding systemic toxicity in highly sensitive anatomical regions, this combined modality

facilitates the critical preservation of essential organ functions, including swallowing, speech, and airway integrity. Ultimately, maximizing the Complete Response rate through thermoradiotherapy minimizes the necessity for highly mutilating salvage surgeries, offering patients a superior functional outcome alongside oncological control [52].

Recent comparative meta-analyses (Datta et al.,**2026**, submission in progress) directly evaluate HTRT against modern modalities in recurrent HNC. The data demonstrates a significantly higher Mean Complete Response (CR) rate for HTRT (61.1%, 95% CI: 52.1–69.4%) compared to modern standalone techniques such as IMRT (39.9%) and SBRT (31.2%), firmly establishing that hyperthermia improves the outcomes of even the most advanced targeted radiotherapy paradigms

### 3.4.5. Esophageal Carcinoma – Level 1A Evidence

For the management of esophageal carcinoma, the integration of L-R HT into neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy protocols is supported by Level 1A evidence. A comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis published by Hu et al. (2017), which synthesized data from 19 Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) encompassing 1,519 patients, unequivocally confirmed the superiority of thermochemoradiotherapy (HTCRT) over standard chemoradiotherapy (CRT) [79]. The meta-analysis demonstrated that the addition of hyperthermia significantly improves the Complete Response (CR) rate (OR 2.00, $p<0.00001$) and yields statistically significant survival benefits at 1, 3, 5, and 7 years ($p<0.05$ across multiple metrics) [79]. Beyond survival, HTCRT significantly decreased severe treatment-related toxicities, including radiation esophagitis, gastrointestinal reactions, and leukocytopenia ($p<0.0001$), emphasizing its dual role in maximizing efficacy while actively preserving patient Quality of Life [79].

Older data: Prospective randomized controlled trials, including the foundational studies by Sugimachi et al. (1994) and Kitamura et al. (1995), confirm significant clinical benefits in both local tumor control and overall patient survival [48, 51].

The therapeutic synergy of this trimodal approach translates into a pronounced survival advantage. Specifically, long-term follow-up from the randomized cohort evaluated by Kitamura et al. (N=64) demonstrated a near doubling of the 3-year survival rate, which increased from 24.1% with chemoradiotherapy alone to 44.2% when hyperthermia was incorporated into the treatment regimen [48]. Furthermore, the application of concurrent thermal stress results in enhanced pathological downstaging of the primary tumor compared to standard treatment, a critical factor that can facilitate surgical resectability and improve comprehensive oncological outcomes.

Beyond the measurable survival and pathological benefits, the addition of hyperthermia exerts a profound impact on patient Quality of Life (QoL). The accelerated reduction in local tumor burden leads to significant clinical improvements in swallowing function and the rapid relief of dysphagia. This immediate functional restoration provides crucial palliative comfort while simultaneously enhancing the overall curative potential of the treatment paradigm [51].

## 3.5. Level 1B Evidence – Extensive Cohorts and Targeted Efficacy

While demonstrating profound clinical utility and substantial effect sizes, the following indications are strictly classified as Level 1B (Moderate GRADE) evidence. This classification reflects a reliance on specialized single-center cohorts, smaller multi-institutional randomized controlled trials, or historical data heterogeneity. Broad, multi-center Phase III validation for these specific indications remains ongoing, though the existing data strongly support their clinical integration.

### 3.5.1. Pelvic Malignancies: Locally Advanced Rectal and Anal Cancers

For the management of pelvic malignancies, specifically Locally Advanced Rectal Cancer (LARC) and Squamous Cell Carcinoma of the Anus, the application of Deep Loco-Regional Hyperthermia (Deep L-R HT) as an adjunct to standard chemoradiotherapy (CCRT) demonstrates profound clinical efficacy. The validation of this trimodal therapy is comprehensively documented in the pivotal studies conducted by Ott et al. [16][81].

**Squamous Cell Carcinoma of the Anus** The analysis of long-term outcomes in anal cancer cohorts revealed a striking survival advantage. While standard chemoradiotherapy achieved a 5-year Overall Survival (OS) rate of 74.5%, the addition of regional hyperthermia elevated the 5-year OS to 95.8%[81]. This represents an absolute survival gain of 21.3% (adjusted HR 0.25; $p = 0.036$), confirming that the addition of heat serves as a decisive factor in long-term patient survival. Furthermore, colostomy-free survival (CFS) significantly improved from 69.0% to 87.7% ($p = 0.016$), highlighting the crucial role of hyperthermia in organ preservation and functional outcomes.

**Locally Advanced Rectal Cancer (LARC)** In the management of LARC, the trimodal approach exerts a profound pathological impact. The HyRec Phase II trial (Ott et al., 2021) evaluating neoadjuvant CCRT combined with Deep L-R HT reported excellent downstaging capabilities, with Pathological Complete Response (pCR) rates reaching 28% in the per-protocol analysis. This high rate of complete tumor eradication facilitates negative surgical margins (R0) and successful sphincter-sparing surgeries. By effectively avoiding the need for permanent colostomies in a significant proportion of the cohort, the integration of hyperthermia delivers a massive and sustained improvement in postoperative Quality of Life (QoL).

Notably, the safety profile of the trimodal approach was impeccable, with a 0% incidence of severe (Grade 3/4) late thermal toxicity reported during long-term follow-up.

### 3.5.2. High-Risk Non-Muscle Invasive Bladder Cancer (NMIBC)

For the management of high-risk Non-Muscle Invasive Bladder Cancer (NMIBC), Localized Intravesical Chemohyperthermia (HIVEC) presents a highly effective, organ-sparing therapeutic strategy. This modality involves the continuous recirculation of the chemotherapeutic agent Mitomycin C (MMC) at a strictly maintained temperature of 42°C utilizing specialized intravesical delivery systems [13, 14]. The fundamental mechanism driving this efficacy relies on thermal stress to drastically increase urothelial permeability and enhance cellular drug uptake. This thermally induced permeability allows Mitomycin C to penetrate deeper into the bladder wall, successfully eradicating residual malignant cells that standard intravesical instillations cannot reach [14, 50].

The clinical validity of the HIVEC protocol is supported by multicenter randomized controlled trials and long-term meta-analyses published in leading oncology journals [13, 50]. The integration of targeted heat yields substantial improvements in both short- and long-term oncological outcomes.

Specifically, the 1-year Recurrence-Free Survival (RFS) rate increases from approximately 35% with standard MMC alone to between 60% and 70% when combined with hyperthermia [13, 50]. Furthermore, long-term data from the randomized cohort evaluated by Colombo et al. (N=83) demonstrated a remarkable increase in the 10-year Disease-Free Survival (DFS) rate, rising from 15% with the standard of care to 53% utilizing the HIVEC protocol [13]. This represents a 3.5-fold increase in long-term disease-free survival.

The profound reduction in tumor recurrence rates translates directly into a critical clinical endpoint: bladder preservation. By effectively managing high-risk NMIBC and delaying or preventing disease progression, this thermochemotherapy protocol allows a significant proportion of patients to successfully avoid radical cystectomy and complex reconstructive surgeries, thereby preserving optimal genitourinary function and maximizing the patient's overall Quality of Life (QoL) [15]

### 3.5.3. Bone Metastases Palliation (L-R HT & WBH) Target Modalities:

For the palliative management of painful bone metastases, the integration of both Deep L-R HT and WBH alongside External Beam Radiotherapy (EBRT) provides substantial clinical efficacy. Evidence from Chi et al. (2017) established that the addition of locoregional radiofrequency

hyperthermia to standard EBRT resulted in a Pain Complete Response (CR) rate of 37.9%, compared to only 7.1% achieved with radiotherapy alone [21].

Systemic thermotherapy yields similarly significant outcomes. A recent Phase III clinical trial conducted by Sahinbas et al. (2024) evaluated the application of WBH in combination with EBRT. This trial demonstrated a Pain CR of 47.4% for the combined modality, contrasting sharply with the 5.3% CR observed in the standard radiotherapy cohort [22]. Crucially, patients in the thermoradiotherapy group achieved complete pain elimination in a median time of just 10 days, a palliative milestone that was categorized as "Not Reached" in the standard treatment arm.

Synthesizing these findings, the integration of hyperthermia increases the overall probability of complete pain elimination by up to 9-fold. This rapid and definitive analgesic effect translates directly into immense clinical benefit by significantly reducing patient dependence on systemic opioids and substantially improving physical mobility and overall quality of life [21, 22].

### 3.5.4. Locally Advanced Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer (NSCLC)

For the management of locally advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC), the integration of regional hyperthermia alongside radiotherapy has demonstrated significant clinical benefits in prospective randomized settings [77]. A multi-institutional prospective randomized trial conducted by Mitsumori et al. (2007) evaluated the addition of regional hyperthermia to standard radiotherapy [77]. The study reported a significantly higher 1-year local progression-free survival (PFS) in the hyperthermia group (67.5%) compared to the control group receiving radiotherapy alone (29.0%) ($p=0.036$) [77]. Furthermore, a Phase II RCT by Shen et al. (2011) combining hyperthermia with gemcitabine and cisplatin showed a substantial improvement in quality of life metrics, cementing its role as a potent multimodal adjunct for thoracic malignancies [78].

### 3.5.5. Advanced and Non-Metastatic Gastric Cancer

For the management of advanced and non-metastatic gastric cancer, the integration of locoregional hyperthermia (L-R HT) demonstrates superior clinical efficacy, validated by randomized controlled trials (RCTs) [75, 76]. The benefits of thermal stress are remarkably evident in both neoadjuvant treatment regimens and concurrent administration with chemotherapy lines [75, 76].

- **Advanced Gastric Cancer (Stage III/IV):** The efficacy of chemotherapy was considerably amplified by hyperthermia in a Phase II randomized study (n=118) conducted by Fang et al. [75]. The addition of L-R HT increased the disease control rate (DCR) to 70.9%, compared to 46.0% in the control group ($p=0.006$) [75]. The impact on survival was profound: the median overall survival (mOS) was 23.5 months in the thermochemotherapy arm, compared to only 14 months in the control arm ($p=0.01$)

[75]. Exceptionally, the three-year survival rate reached 11.4% with the use of hyperthermia, while in the chemotherapy-alone group it was 0% (p=0.018) [75].

- **Non-Metastatic Gastric Cancer:** In an extensive Phase III randomized clinical trial with three study arms (n=293) by Shchepotin et al. [76], it was demonstrated that preoperative radiotherapy combined with hyperthermia (HTRT) radically modifies the curative trajectory of patients eligible for resection. Compared to surgery alone, the HTRT protocol improved the three-year survival rate from 35.5% to 57.6% ($p<0.05$) and raised the five-year survival rate from 30.1% to 51.4% ($p<0.05$) [76]. Preoperative radiotherapy administered alone did not generate a significant benefit, highlighting that L-R HT is the decisive biological factor for the successful radiosensitization of gastric tumors [76].

## 3.6 Study Limitations, Evidence Heterogeneity, and GRADE Assessment

To adhere to strict Evidence-Based Medicine (EBM) standards and PRISMA/CONSORT guidelines, it is imperative to transparently disclose the methodological limitations and heterogeneity of the cited Level 1A and 1B evidence. The clinical benefits described throughout this document must be interpreted within this specific methodological context.

For high-risk Soft Tissue Sarcoma, the landmark EORTC 62961 trial [8, 19, 71] provides High GRADE evidence; however, inherent limitations include an open-label design—as blinding is technically impossible in clinical hyperthermia—and the reliance on a sub-cohort for the long-term overall survival analysis. These results currently await independent multicenter Phase III replication utilizing modern non-invasive 3D MR-thermometry. In the context of Locally Advanced Cervical Cancer, the Cochrane and Datta network meta-analyses [18, 45] present Moderate to High GRADE evidence with low to moderate heterogeneity ($I2 < 40\%$). A notable limitation within this dataset is that control arms frequently reflect historical cohorts treated prior to the establishment of modern concurrent chemoradiotherapy (CCRT), limiting comprehensive direct comparative analyses.

Evidence supporting recurrent breast cancer [46] achieves a Moderate GRADE. The pooled data of 627 patients spans several decades, introducing technological variability between microwave and radiofrequency equipment, which is reflected in the statistical heterogeneity for Complete Response ($I2 = 48\%$). Similarly, the Moderate GRADE evidence for Head and Neck Cancers [47] relies on smaller randomized trials (totaling 451 patients) that largely predate the modern IMRT and VMAT radiotherapeutic eras. *However, an updated comparative meta-analysis currently in submission (Datta et al., 2026)* [72] *resolves this by demonstrating significant superiority of HTRT even against modern standalone IMRT and SBRT.* The evidence for esophageal carcinoma [48, 51] is also classified as Moderate, primarily due to imprecision and a reliance on older

prospective randomized trials (e.g., Kitamura, N=64) conducted before the advent of contemporary systemic regimens.

Regarding Level 1B indications, the evidence for LARC [16] is downgraded to Low to Moderate GRADE due to imprecision and single-center indirectness. While demonstrating clear local efficacy, the primary data relies heavily on single-center, long-term follow-up cohorts—such as the 69 patients evaluated by Ott et al.—necessitating broader multicenter Phase III validation. The efficacy of HIVEC for high-risk NMIBC [13, 14] is categorized as Moderate GRADE, relying primarily on focused multi-institutional cohorts (e.g., 190 patients in the Arends et al. study). Finally, evidence supporting bone metastasis palliation achieves a Moderate GRADE, though it strictly requires methodological stratification by treatment modality (Deep L-R HT versus WBH), given the significant differences in their mechanisms of action and required quality assurance protocols.

To maintain absolute clinical objectivity, this framework explicitly acknowledges existing counter-evidence within the literature. For instance, while comprehensive network meta-analyses strongly support L-R HT in cervical cancer, specific earlier randomized trials (such as the Vasanthan et al. / RTOG study) [73] reported negative or mixed findings. Such counter-evidence underscores the critical necessity of strict patient selection and absolute adherence to established QA/QC protocols to achieve reproducible success.

Furthermore, it is imperative to distinguish the evidentiary evolution of different thermal modalities. Historically, robust Phase III data primarily supported conventional radiative hyperthermia, while early modulated electro-hyperthermia (mEHT) relied heavily on Phase II or cohort data. However, the modern clinical landscape has successfully bridged this gap. A large-scale Phase III randomized controlled trial (Minnaar et al.) [74] evaluating locally advanced cervical cancer demonstrated a statistically significant increase in local Complete Response rates at 6 months ($p=0.033$) when mEHT was added to standard chemoradiotherapy. This trial confirmed remarkable improvements in 3-Year Progression-Free Survival (PFS) and Overall Survival (OS), without any increase in acute or late toxicity to healthy pelvic tissues, thereby validating the complete safety and efficacy of capacitive nano-heating. These pivotal Phase III findings are further corroborated by extensive PROSPERO-registered meta-analyses, which confirm an overwhelming 2-year OS rate exceeding 78% when 13.56 MHz modulated hyperthermia is integrated into definitive chemoradiotherapy protocols for gynecological malignancies. Therefore, while acknowledging that certain mEHT indications (such as glioblastoma or pancreatic cancer) currently rely on Phase II evidence, its application in locally advanced cervical cancer is now firmly supported by contemporary, high-certainty Phase III data.

The SRHO explicitly acknowledges these historical limitations and evidentiary nuances. It is precisely because of past variations in equipment and dosimetry—often reflected in the heterogeneity metrics of older trials—that the SRHO establishes a rigorous, tiered Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC) framework, as detailed in Section 9. To guarantee that all future clinical applications achieve optimal and reproducible outcomes, this framework mandates validated, MDR-certified clinical monitoring for standard practice (Tier 1), while actively facilitating the transition of Centers of Excellence toward advanced precision thermometry standards (Tier 2).

## 3.7: Breaking the Survival Plateau (Level 2/3 Evidence)

For indications historically resistant to standard treatments, the integration of hyperthermia offers a potential paradigm shift in survival trajectories [31, 42]. While the clinical utility in these refractory malignancies is supported by promising Phase II trials and preliminary meta-analyses, the following indications are strictly classified within this document as emerging Level 2 evidence, acknowledging the necessity for broad Phase III randomized confirmation.

### 3.7.1 Glioblastoma (GBM) - 1-Year Survival:

For Glioblastoma (GBM), the application of mEHT alongside standard chemoradiation demonstrates substantial clinical promise. While the standard of care (the Stupp Protocol) historically yields a 1-year survival rate of approximately 37%, Phase II data from Fiorentini et al. reports a 1-year survival rate of 73% when mEHT is integrated, representing a 36% absolute gain [23, 24]. Mechanistically, combining hyperthermia with Temozolomide (TMZ) protocols exerts synergistic effects by downregulating STAT3 pathways and enhancing blood-brain barrier permeability, thereby facilitating superior targeted drug delivery to the tumor microenvironment [33].

### 3.7.2. Pancreatic Cancer

In the management of pancreatic cancer, the application of **mEHT (Modulated Electro-Hyperthermia)** or Deep Regional Hyperthermia has demonstrated significant survival extensions in both preliminary and recently updated cohorts. **Comprehensive data synthesized by Fiorentini et al. (2024)[56]** indicates a median Overall Survival (**OS**) of approximately **20 months** for patients receiving integrated thermochemotherapy, contrasting sharply with a historical baseline of roughly **9 months** for standard chemotherapy alone.

This therapeutic synergy is attributed to the ability of hyperthermia to overcome the dense desmoplastic stroma of pancreatic tumors, thereby enhancing intratumoral drug concentration and inducing a potent radiosensitizing effect.

However, as these outcomes primarily derive from Phase II studies and prospective non-randomized analyses, this indication remains strictly classified as **Level 2 evidence**. While the data highlights a promising shift in the palliative and curative potential for this refractory malignancy, definitive **Phase III randomized validation** is required to establish this multimodal approach as a global standard of care.

### 3.7.3 Additional Indications & The "HT Advantage":

Beyond the primary indications, Level 2 evidence supports the integration of specific hyperthermic modalities across various other challenging malignancies.

In the treatment of locally advanced malignant melanoma, Hyperthermic Isolated Limb Perfusion (HILP) has achieved Complete Response (CR) rates of 40% to 50%, as documented in landmark analyses published in *The Lancet* by Vrouenraets et al. [27].

For metastatic colorectal cancer with peritoneal dissemination, Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy (HIPEC) is associated with a median overall survival extension of 12 to 24 months compared to systemic therapy alone [26].

Furthermore, in Hepatocellular Carcinoma (HCC), the application of mEHT has been shown to increase the Objective Response Rate (ORR) to between 40% and 60%, as demonstrated by Vogl et al. [29].

## 3.8 Evidentiary Alignment and Source Validation

The clinical data synthesized within this framework are explicitly aligned with the highest standards of oncological peer review. The evidence base is anchored by landmark publications, including the overarching European perspective on soft tissue sarcomas published in *JAMA Oncology* [71], the definitive Cochrane Systematic Review establishing the gold standard for cervical cancer [18], and the foundational *Journal of Clinical Oncology* (JCO) publications establishing HIVEC protocols [13, 14]. This foundation is further reinforced by long-term rectal cancer validations in *Strahlentherapie und Onkologie* [16], recurrent breast cancer local control confirmations in the *International Journal of Radiation Oncology, Biology, Physics* (IJROBP) [30, 41], and recent Phase III bone pain palliation data published in the *Journal of Thermal Biology* [22].

# Section 4: The Immunological Paradigm Shift: Transitioning from Level 1A Evidence to the Future of Immuno-Oncology

Oncological hyperthermia (HT) has evolved far beyond its traditional role as a localized cytotoxic agent or a simple radiosensitizer. In the current era of precision oncology, HT is recognized as a profound biological response modifier capable of fundamentally reshaping the tumor microenvironment (TME) and overcoming the greatest barrier in modern cancer treatment: immunotherapy resistance [57].

## 4.1. The Biological Switch: ICD and TME Reprogramming

Immune Checkpoint Inhibitors (ICIs), such as anti-PD-1, anti-PD-L1, and anti-CTLA-4 therapies, frequently fail in immunologically "cold" tumors characterized by severe hypoxia, dense stroma, and a lack of T-cell infiltration [57,58]. Hyperthermia provides the exact biophysical prerequisite needed to overcome this resistance. Mild to moderate thermal stress actively induces Immunogenic Cell Death (ICD), triggering the massive extracellular release of Heat Shock Proteins (e.g., HSP70) and Danger-Associated Molecular Patterns (DAMPs) [57,67]. These signals act as powerful endogenous adjuvants, stimulating dendritic cell maturation and robust tumor antigen cross-presentation.

Concurrently, heat acts as a biophysical switch that polarizes the immunosuppressive TME from a pro-tumoral Th2 phenotype into a highly reactive, anti-tumoral Th1 state [57]. Thermally induced vascular normalization creates a gateway that permits the massive infiltration of CD8+ Cytotoxic T-Lymphocytes (CTLs) deep into the tumor core, effectively converting "cold," immune-evasive tumors into "hot," highly immunogenic targets perfectly primed for immunotherapy [58,59].

## 4.2. Systemic Immunity and the Abscopal Effect

Beyond the primary tumor site, fever-range Whole-Body Hyperthermia (WBH) drastically accelerates systemic immune surveillance. Under normal physiological conditions, the entire naive T-cell pool within an individual lymph node turns over approximately 3 times per day [60,61]. Thermal stress remodels high endothelial venules (HEVs), accelerating this kinetic lymphocyte turnover by 3- to 4-fold, mathematically maximizing the probability of T-cells encountering specific tumor antigens [60,61].

When locoregional or systemic hyperthermia is combined with immune checkpoint blockade, this heightened immune traffic reliably triggers the abscopal effect—a phenomenon where localized thermal destruction generates systemic, tumor-specific memory T-cells capable of seeking out and eradicating distant, non-heated metastatic lesions [62].

## 4.3. Present Clinical Evidence and Future Perspectives (2024–2026)

The synergistic integration of HT and ICIs represents the definitive future of precision oncology. Recent high-impact clinical data confirm that HT not only enhances the physical delivery of monoclonal antibodies into the tumor bed but also reactively upregulates PD-L1 expression on malignant cells, rendering them highly susceptible to checkpoint blockade [58].

Pioneering clinical trials and reports are actively cementing this combination as a new Standard of Care:

- **Reversing ICI Resistance (2025 Clinical Evidence):** A 2025 clinical breakthrough published in *Cancer Immunology, Immunotherapy* demonstrated a durable, complete response to Nivolumab combined with regional hyperthermia in a patient with recurrent, PD-L1-negative metastatic squamous cell carcinoma, proving HT's ability to activate an immunogenic milieu in previously refractory patients [63].
- **Active Phase II/III Clinical Trials:** The ongoing multicenter Phase II trial (NCT07118566, updated 2025) is evaluating the synergistic effects of HT combined with ICIs in advanced gastrointestinal malignancies with liver metastases, explicitly aiming to break hepatic immunosuppression [64].
- **Targeted Hyperthermia Therapy (THT):** Emerging 2024-2025 studies utilizing gold nanorods for targeted hyperthermia have demonstrated the ability to completely reprogram notoriously resistant, microsatellite-stable (MSS) colorectal and melanoma tumors, restoring full sensitivity to anti-PD-1 therapies [66].

**Strategic Conclusion:** As the global oncological focus shifts toward cellular and immune therapies, hyperthermia can no longer be viewed merely as a standalone adjuvant. By successfully overriding immunological tolerance and transforming the TME, HT solidifies its position as a mandatory, synergistic partner, essential for unlocking the full curative potential of modern immunotherapy

*(Note: An exhaustive analysis of the underlying molecular biology, cellular mechanisms, and comprehensive preclinical datasets is provided in Appendix B).*

# Section 5: Clinical Implementation Protocols and Quality Assurance (QA/QC) Standards

## 5.1 Technical Standards and Quality Assurance (QA/QC) – DGHT Alignment

To guarantee therapeutic reproducibility and maximize patient safety, the SRHO officially adopts the rigorous Quality Assurance (QA) and Quality Control (QC) protocols established by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Hyperthermie e.V. (DGHT) [4, 43]. Central to this alignment is the implementation of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) structured around a pragmatic, tiered clinical framework for real-time thermometry and monitoring. Tier 1 protocols mandate the utilization of native monitoring systems integrated directly within Medical Device Regulation (MDR)-certified equipment. This includes continuous core temperature tracking for WBH, alongside impedance, power-reflection, and surface thermal sensors for modulated electro-hyperthermia (mEHT) and targeted radiofrequency systems. This baseline tier ensures immediate patient safety and foundational clinical efficacy without creating unethical technical barriers to treatment access. For institutions engaged in prospective research and precision protocols, Tier 2—designated for Centers of Excellence—strongly recommends the integration of advanced spatial thermometry. Utilizing either invasive probes or non-invasive 3D modeling, this advanced tier mathematically validates the precise 40°C to 43°C target therapeutic range within the tumor core [41, 43].

Beyond temperature monitoring, the SRHO requires strict adherence to the DGHT Technical Guidelines regarding applicator calibration. This standardization ensures high-precision radiofrequency focusing, concentrating the thermal energy strictly within the defined tumor volume while actively minimizing the risk of "hot spots" in adjacent healthy tissues. Such rigorous calibration remains a critical requirement for the ongoing clinical validation of advanced hyperthermia systems [5, 43].

Furthermore, to ensure the highest quality of patient care, all SRHO-affiliated practitioners should undergo comprehensive and standardized training modules. Professional certification may be obtained through international pathways, strictly aligned with the European School of Thermotherapy and DGHT clinical standards. Alternatively, practitioners may achieve national certification through equivalent SRHO-endorsed university curricula and officially accredited Continuing Medical Education (CME) courses [42, 43].

## 5.2 Clinical Protocols: The "48-Hour Rule" and the HSP Cycle

In strict adherence to the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Hyperthermie e.V. (DGHT) Guidelines (v2.0), the clinical application of hyperthermia must be governed by tumor biology and molecular kinetics, rather than mere logistical convenience [41, 43].

The standard therapeutic frequency dictates two to three sessions per week, maintaining a mandatory minimum interval of 48 hours between hyperthermia applications [5, 43]. The biological imperative for this specific scheduling is rooted in the phenomenon of thermotolerance. The application of thermal stress triggers the rapid cellular expression of Heat Shock Proteins, specifically HSP70, which effectively act as a temporary "thermal shield." Consequently, administering hyperthermia on a daily basis is clinically counter-productive; during this period, the tumor enters a temporary state of resistance to heat-induced apoptosis [8, 37].

The 48-hour therapeutic window is strategically designed to respect this biological rhythm. This specific interval allows for adequate healthy tissue recovery while simultaneously ensuring that the subsequent hyperthermia session strikes the tumor only after the HSP70 kinetic curve has subsided. By waiting for this protective molecular shield to diminish, the clinician ensures the tumor has undergone complete re-sensitization, thereby maximizing the apoptotic potential of the next thermal dose [3, 30].

## 5.3. Academic Evidence for Optimal Timing (RT & CHT)

The precise sequencing of treatments—often referred to as the "Precision Window"—is critical for maximizing the Thermal Enhancement Ratio (TER). Strict adherence to optimal timing ensures that the physiological and molecular synergy between modalities is exploited at its absolute peak [41].

**Radiotherapy (RT) Synergy:** When combining hyperthermia with radiotherapy, the highest clinical efficacy, reflected in a TER of 1.5 to 2.0, is achieved when thermal stress is applied within 30 to 60 minutes of irradiation [2, 21]. The biological imperative for this narrow window is the immediate inhibition of Sublethal Damage Repair (SLDR). Heat must be present to prevent tumor cells from effectively recovering from radiation-induced double-strand DNA breaks [1, 5]. Consistent with the Spanish SEOR standards, the SRHO formally adopts the protocol requiring hyperthermia to be administered within this 30–60 minute window following radiotherapy. This specific timeframe is highlighted in the Spanish consensus as a critical factor for therapeutic success. However, while the 60-minute window represents a stringent clinical target, it is important to acknowledge that absolute global consensus on optimal timing is continually evolving based on specific heating techniques and distinct tumor biology. Therefore, clinical applications should remain adaptable, integrating ongoing institutional research and emerging

models. This includes incorporating the comprehensive timing data and optimization models developed by researchers from the University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston (and summarized in modern clinical reviews), allowing practitioners to safely and effectively adapt timing to highly specific multimodal regimens.

**Chemotherapy (CHT) Synergy:** In the context of chemotherapy, therapeutic synergy is heavily reliant on pharmacokinetics and tumor microcirculation. The simultaneous application of heat and chemotherapy is considered ideal for maximizing intratumoral blood flow while simultaneously reducing interstitial fluid pressure. This combined physical effect effectively "forces" the circulating cytotoxic agents deep into the poorly perfused, necrotic tumor core—a physiological mechanism comprehensively validated in human clinical settings [5, 35, 41].

For maximum efficacy, particularly when utilizing platinum-based compounds (such as Cisplatin or Carboplatin) or agents like Gemcitabine, the application of hyperthermia must be precisely synchronized with the drug's Peak Plasma Concentration [7, 35, 40]. The timing of this sequence is highly sensitive; clinical data explicitly indicate that extending the interval between chemotherapy administration and hyperthermia beyond 2 hours results in a significant loss of therapeutic synergy and drastically reduced intracellular drug accumulation [5, 41].

## 5.4. Perfusion vs. Sequestration: The Vascular Switch

The clinical success of combining hyperthermia with systemic therapy relies heavily on the active management of tumor hemodynamics. Thermally induced physiological changes act essentially as a "biological switch," governed by precise temperature thresholds [5, 30, 45].

During the initial **Delivery Phase**, maintaining the target tissue between 39°C and 41°C induces significant, localized vasodilation. When applied simultaneously with chemotherapy administration, this moderate thermal stress actively increases blood perfusion and local oxygenation. This physiological alteration effectively transports the circulating cytotoxic agents deep into the otherwise poorly perfused, necrotic, and hypoxic core of the tumor [41, 45].

Conversely, the **Capture Phase** occurs at temperatures exceeding 42°C. At this higher thermal threshold, the physiological response shifts, inducing micro-vascular congestion within the disorganized tumor vasculature. This phenomenon, often referred to as the "Trap Effect," is strategically utilized post-chemotherapy. By inducing vascular collapse after the drug has penetrated the tumor, the cytotoxic agents are effectively "locked" inside the malignant volume. This prevents systemic wash-out, significantly increasing the local residence time and subsequent cytotoxicity of the drug [5, 30, 41].

A critical clinical consideration arises from this biphasic vascular response: reaching temperatures above 42°C too rapidly during a session may prematurely "close the vascular

door" before the chemotherapeutic agent has adequately penetrated the tumor core. Therefore, adequate thermal guidance (QA/QC) and a strategic, gradual temperature escalation are highly desirable insofar as technically and ethically possible. This approach optimizes the sequencing of these vascular phases, ensuring maximum drug delivery and sequestration, without creating unethical technical barriers to treatment access [43].

## 5.5. Systematic Interaction Table (Hager / Wust & Issels Models)

To optimize the integration of hyperthermia with systemic therapies, cytostatic agents must be systematically categorized based on their synergistic potential with thermal stress. Following the clinical models established and validated by ESHO and DGHT, chemotherapeutic compounds are classified into three distinct interaction profiles: strong synergy, additive effects, and independent or sequential facilitation [41, 42, 43].

Compounds exhibiting **Strong Synergy**—including Cisplatin [7], Carboplatin [35], Mitomycin C [13, 14, 50], Oxaliplatin, Ifosfamide [19], Irinotecan, and Cyclophosphamide—demonstrate a linear to exponential thermal effect profile. For these specific agents, the inherent cytotoxicity increases dramatically with every degree of temperature elevation above 40°C, driven by direct thermally induced alterations in DNA repair and cellular metabolism [5, 41].

A second category of agents provides an **Additive Effect**. This group encompasses Gemcitabine [30, 43], 5-Fluorouracil (5-FU), Doxorubicin, Temozolomide [23, 33], and Bendamustine. When combined with hyperthermia, these compounds exhibit a supra-linear increase in efficacy. Rather than altering the chemical cytotoxicity exponentially, heat primarily enhances cellular uptake and actively inhibits the physiological resistance mechanisms typically induced by the hypoxic tumor microenvironment [41].

Finally, agents classified under **Independent or Sequential** interaction—such as Taxanes (e.g., Paclitaxel), Vinca Alkaloids, Etoposide, and Methotrexate—benefit from mechanically facilitated transport. In these regimens, hyperthermia acts primarily as a powerful targeted delivery mechanism. By increasing local perfusion and altering vascular permeability, thermal stress significantly increases the physical delivery of these drugs to the tumor site without necessarily altering their inherent biochemical properties [5].

### Table 3: Synergistic Classification of Chemotherapeutic Agents

| Interaction Category | Chemotherapeutic Compounds | Thermal Effect Profile |
|---|---|---|
| **Strong Synergy** | Cisplatin [7], Carboplatin [35], Mitomycin C [13, 14, 50], Oxaliplatin, Ifosfamide [19], Irinotecan, Cyclophosphamide. | Linear to Exponential: Cytotoxicity increases dramatically with every degree above 40°C [5, 41]. |
| **Additive Effect** | Gemcitabine [30, 43], 5-FU, Doxorubicin, Temozolomide [23, 33], Bendamustine. | Supra-linear Increase: Heat enhances cellular uptake and inhibits hypoxia-induced resistance [41]. |
| **Independent / Sequential** | Taxanes (Paclitaxel), Vinca Alkaloids, Etoposide, Methotrexate. | Facilitated Transport: HT acts primarily by increasing drug delivery without altering inherent biochemistry [5]. |

# Section 6: Thermal Dosimetry – Clinical Pragmatism and the Precision Ideal

## 6.1. The Primacy of Clinical Integration (Tier 1 Baseline)

The primary strategic objective of the SRHO is the immediate clinical integration of oncological hyperthermia for indications supported by Level 1A and 1B evidence. It is imperative to contextualize that many landmark Phase III randomized controlled trials—which demonstrated significant improvements in Overall Survival (OS), Local Control (LC), and Quality of Life (QoL)—achieved these outcomes based on the fundamental biological, radiosensitizing, and immunomodulatory effects of thermal stress. Crucially, a significant proportion of these historical clinical successes were realized without the integration of advanced real-time thermometry or complex 3D spatial dosimetry.

Consequently, the absence of advanced dosimetric equipment or sophisticated 3D treatment planning software must not serve as an administrative or clinical barrier to implementation. The fundamental clinical mandate, designated as the Tier 1 Baseline, focuses strictly on the safe addition of hyperthermia to standard multimodal regimens to secure these proven survival benefits. This baseline is effectively achieved utilizing the native monitoring systems already integrated within Medical Device Regulation (MDR)-certified equipment. The biological synergy of heat remains highly effective under these standard conditions, and its application should be actively facilitated across all general oncology centers.

As a core clinical principle, precise spatial temperature control is highly desirable insofar as it is technically and ethically possible. However, the SRHO firmly maintains that the absence of invasive spatial thermometry must never be utilized as a justification to obstruct a patient's access to a clinically validated, life-extending therapeutic modality.

## 6.2. The 'Gold Standard' Recommendation: Modality-Specific Precision (Tier 2)

While the baseline application of hyperthermia delivers substantial clinical benefit, the SRHO encourages a progressive transition toward the precision oncology paradigm. For institutions aiming to establish Centers of Excellence and maximize therapeutic efficacy, the adoption of an ideal dosimetric framework is strongly recommended, tailored to the specific modality utilized.

**L-R HT: The Precision Ideal** For targeted tumor heating, the ideal framework bridges physical energy prediction with biological validation. As a recommended standard for treatment preparation, the calculation of the Specific Absorption Rate (SAR)—measured in Watts per kilogram (W/kg)—aids clinicians in predicting electromagnetic energy distribution. This allows for the optimal focusing of heat within the target volume before the session begins.

Furthermore, when clinically feasible, the use of advanced thermometry is highly recommended to validate the thermal dose delivered, specifically measuring the Equivalent Minutes at 43°C reached in 90% of the tumor volume (T90). To overcome the practical and ethical barriers associated with historical invasive probes, the SRHO advocates for the progressive adoption of non-invasive 3D thermal modeling software. This includes advanced solutions developed within the Torino research cluster, currently undergoing validation through the HEAT-UP multicentric study. This approach represents the ultimate Quality Assurance standard for Centers of Excellence, as it allows clinicians to identify and minimize "cold spots" while maintaining absolute patient comfort and safety.

**WBH: Systemic Thermodynamics** In the context of WBH, where the clinical objective is systemic immunomodulation—such as HSP70 release and NK cell activation—rather than local tissue ablation, spatial metrics like SAR and T90 are inapplicable. Instead, the ideal dosimetric framework is governed by systemic thermodynamic parameters. The therapeutic dose is defined by achieving and maintaining a specific systemic target temperature plateau, typically ranging between 39.0°C and 41.5°C. Clinical efficacy in this modality is measured by the duration of the plateau phase, which requires continuous real-time tracking of core body temperature and vital signs in full compliance with DGHT safety standards.

## 6.3 Conclusion on Evidence Quality and the Implementation Roadmap

The SRHO transparently acknowledges the historical methodological limitations and the heterogeneity observed in earlier clinical trials. However, it is crucial to emphasize that landmark Phase III trials demonstrated significant Level 1A survival benefits based on the fundamental biological synergy of heat, frequently without the utilization of advanced real-time thermometry or complex dosimetry.

To bridge the gap between clinical pragmatism and academic precision, the SRHO establishes a structured, tiered QA/QC framework. To ensure immediate clinical integration and secure baseline patient benefits without obstructing access to care, validated, MDR-certified clinical monitoring is mandated for standard practice (Tier 1).

Simultaneously, the SRHO is committed to actively transitioning Centers of Excellence toward advanced, non-invasive ESHO/DGHT thermometry standards to minimize future data heterogeneity and achieve optimal, reproducible precision (Tier 2). This dual-track approach ensures that Romanian oncology remains both accessible to the patient and aligned with the highest international scientific standards.

# Section 7: Safety Profile, Quality of Life (QoL), and Contraindications

## 7.1. Exceptional Safety and Tolerability

Oncological hyperthermia exhibits an exceptionally favorable safety profile, establishing it as an ideal adjuvant modality that does not significantly compound the systemic toxicity of concomitant treatments, such as chemotherapy or radiotherapy. The historical foundations of its safety have been comprehensively validated by modern, large-scale Phase III trials and extensive clinical evaluations [43].

**L-R HT** Landmark multicenter trials, such as those conducted by Van der Zee et al. (2000) and Issels et al. (2010), have conclusively demonstrated that adverse events associated with L-R HT are predominantly localized and transient. The most common effects—including localized thermal discomfort, minor subcutaneous thermal stress (fat burns), or mild blistering—are generally classified as Grade I–II and resolve rapidly without permanent sequelae. In clinical practice, these effects are effectively mitigated through active patient feedback, native surface monitoring, and integrated cooling systems (Tier 1). In specialized research settings, advanced spatial thermometry and precision dose validation (Tier 2) provide an additional layer of risk management [56, 57].

Furthermore, the risk profile and specific contraindications are heavily dependent on the heating technique applied. Modern capacitively coupled radiofrequency systems (e.g., operating at 13.56 MHz and widely adopted within DGHT, SIIO, and other international frameworks) exhibit a distinct and significantly lower risk of localized adverse events compared to alternative radiative microwave devices. This specific technological profile ensures high patient tolerability and minimizes treatment-related morbidity.

**WBH** Modern WBH protocols also demonstrate a favorable safety profile with minimal Grade 3/4 toxicity when conducted under strict physiological monitoring. Recent Clinical Evaluation Reports (CER) for advanced water-filtered Infrared-A (wIRA) devices, such as the IRATHERM® system, have documented an incidence of severe adverse events approaching zero across monitored oncology cohorts (N > 190). When applied according to standard clinical protocols and continuous core temperature monitoring (Tier 1), WBH maintains a predictable and favorable risk-benefit profile. Potential physiological stress is strictly managed through the real-time tracking of vital signs and active cooling, ensuring patient safety without the absolute requirement for complex invasive dosimetry [43, 58].

## 7.2. Quality of Life (QoL) Benefits

Beyond measurable survival metrics, the improvement of patient Quality of Life (QoL) is established as a primary clinical benefit of oncological hyperthermia. This enhancement of well-being is achieved through a multi-faceted impact on disease progression and symptom management, aligning with the highest international standards of patient-centered care.

A fundamental driver of improved QoL is the superior disease control achieved through multimodal integration. By enhancing the efficacy of radiotherapy and chemotherapy, hyperthermia actively reduces the physical and psychological burden associated with tumor progression and its subsequent complications [16, 42]. This is particularly evident in the management of refractory pain; hyperthermia has proven highly effective in mitigating chronic pain associated with bone metastases, thereby facilitating a significant reduction in opioid dependence and restoring patient mobility [21, 22].

Furthermore, the integration of hyperthermia is associated with lower local recurrence rates across major indications. By maximizing the probability of complete tumor eradication in the first instance, the modality minimizes the cumulative trauma of repetitive surgical interventions and the systemic distress of treatment failures [18, 31]. Collectively, these factors represent an essential pillar of comprehensive cancer management, ensuring that therapeutic success is defined not only by the duration of survival but by the functional and emotional health of the survivor.

## 7.3. Strict Clinical Contraindications

To guarantee maximum patient safety and ensure full compliance with international regulatory standards, the SRHO strictly adheres to the contraindications established for thermal therapies. The administration of hyperthermia is prohibited in the presence of specific physiological or technical conditions that could compromise patient stability or treatment integrity [41, 43].

**Contraindications for WBH** Due to the systemic nature of the procedure and the associated hemodynamic stress, WBH is contraindicated for patients with significant cardiovascular or systemic impairments. This includes heart failure exceeding NYHA Grade II, severe arterial occlusive disease, and advanced internal organ insufficiencies. Acute severe inflammations, uncontrolled hyperthyroidism, delirium, or severe cerebral hypoperfusion also preclude the use of systemic heat. Furthermore, the therapy must not be administered during pregnancy or in cases of acute thermal skin damage.

A critical safety requirement for WBH is the patient's ability to perceive and communicate thermal sensations. Therefore, patients with a localized lack of heat or pain perception in the treatment areas, or those who are unable to articulate their current status and sensations, are not candidates for this modality.

**Contraindications for L-R HT / mEHT** The contraindications for loco-regional therapies are primarily governed by the physics of electromagnetic energy transfer and the risk of uncontrolled localized heating. The presence of active electronic medical implants, such as pacemakers or implanted defibrillators, within the radiofrequency or electromagnetic heating field is a strict contraindication. Similarly, metallic implants located in close proximity to the targeted area pose a risk of localized "hot spots" and must be carefully evaluated.

In terms of regional physiology, peritoneal ascites represent a significant technical barrier; fluid accumulation disproportionately attracts and absorbs radiofrequency radiation, which significantly impedes deep tissue thermal penetration and alters the intended energy distribution. Other contraindications include active thrombosis, pregnancy, and impaired thermal perception. The latter is particularly relevant for patients with severe sensory neuropathy in the treatment area or those on potent analgesic regimens that may mask the ability to provide accurate and timely thermal feedback during the procedure.

# Section 8. Bridging the Implementation Gap

## 8.1. Conclusions for Systemic Integration

The clinical evolution of oncological hyperthermia has reached a definitive stage of maturity, successfully transitioning from experimental observation to a mathematically quantifiable medical discipline [41, 71]. The historical evidence supporting this transition is unequivocal; significant clinical breakthroughs—such as the doubling of Overall Survival (OS) in locally advanced cervical cancer [18] and the tripling of survival rates in high-risk soft tissue sarcoma [71]—were demonstrated and validated even before the widespread adoption of advanced digital thermometry. These milestones confirm the inherent biological potency and therapeutic efficacy of the modality, independent of complex dosimetric requirements [2, 5].

Hyperthermia should now be firmly established as the "Fourth Pillar" of oncological care, serving as a critical biological bridge that enhances the efficacy of surgery, chemotherapy, and radiotherapy [3, 30]. For indications supported by Level 1A evidence, hyperthermia represents a clinically essential standard of care. To ensure the highest probability of local tumor control and long-term patient survival, this modality must be integrated into standard multimodal protocols, initiated through validated Tier 1 monitoring frameworks that prioritize immediate patient access and safety [19, 43].

## 8.2. Strategic Recommendation

To align the Romanian healthcare system with established European oncological standards (ESHO/DGHT), the SRHO recommends that all oncology centers providing radiotherapy or chemotherapy for validated indications integrate hyperthermia as a standard of care [41, 43].

This strategic integration follows a dual-track implementation model. While clinical integration is mandated based on the definitive Phase III survival data (Tier 1), the SRHO strongly encourages the progressive adoption of advanced thermal dosimetry to maximize therapeutic precision. For designated Centers of Excellence (Tier 2), ensuring a reproducible and documented therapeutic dose—quantified through metrics such as CEM43°C T90 and supported by modern non-invasive modeling—represents the ideal pathway. This tiered approach not only optimizes long-term clinical outcomes for the patient but also ensures maximum resource efficiency and scientific rigor within the national health system [43].

# Section 9. Practice Standards and Quality Assurance (QA/QC)

## 9.1. SRHO Alignment with ESHO/DGHT Guidelines: A Tiered Approach

To ensure therapeutic safety and maximize clinical reproducibility while avoiding unnecessary technological barriers to entry (as outlined in Section 5), the SRHO adopts a tiered approach to Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC). This framework harmonizes clinical pragmatism with the precision ideals established by ESHO and DGHT, ensuring that the highest standards of care are accessible across the Romanian healthcare landscape [41, 43].

**Tier 1: Standard Clinical Integration (Baseline Practice)** For general oncology centers, the primary mandate is the safe and consistent integration of hyperthermia into standard multimodal regimens to secure baseline survival benefits for the patient. Clinical implementation at this level is fully justified by existing Level 1A and 1B evidence. Tier 1 practice utilizes the integrated safety and monitoring systems provided by MDR-certified equipment manufacturers. This includes continuous core temperature tracking for Whole-Body Hyperthermia (WBH), alongside impedance, power-reflection, and surface thermal sensors for modulated electro-hyperthermia (mEHT) or radiofrequency (RF) units. This baseline approach ensures that patients receive life-saving therapy without the prohibitive costs or complexity barriers associated with advanced spatial sensing, maintaining a focus on immediate clinical access.

**Tier 2: Centers of Excellence (The Precision Ideal)** For institutions aiming to establish designated Centers of Excellence or participate in prospective clinical trials, strict adherence to advanced ESHO/DGHT QA/QC protocols is required. This level of practice involves the implementation of spatial thermometry to mathematically validate the delivery of a Minimum Effective Thermal Dose, typically quantified as CEM43°C T90. The SRHO strongly supports a strategic transition toward modern, non-invasive 3D thermal modeling and real-time treatment planning software—such as the solutions currently undergoing validation within the HEAT-UP study. This approach aligns ultimate scientific rigor with patient comfort, providing a blueprint for the future of precision thermooncology.

## 9.2 Safety Protocols and Modality-Specific Mandates

The assessment of side effects, safety protocols, and clinical contraindications is strictly dependent on the specific modality and technique applied. For Whole-Body Hyperthermia, protocols are categorized based on the target systemic temperature: mild (up to 38.5°C), moderate (up to 40.5°C), extreme (up to 42.0°C), and thermal (exceeding 43.0°C).

Regardless of the designated tier, all practitioners must implement comprehensive safety measures as a universal mandate. This includes the continuous real-time monitoring of vital signs and adherence to the official DGHT guidelines for both systemic whole-body hyperthermia and capacitively coupled RF-LHT. By following these standardized clinical frameworks, practitioners ensure a predictable and favorable risk-benefit profile across all therapeutic applications [11, 43].

## 9.3. The Role of the SRHO Scientific Advisory Board (SAB)

The SRHO Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) serves as the primary academic and regulatory engine of the society, tasked with the strategic development, educational structuring, and national implementation of international hyperthermia standards. The SAB ensures that the integration of this modality into the Romanian healthcare system remains evidence-based, scientifically rigorous, and ethically sound [42, 43].

**Educational Leadership and Curriculum Development** A core mission of the SAB is the development and implementation of standardized university curricula and Continuing Medical Education (CME) programs. In direct collaboration with international institutional partners, such as ESHO and DGHT, the SAB designs these educational tracks to guarantee that Romanian medical professionals receive training that is perfectly aligned with European standards of excellence. This includes the formulation of theoretical modules and clinical rotations required for the official recognition of medical competency in oncological hyperthermia.

**Supportive Clinical Audits and Quality Mentorship** Beyond its regulatory functions, the SAB operates as a body focused on professional guidance and quality mentorship. It performs periodic clinical audits to ensure that SRHO-affiliated units maintain strict compliance with the Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC) standards appropriate to their designated tier (Tier 1 or Tier 2). These audits are designed to provide necessary technical and scientific support, protecting patient safety and optimizing treatment outcomes through the promotion of best practices rather than purely restrictive oversight.

**Knowledge Management and Research Integration** The SAB provides essential scientific validation for national case studies and retrospective data, ensuring that Romanian clinical results meet the requirements of international academic rigor. By fostering a high-standard research environment, the SAB facilitates the publication of local evidence in high-impact oncology journals. Furthermore, the Board actively supports the progressive transition of clinical centers from Tier 1 baseline practice toward Tier 2 research excellence, ensuring that the Romanian oncological community contributes meaningfully to the global advancement of thermooncology [43].

# Section 10. Conclusions and Implementation Recommendations

## 10.1. Strategic Conclusion

HT has long evolved beyond the stages of experimental or alternative therapy; it is a mature, essential adjuvant modality that strictly fulfills the criteria of Evidence-Based Medicine (EBM). With Level 1A support across a broad spectrum of indications, its clinical impact is unequivocally quantified by landmark outcomes: the doubling of Recurrence-Free Survival (RFS) in bladder cancer [13], the tripling of overall survival in high-risk soft tissue sarcomas [71], and the successful facilitation of organ preservation in rectal cancer [16],etc.

From the perspective of the Romanian Society of Hyperthermic Oncology (SRHO)—acting as a dedicated Civil Society Organization (CSO)—hyperthermia must now be firmly established as the "Fourth Pillar" of oncological care. It is no longer a mere optional adjunct, but a fundamental patient right. To ensure Romanian patients benefit from the highest international therapeutic standards and equitable chances of survival, SRHO strongly advocates for a stratified integration based on the current hierarchy of clinical evidence [18, 19, 42]:

- It must be integrated as a **mandatory standard of care** for Level 1A indications;
- It is highly **recommended** as an essential multimodal component for Level 1B indications;
- It must be actively **considered as a complementary therapeutic option** within the Tumor Board for challenging malignancies currently supported by Level 2 evidence (e.g., glioblastoma, pancreatic cancer, hepatocellular carcinoma, and melanoma) [23, 25, 27, 29].

Furthermore, because thermo-oncology is a rapidly evolving scientific field, these recommendations are dynamic; as high-quality clinical evidence continues to accumulate globally, this therapeutic spectrum will be continuously refined and expanded to ensure patients always have access to the most advanced integrative treatments available.

## 10.2. Formal Requests

To harmonize national clinical practice with global scientific evidence, protect the patient from the risks of uncertified practices, and eradicate current financial barriers, SRHO submits the following formal, collaborative requests to the primary governing bodies:

- **To the Universities of Medicine and Pharmacy (UMF):** SRHO requests the formal endorsement and hosting of the Continuous Professional Training Curriculum (140 hours). By integrating an international faculty of leading experts (including Dr. Hüseyin Sahinbas, Prof. Dr. Giammaria Fiorentini, and others), the UMFs have the unique opportunity to bridge the current educational void. This academic integration will transform Romania into a European educational hub, ensuring that medical professionals are trained at the highest standards of safety and precision.
- **To the Ministry of Health (MS) and the National Health Insurance House (CNAS):**
    1. *The Legal Shield:* SRHO calls for the immediate initiation of the accreditation process for the "Certificate of Complementary Studies" (Atestat de Studii Complementare). This will provide the necessary legal protection for physicians and guarantee patient safety.
    2. *Eradicating Financial Toxicity:* SRHO urgently requests the establishment of specific Diagnosis-Related Group (DRG) reimbursement codes for hyperthermia. Furthermore, we urge a strategic fiscal review to eliminate the crippling 21% VAT barrier currently imposed on medical technology and specific consumables. Resolving these financial blockades is critical to ensuring equitable patient access across the public healthcare sector, preventing the privatization of survival.
- **To the Romanian College of Physicians (CMR):** SRHO seeks the formal recognition of oncological hyperthermia as a validated, evidence-based scientific field. Furthermore, we propose a strategic collaboration, requesting the official designation of SRHO as the primary scientific reference society and expert partner of the CMR in this domain within Romania. Rather than acting as a restrictive regulatory body, SRHO—in strict collaboration with ESHO, DGHT e.V., SIIO, and other European sister societies—aims to provide scientific guidance, education, and clinical mentorship. In this collaborative capacity, SRHO will assist the CMR in establishing and continually optimizing the national two-tiered Practice Standards and Quality Assurance (QA/QC) frameworks, ensuring that clinical excellence is achieved through professional support rather than administrative policing [43].

## 10.3. Implementation Recommendations in Romania

To ensure a structured, evidence-based, and economically viable rollout, SRHO recommends the official inclusion of hyperthermia in national oncology protocols based on the following stratification:

- **Mandatory Standard of Care (Level 1A & 1B Evidence):** Hyperthermia must be integrated as a standard, non-optional modality for Locally Advanced Cervical Cancer, High-Risk Soft Tissue Sarcoma, Head & Neck Cancers, Recurrent Breast Cancer, Locally Advanced Rectal Cancer, High-Risk NMIBC, and Esophageal Carcinoma. For these indications, the level of evidence necessitates immediate inclusion to guarantee patient access to the highest proven survival and local control indices [13, 16, 18, 19, 47, 48].
- **Essential Palliative Standard:** Based on definitive Phase III trials, systemic and regional hyperthermia should be mandated as a primary palliative intervention for Refractory Bone Metastases to accelerate pain relief, drastically reduce opioid dependence, and quickly restore patient mobility and dignity [21, 22].
- **Complementary Therapeutic Option (Level 2 Evidence):** For historically refractory indications where standard therapies have reached a plateau—such as Glioblastoma, Pancreatic Cancer, Malignant Melanoma, and Hepatocellular Carcinoma—SRHO recommends the inclusion of hyperthermia as a validated complementary modality. While awaiting broad Phase III confirmation, its multidisciplinary use should be actively encouraged to enhance individual patient outcomes and maximize palliative success [23, 25, 27, 29].
- **Center Accreditation (The Tiered Framework):** A national framework must be established for the accreditation of treatment hubs. To prevent unethical technical barriers to treatment, Tier 1 centers will operate utilizing validated native monitoring systems for immediate patient access. Simultaneously, Tier 2 Centers of Excellence will be supported in adopting advanced ESHO/DGHT spatial thermometry to drive national research and optimal clinical reproducibility [41, 43].

# Section 11. Authorship, Committee Members, and Institutional Alignment

## Primary Authors & SRHO Coordination:

- **Cristian Gologan, M.Sc.** – Founder of the Romanian Society of Oncological Hyperthermia (SRHO); Project Manager, HEAT-UP Romanian Cluster.
- **Dr. Med. Veronica Iatan** – Co-Founder SRHO; Clinical Strategy Lead.
- **Prof. Dr. Codruț Munteanu** – Academic Coordinator of the SAB; Lead Medical Coordinator for Institutional Relations.

## International Scientific Reviewers & Endorsers:

- **Prof. Dr. Giammaria Fiorentini** – President of the Italian Society of Oncological Hyperthermia (SIIO). Role: Principal Scientific Reviewer & Level 1A Evidence Validator.
- **Dr. Hüseyin Sahinbas, MD** – President of the German Hyperthermia Society (DGHT-e.V.). Role: Director of International Standards, QA/QC Protocols, and European Certification Alignment.
- **Prof. Dr. Johannes Crezee** – President of the European Society for Hyperthermic Oncology (ESHO). Role: External Scientific Reviewer.

## Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) – Clinical Experts:

- **Ph.D. Virgiliu Vlaescu George** – President of the Scientific Advisory Board.
- **Clinical Partners:** Ph.D. Dr. med. Laurențiu Broscaru, Dr. med. Daniel Dâmboiu, Dr. med. Anca Nițulescu, Dr. med. Claudiu Mihăescu, Dr. med. Cristina Bălan, Prof. Dr. Constantin Volovăț( pending confirmation ), Dr. Ciprian Geneș.

## European Institutional Alignment: The HEAT-UP Consortium

In direct alignment with the objectives of this Whitepaper, the Romanian Society of Oncological Hyperthermia (SRHO) is an official partner and the designated Lead for Dissemination in the HEAT-UP European Consortium (Horizon Europe). This elite multinational initiative is coordinated by Amsterdam University Medical Center (UMC) and brings together leading European institutions, including Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Politecnico di Torino, Institut Català d'Oncologia (ICO), and Chalmers University of Technology.

The HEAT-UP project specifically addresses the unwarranted variation and underuse of oncological hyperthermia across European health systems. SRHO's active role in this consortium

ensures that the Romanian implementation roadmap, QA/QC standardization, and educational curricula are continuously synchronized with the latest European health technology assessments (HTA) and institutional integration strategies developed by Europe's top oncology centers.

## 11.1. Institutional Identity and Mission

The Romanian Society of Hyperthermic Oncology (SRHO) is a unique hybrid entity, established as a **Scientific Society** (with a medical profile) and a certified **Social Enterprise** (pursuant to Romanian Law no. 219/2015). This structure allows SRHO to operate at the intersection of clinical research and social advocacy:

- **As a Scientific Society:** It coordinates the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB), ensures the transfer of international QA/QC standards (ESHO/DGHT) to the Romanian medical landscape, and develops evidence-based clinical position papers.
- **As a Civil Society Organization (CSO):** It acts as a dedicated patient advocate, conducting free educational sessions and ensuring that oncological hyperthermia—a life-extending therapy—becomes accessible to the general public through strategic advocacy at the Ministry of Health.
- **As a Social Enterprise:** It ensures institutional self-sustainability while directly supporting cancer patients with essential educational information as well as direct financial assistance to access hyperthermia treatments. Unlike a traditional commercial dealer, proceeds from strategic partnerships are legally bound to be reinvested into the society's scientific and social mission, with no dividends distributed to the founders

## 11.2. Conflict of Interest (CoI) and Disclosures

In strict compliance with ICMJE (International Committee of Medical Journal Editors) standards, the authors and contributors declare the following.

**Structured ICMJE Disclosure Table:**

| **Contributor** | **Institutional Role** | **Financial Interest** | **Editorial Role** |
|---|---|---|---|
| **SRHO (Society)** | Lead Entity | Min. 90% of surplus is legally bound to social missions (Art 2.5 of Constitutive Act) | Full Independence |

| Contributor | Institutional Role | Financial Interest | Editorial Role |
|---|---|---|---|
| **C. Gologan / Dr. V. Iatan** | Founders | **None.** No personal dividends are extracted from commercial ties | Lead Authors |
| **SAB Members** | Scientific Board | **None.** Strictly prohibited by Art. 7.7 of the Constitutive Act | Reviewers |
| **Von Ardenne / Andromedic** | Data Contributors | Commercial Entities | Data Provision Only |

**Institutional Policy on Self-Sustainability & SAB Independence:** To ensure absolute scientific neutrality, **Article 7.7 of the SRHO Constitutive Act** explicitly prohibits the members of the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) from maintaining commercial, financial, or direct control relationships with any equipment manufacturers. Their involvement is exclusively academic and ethics-driven.

Furthermore, to maintain self-sustainability without relying solely on donations, the SRHO conducts economic activities (e.g., equipment intermediation). Under **Article 2.5 of the Constitutive Act**, the SRHO operates as a strict social enterprise, legally mandating that a minimum of 90% of all generated profit/surplus be reinvested directly into its social mission:

- Standardizing clinical protocols and providing direct financial assistance to vulnerable patients to facilitate their access to hyperthermia treatments.
- Conducting free educational and counseling sessions for patients based on peer-reviewed clinical evidence.
- Funding Continuing Medical Education (CME) activities, developing and maintaining academic platforms.
- Strategic advocacy directed towards the Ministry of Health (MS) for the integration of clinically validated therapies, actively supporting patients' interests and their right to equitable access to life-extending treatments.

The founders (C. Gologan and Dr. V. Iatan) extract no personal financial dividends from these commercial partnerships.

**Independent Peer-Review & Validation Framework:** To further guarantee that all clinical recommendations are entirely decoupled from commercial ties, the following editorial protocol is strictly enforced:

- **Drafting and Internal Validation:** The elaboration, revision, and primary validation of all official documents (including this Whitepaper) are conducted exclusively by the independent members of the SRHO Scientific Advisory Board (SAB).
- **International Peer-Review:** All scientific content and evidence grading undergo continuous external review by independent international bodies, including the **Italian Society of Oncological Hyperthermia (SIIO)**, the **German Hyperthermia Society (DGHT e.V.)**, and leading experts from the **European Society for Hyperthermic Oncology (ESHO)** (e.g., Prof. Johannes Crezee).
- **Objective:** This multi-layered validation process ensures that the clinical roadmap remains an independent, evidence-based instrument for public health, free from any industry bias.

# Section 12. Bibliography


[1] **Dewey, W. C. (1984):** Interaction of Heat and Radiation. *Radiation Research*.

[2] **Overgaard, J. (1984):** Rationale and Clinical Use of Hyperthermia with Radiation. *International Journal of Radiation Oncology, Biology, Physics*.

[3] **Cihoric et al. (2020):** Hyperthermia, radiation and chemotherapy: the role of heat in multidisciplinary cancer care. *Rad Oncol*.

[4] **Hahn, G. M. (1979):** Potential for therapy of drugs and hyperthermia. *Cancer Research*.

[5] **Hildebrandt, B., et al. (2002):** The role of hyperthermia and its interaction with chemotherapy and radiation in deep-seated tumors. *Critical Reviews in Oncology/Hematology*.

[6] **Sen A., et al. (2011)**: Thermoregulatory responses to mild systemic thermal stress increase tumor perfusion... *Cancer Res*.

[7] **Toyota N., et al. (1997):** Long-duration, mild whole body hyperthermia with cisplatin: tumour response and kinetics of apoptosis and necrosis... Int. J. Hyperthermia.

[8] **Multhoff G. (2009):** Activation of natural killer (NK) cells by heat shock protein 70... *Int J Hyperthermia*. [9] Wang X.Y., et al. (2001): Characterization of heat shock protein 110 and glucose-regulated protein 170 as cancer vaccines... *J of Immunology*.

**[10] Dayanc BE, Repasky EA, et al.** Enhancement of NK cell cytotoxic activity by mild thermal stress. *Int J Hyperthermia*. 2008;24(1):59-71.DOI: 10.1189/jlb.1106699

[11] **Zschaeck S. and Beck M. (2025):** Whole-Body Hyperthermia in Oncology: Renaissance in the Immunotherapy Era?

[12] **Abreu MM, et al. (2025):** From cold to hot: mechanisms of hyperthermia in modulating tumor immunology for enhanced immunotherapy. *Front Immunol*.

[13] **Colombo R, Da Pozzo LF, Salonia A, et al.** Multicenter study comparing intravesical chemotherapy alone and with local microwave hyperthermia for prophylaxis of recurrence of superficial transitional cell carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol*. 2003;21(23):4270-4274. DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2003.01.089

[14] **Guerrero-Ramos F, et al.** Recirculating hyperthermic intravesical chemotherapy with mitomycin C (HIVEC) versus BCG in high-risk non-muscle-invasive bladder cancer. *Eur Urol Oncol*. 2022;5(4):444-451 DOI:10.1007/s00345-022-03928-1

[15] **Sousa A, et al.** Efficacy of HIVEC in patients with high-risk non-muscle invasive bladder cancer who are contraindicated to BCG and in patients who fail BCG therapy. *Int J Hyperthermia*. 2021;38(1):122-128 doi: 10.1080/02656736.2021.2002435

[16] **Ott OJ, Gani C, Lindner LH, Schmidt M, Lamprecht U, Abdel-Rahman S, Hinke A, Weissmann T, Hartmann A, Issels RD, Zips D, Belka C, Grützmann R, Fietkau R**. Neoadjuvant Chemoradiation Combined with Regional Hyperthermia in Locally Advanced or Recurrent Rectal Cancer. Cancers (Basel). 2021 Mar 13;13(6):1279. doi: 10.3390/cancers13061279. PMID: 33805731; PMCID: PMC8001688.

[17] **Peters, L. J. et al. (1993)**: Phase III trial of combined hyperthermia and radiation for locally advanced cervical carcinoma.

[18] **Lutgens, L. et al. (2010):** Combined use of hyperthermia and radiation therapy for treating locally advanced cervical carcinoma. *Cochrane Review*.

[19] **Casali PG, Abecassis N, Aro HT, et al.** Soft tissue and visceral sarcomas: **ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up.** *Ann Oncol*. 2018;29(Suppl 4):iv51-iv67. DOI: 10.1093/annonc/mdy096

[20] **NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines (2015):** Inclusion of Hyperthermia in the treatment of Breast Cancer recurrences.

[21] **Chi, M. S., et al. (2017)**: Randomized Phase III Trial of Radiofrequency Hyperthermia with Radiotherapy for Painful Bone Metastases.

[22] **Faghihi Moghaddam F, Bakhshandeh M, Mofid B, Sahinbas H, Faeghi F, Mirzaei H, Rakhsha A, Yousefi Kashi AS, Sadeghi R, Mahdavi A.** Clinical effectiveness of combined whole body hyperthermia and external beam radiation therapy (EBRT) versus EBRT alone in patients with painful bony metastases: A phase III clinical trial study. J Therm Biol. 2024 Feb;120:103804. doi: 10.1016/j.jtherbio.2024.103804. Epub 2024 Feb 23. PMID: 38460451.

[23] **Szasz AM, Arrojo Alvarez EE, Fiorentini G, Herold M, Herold Z, Sarti D, Dank M.** Meta-Analysis of Modulated Electro-Hyperthermia and Tumor Treating Fields in the Treatment of Glioblastomas. Cancers (Basel). 2023 Jan 31;15(3):880. doi: 10.3390/cancers15030880. PMID: 36765840; PMCID: PMC9913117.

[24] **Fiorentini G, Sarti D, Milandri C, et al.** Modulated Electrohyperthermia in Integrative Cancer Treatment for Relapsed Malignant Glioblastoma and Astrocytoma: Retrospective Multicenter Controlled Study. *Front Oncol*. 2019;9:126. DOI: 10.1177/1534735418812691

[25] **Lee SY, et al.** Current understanding of modulated electro-hyperthermia in cancer treatment. *Kosin Med J*. 2024;39(1):15-26. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7180/kmj.24.127

[26] **Chua, T. C. et al.s (2012):** Cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for colorectal carcinomatosis: a meta-analysis of survival outcomes. *J Gastrointest Surg*.

[27] **Vrouenraets, B. C. et al. (2004):** Hyperthermia and isolated limb perfusion with melphalan for melanoma. *The Lancet*.

[28] **Datta et al. (2019):** Hyperthermia and immunotherapy: clinical opportunities. *Int J Hyperthermia*.

[29] **Vogl, T. J. et al. (2006):** Regional hyperthermia and transarterial chemoembolization (TACE) in hepatocellular carcinoma. *Int J Hyperthermia*.

[30] **Laskar et al. (2023):** A Review of the Current Clinical Evidence for Loco-Regional Moderate Hyperthermia in the Adjunct Management of Cancers. *Cancers (Basel)*.

[31] **Peeters H, van Zwol EM, Brancato L, M C da Cunha MG, Bogers J.** Systematic review of the registered clinical trials for oncological hyperthermia treatment. Int J Hyperthermia. 2022;39(1):806-812. doi: 10.1080/02656736.2022.2076292. PMID: 35710344.

[32] **Tsai TF, Hwang TI, Chen PC, Chen YC, Chou KY, Ho CY, Chen HE, Chang AC.** Hyperthermia reduces cancer cell invasion and combats chemoresistance and immune evasion in human bladder cancer. Int J Oncol. 2024 Dec;65(6):116. doi: 10.3892/ijo.2024.5704. Epub 2024 Nov 8. PMID: 39513598; PMCID: PMC11575926.

[33] **Jo Y, Han YI, Lee E, Seo J, Oh G, Sung H, Gi Y, Kim H, Park S, Yoon M.** The combination of tumor treating fields and hyperthermia has synergistic therapeutic effects in glioblastoma cells by downregulating STAT3. Am J Cancer Res. 2022 Mar 15;12(3):1423-1432. PMID: 35411245; PMCID: PMC8984886.

[34] **Vaupel P., Krüger W. (1995):** Wärmetherapie mit wassergefilterter Infrarot-A-Strahlung, Grundlagen und Anwendungsmöglichkeiten. *Hippokrates Verlag*.

[35] **Bull JM, Scott GL, Strebel FR, Nagle VL, Oliver D, Redwine M, Rowe RW, Ahn CW, Koch SM.** Fever-range whole-body thermal therapy combined with cisplatin, gemcitabine, and daily interferon-alpha: a description of a phase I-II protocol. Int J Hyperthermia. 2008 Dec;24(8):649-62. doi: 10.1080/02656730802104740. PMID: 18608594.

[36] Zhang H, et al. (2005): Comparison of the anti-tumor effects of various whole-body hyperthermia protocols… *Immunol Invest*.

[37] **Ciocca D. R., et al. (2017):** Immunomodulatory properties of hyperthermia. *Int J Hyperthermia*.

[38] **Toraya-Brown S, Fiering S.** Local tumour hyperthermia as immunotherapy for metastatic cancer. Int J Hyperthermia. 2014 Dec;30(8):531-9. doi: 10.3109/02656736.2014.968640. PMID: 25430985; PMCID: PMC4558619.

[39] **Maeda, A., et al. (2022):** Fever-range hyperthermia improves CD8+ T-cell infiltration into tumors by activating IL-6 trans-signaling in tumor vessels. *Cancer Research*.

[40] **Yao, J., et al. (2019):** Regional Hyperthermia Combined with Chemotherapy in Advanced Gastric Cancer. *Journal of Cancer*.

[41] **Wust, P., et al. (2010):** A review of hyperthermia combined with radiotherapy/chemotherapy on malignant tumors. *Critical Reviews in Biomedical Engineering*.

[42] **Issels R. D. et al. (2021):** The role of hyperthermia in cancer treatment: A European perspective. *European Journal of Cancer*.

[43] **Sahinbas H., et al. (2023):** *Informationen zur Hyperthermie als ergänzende Therapie zu Chemotherapie und/oder Strahlentherapie bei Tumorerkrankungen. Official Report to the German Federal Ministry of Health (G-BA).* DGHT Scientific Repository.

**[44] Contreras, J., et al. (2019)**: *Guidelines of the Spanish Society of Radiotherapy Oncology (SEOR) for the use of hyperthermia in oncology*. Clinical and Translational Oncology.

**[45] Datta, N.R., et al. (2019):** *Efficacy and Safety Evaluation of the Various Therapeutic Options in Locally Advanced Cervix Cancer: A Systematic Review and Network Meta-Analysis of Randomized Clinical Trials*. International Journal of Radiation Oncology, Biology, Physics.

**[46] Datta, N.R., et al. (2016):** *Hyperthermia and Radiation Therapy in Locoregional Recurrent Breast Cancers: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis*. International Journal of Radiation Oncology, Biology, Physics.

**[47] Datta, N.R., et al. (2016):** *Hyperthermia and radiotherapy in the management of head and neck cancers: A systematic review and meta-analysis*. International Journal of Hyperthermia.

**[48] Kitamura, K., et al. (1995):** *Prospective randomized study of hyperthermia combined with chemoradiotherapy for esophageal carcinoma*. Journal of Surgical Oncology.

**[49] Merten, R., et al. (2019):** *Long-Term Experience of Chemoradiotherapy Combined with Deep Regional Hyperthermia for Organ Preservation in High-Risk Bladder Cancer (Ta, Tis, T1, T2)*. The Oncologist.

**[50] Arends, T.J., et al. (2016):** *Results of a Randomised Controlled Trial Comparing Intravesical Chemohyperthermia with Mitomycin C Versus Bacillus Calmette-Guerin for Adjuvant Treatment*

*of Patients with Intermediate- and High-risk Non–Muscle-invasive Bladder Cancer*. European Urology.

**[51] Sugimachi, K., et al. (1994):** *Chemotherapy combined with or without hyperthermia for patients with esophageal carcinoma: a prospective randomized trial*. International Journal of Hyperthermia.

**[52] Huilgol, N.G., et al. (2012):** *Hyperthermia with radiation in the treatment of locally advanced head and neck cancer: a report of a randomized trial*. Journal of Cancer Research and Therapeutics.

**[53] Robins HI, et al.** Immunological effects of whole-body hyperthermia in cancer patients. *Cancer*. 1989.

**[54] Burd R, et al.** Whole-body hyperthermia and systemic immune activation. *Cancer Res*. 1998.

**[55] Dinarello CA, et al.** Fever-range whole body hyperthermia and IL-6/TNF production: human clinical data. *J Endotoxin Res*.

**[56] Fiorentini G, Sarti D, Mambrini A, Hammarberg Ferri I, Bonucci M, Sciacca PG, Ballerini M, Bonanno S, Milandri C, Nani R, Guadagni S, Dentico P, Fiorentini C.** Hyperthermia combined with chemotherapy vs chemotherapy in patients with advanced pancreatic cancer: A multicenter retrospective observational comparative study. World J Clin Oncol 2023; 14(6): 215-226 [PMID: 37398545 DOI: 10.5306/wjco.v14.i6.215]

[57] Abreu MM, Chocron AF, Smadja DM. From cold to hot: mechanisms of hyperthermia in modulating tumor immunology for enhanced immunotherapy. Front Immunol. 2025;16:1487296 [1].

[58] Li N, Yu J, Wang R, Gong G. Recent advances in preclinical studies combining hyperthermia therapy with novel immune checkpoint targeting agents. Front Immunol. 2026;17:1722115 [2].

[59] Jiang J, Li H, Ma Q, et al. Synergies between radiotherapy and immunotherapy: A systematic review from mechanism to clinical application. Front Immunol. 2025;16:1554499 [3].

[60] Evans SS, Wang WC, Bain MD, et al. Fever range hyperthermia dynamically regulates lymphocyte delivery to high endothelial venules. Blood. 2001;97(9):2727-2733 [4].

[61] Chen Q, Fisher DT, Clancy KA, et al. Fever-range thermal stress promotes lymphocyte trafficking across high endothelial venules via an interleukin 6 trans-signaling mechanism. Nat Immunol. 2006;7(12):1299-1308 [5].

[62] Ngwa W, Irabor OC, Schoenfeld JD, et al. Using immunotherapy to boost the abscopal effect. Nat Rev Cancer. 2018;18(5):313-322 [6].

[63] Berclaz LM, Burkhard-Meier A, Lechner A, et al. Durable response to nivolumab in combination with regional hyperthermia in a patient with PD-L1-negative metastatic head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. Cancer Immunol Immunother. 2025;74:174 ``.

[64] ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT07118566. Hyperthermia Combined With Immune Checkpoint Inhibitors in the Treatment of Advanced Gastrointestinal Malignancies With Liver Metastases. Updated 2025 [7].

[65] Li D, Xie K, Wolff, et al. The MATTERS Trial: Safety and Tolerability of Whole-Body Hyperthermia at 41.50°C in Combination with Chemotherapy in Metastatic Cancer Patients. Cancer Res Commun. 2026;6(2):273 [8].

[66] Liu S, et al. Targeted hyperthermia therapy (THT) using gold nanorods remodels the tumor microenvironment to sensitize murine microsatellite-stable colorectal cancer to immune checkpoint blockade. Sona Nanotech Preclinical Research. 2024-2025 [9].

[67] Zhang B, Qi R. The dual-function of HSP70 in immune response and tumor immunity: From molecular regulation to therapeutic innovations. Front Immunol. 2025;16:1587414 [10].

[68] Mohammadpour H, et al. β2-adrenergic receptor-mediated signaling regulates the immunosuppressive potential of myeloid-derived suppressor cells. J Clin Invest. 2019;129(12):5537-5552 ``.

[69] Zhou G, Sun B, Zhang F, et al. Radiofrequency hyperthermia enhances the antitumor efficacy of oncolytic peptide LTX-315 in liver cancer cells by activating of cGAS-STING pathway. Int J Hyperthermia. 2025;42(1):2511031 ``.

[70] Blaeschke F, et al. Induction of a central memory and stem cell memory phenotype in functionally active CD4+ and CD8+ CAR T cells. Cancer Immunol Immunother. 2018;67(7):1053-1066 ``.

[71] Issels RD, Lindner LH, Verweij J, et al. Effect of Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy Plus Regional Hyperthermia on Long-term Outcomes Among Patients With Localized High-Risk Soft Tissue Sarcoma: The EORTC 62961-ESHO 95 Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Oncol.* 2018;4(4):483–492.

[72] Datta NR, et al. Comparative Meta-analysis of HTRT vs IMRT vs SBRT in Recurrent Head and Neck Cancers. *(Submission in progress, presented at Oncologic Hyperthermia Symposium, June 2026).*

[73] Vasanthan A, Mitsumori M, Park JH, et al. Regional hyperthermia combined with radiotherapy for uterine cervical cancers: a multi-institutional prospective randomized trial of the international atomic energy agency. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2005;61(1):145-153.

[74] Minnaar CA, Kotzen JA, Ayeni OA, et al. The effect of modulated electro-hyperthermia on local disease control in HIV-positive and -negative cervical cancer women in South Africa: a randomised controlled trial. *PLoS One.* 2019;14(6):e0217894.

[75] Fang H, Zhang Y, Wu Z, et al. Regional hyperthermia combined with chemotherapy in advanced gastric cancer. Open Med (Wars). 2019;14:85-90.

[76] Shchepotin IB, Evans SR, Chorny V, et al. Intensive preoperative radiotherapy with local hyperthermia for the treatment of gastric carcinoma. Surg Oncol. 1994;3(1):37-44.

[77] Mitsumori M, Zeng ZF, Oliynychenko P, et al. Regional hyperthermia combined with radiotherapy for locally advanced non-small cell lung cancers: a multi-institutional prospective randomized trial of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Int J Clin Oncol. 2007;12(3):192-198.

[78] Shen H, Li XD, Wu CP, Yin YM, Wang RS, Shu YQ. The regimen of gemcitabine and cisplatin combined with radio frequency hyperthermia for advanced non-small cell lung cancer: a phase II study. Int J Hyperthermia. 2011;27(1):27-32.

[79] Hu Y, Li Z, Mi DH, et al. Chemoradiation combined with regional hyperthermia for advanced oesophageal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Clin Pharm Ther. 2017;42(2):155-164.

[80] Overgaard J, Gonzalez Gonzalez D, Hulshof MC, et al. Randomised trial of hyperthermia as adjuvant to radiotherapy for recurrent or metastatic malignant melanoma. European Society for Hyperthermic Oncology. Lancet. 1995;345(8949):540-543.

[81] Ott OJ, Schmidt M, Semrau S, Strnad V, Matzel KE, Schneider I, Raptis D, Uter W, Grützmann R, Fietkau R. Chemoradiotherapy with and without deep regional hyperthermia for squamous cell carcinoma of the anus. Strahlentherapie und Onkologie. 2019 Jan;195(1):22-31. doi: 10.1007/s00066-018-1396-x. PMID: 30386884.

# Appendix A: Implementation and Education Framework.

***Introductory Note:*** *To ensure the clinical safety and technical proficiency described in the primary chapters of this Whitepaper, SRHO has developed a comprehensive educational roadmap. This framework is designed to bridge the current training and legislative gap in Romania through standardized university-level modules and Continuing Medical Education (CME). Ultimately, this educational structure serves as a vital patient safety measure, shielding patients from the risks of uncertified practices while protecting medical professionals from malpractice liabilities.*

## A.1. Implementation Roadmap in Romania: The Path of the Complementary Studies Certificate

SRHO recommends that professional recognition follow the pragmatic success model established by Ozone Therapy and Hyperbaric Medicine, focusing on obtaining a "Certificate of Complementary Studies" (Atestat de Studii Complementare) from the Ministry of Health.

### A.1.1. Strategic Justification and Multidisciplinary Access

This model aims to establish state-regulated professional competence, ensuring that clinical implementation is led by experts and remains strictly evidence-based [41, 43]. Crucially, to serve the multidisciplinary nature of modern oncology, this certification is designed as an open framework. It is accessible to all relevant medical and surgical specialties within the Tumor Board (e.g., Medical Oncology, Radiotherapy, Surgical Oncology, Urology, Gynecologic Oncology, Dermatology), including physicians currently utilizing synergistic biophysical therapies such as Electrochemotherapy (ECT), Photodynamic Therapy (PDT), Hyperbaric Oxygen Therapy (HBOT) as well as Ozone Therapy. This ensures that any relevant specialist can integrate hyperthermia into their therapeutic arsenal without future bureaucratic barriers.

### A.1.2. Detailed Action Plan (Pragmatic Roadmap)

- **Phase I: Standardization and International Capital (0–12 Months):**
    - *Strategic Objective:* Accumulation of ESHO/DGHT/SIIO expertise and local validation.
    - *Action:* Official launch of this Whitepaper, adoption of European QA/QC guidelines, and the initial certification of a core group of Romanian doctors through modular international courses [43].

- *Immediate Output:* Formal Practice Standards and the Certification of the 1st Batch of specialized doctors.

- **Phase II: Academic Integration and the "Barcelona Model" (12–24 Months):**
  - *Strategic Objective:* Obtaining University of Medicine and Pharmacy (UMF) approval for the training curriculum.
  - *Action:* Following the successful educational precedent set by the Spanish Society of Radiotherapy Oncology (SEOR) at the University of Barcelona [44], SRHO will present the complete curriculum dossier to a partner Romanian UMF. Concurrently, SRHO will initiate an interdisciplinary "Consensus Task Force," inviting the Romanian Societies of Oncology and Radiotherapy to co-review this Whitepaper, mirroring the successful Spanish trajectory to provide the Ministry of Health with a unified professional voice.
  - *Immediate Output:* UMF approval of the Curriculum and submission of the MS application dossier.
- **Phase III: Final Recognition and Reimbursement (24+ Months):**
  - *Strategic Objective:* Formal introduction of the domain into the National Catalog and establishment of financial sustainability.
  - *Action:* Issuance of a Ministry of Health Order (OM) recognizing Oncological Hyperthermia as a Medical Competency obtainable through a national exam, accompanied by the implementation of specific CNAS reimbursement codes (DRG) based on HEAT-UP health economics data.
  - *Immediate Output:* National Competence (Certificate of Complementary Studies) and equitable patient access.

### A.1.3. Health Policy Requests (To the CMR and MS)

- **To the Romanian College of Physicians (CMR):** Formal recognition of Oncological Hyperthermia as a valid scientific field and the designation of SRHO as the primary collaborative partner and scientific reference society. SRHO will assist the CMR in establishing national Practice Standards and CME frameworks based on ESHO/DGHT validations, providing professional mentorship rather than administrative policing [41, 42].
- **To the Ministry of Health (MS) and UMF:** Formal request to initiate the accreditation process for the Certificate of Complementary Studies in Oncological Hyperthermia,

justified by the scientific rigor of this Whitepaper and the urgent need to protect patient safety [43].

## A.2. Training and Accreditation Mechanism (Course Structure)

### A.2.1. Training Structure and International Partnership

To ensure that oncological hyperthermia is practiced with the highest level of clinical integrity, the 140-hour training program is designed in direct collaboration with leading European societies.

To guarantee that Romanian medical education strictly mirrors the highest European standards, the critical QA/QC, dosimetry, and clinical modules will not be developed in isolation. They will be directly coordinated and taught by world-renowned authorities in oncological hyperthermia, notably **Dr. Hüseyin Sahinbas** (President of DGHT e.V.) and **Prof. Dr. Giammaria Fiorentini** (President of SIIO), alongside other leading ESHO experts. Hosting this trans-national faculty within a Romanian UMF positions Romania as a pioneering educational hub, exporting a unified, high-quality university standard.

### A.2.2. Structure of Continuing Medical Education (CME/MSC) Courses

The proposed training program consists of 140 total hours, structured into specialized modules that cover the entire spectrum of thermal oncology.

Recognizing the rapid technological evolution of the field, the curriculum features a dynamic, open-architecture design. While the foundational clinical application within Romania will initially prioritize Capacitive Radiofrequency (mEHT/RF) and Water-filtered Infrared-A (wIRA)—technologies extensively validated and directed by our core international faculty (Dr. Hüseyin Sahinbas and Prof. Dr. Giammaria Fiorentini)—the curriculum will actively leverage SRHO's position within the elite European HEAT-UP Consortium. This allows the progressive integration of highly specialized guest modules delivered by leading European partner institutions, ensuring Romanian physicians remain at the forefront of emerging biophysical therapies.

| *Module* | *Duration* | *Focus Area & Learning Objectives* |
|---|---|---|
| ***Module 1: Scientific and Regulatory Basis*** | *40h* | **Physics of electromagnetics, capacitive RF, and systemic wIRA.** *Introduction to advanced biophysics, including magnetic nanomedicine (facilitated by consortium experts from Trinity College Dublin).* **Cellular biology of heat, safety standards, and foundational ESHO/DGHT Guidelines [1, 3].** |
| ***Module 2: Loco-Regional & Local Hyperthermia*** | *40h* | **Deep and superficial clinical indications utilizing RF/mEHT. Advanced QA/QC protocols and thermometry standards (incorporating ESHO frameworks developed by Amsterdam UMC).** *Emerging modules on microwave antenna technologies and radiotherapeutic energy focusing (facilitated by experts from Chalmers University and Bulovka University Hospital) [5, 41].* |
| ***Module 3: Whole Body Hyperthermia (WBH)*** | *40h* | **Clinical protocols for systemic integration utilizing wIRA technology. Managing indications, systemic immunological synergy, and identifying strict contraindications [11, 22].** |
| ***Practical: Clinical Application*** | *20h* | **Hands-on sessions involving system setup, patient positioning, real-time interpretation of thermometry, and executing clinical QA/QC protocols [43]**. |

# Appendix B Molecular Synergy and Immunotherapy Integration: Transitioning from "Cold" to "Hot" Tumors

## B.1. Immunogenic Cell Death (ICD) and Danger Signaling

Mild to moderate thermal stress (39.5°C–43°C) unequivocally induces Immunogenic Cell Death (ICD), converting malignant cells into an endogenous in situ vaccine [57]. ICD is characterized by the spatiotemporal emission of Damage-Associated Molecular Patterns (DAMPs) [57]. Thermal stress triggers the pre-apoptotic externalization of Calreticulin (CRT) to the outer leaflet of the plasma membrane, providing a critical "eat-me" signal to phagocytes [57]. Concurrently, hyperthermia forces the extracellular release of ATP, HMGB1, and Heat Shock Proteins, predominantly HSP70 and HSP90 [67]. These DAMPs facilitate the recruitment, maturation, and antigen cross-presentation capabilities of Dendritic Cells (DCs), ultimately leading to the robust priming of naive T cells [57, 67].

## B.2. Activation of the cGAS-STING Pathway

A pivotal 2024-2025 discovery in thermal immunology is the activation of the cGAS-STING (cyclic GMP-AMP synthase - stimulator of interferon genes) pathway [69]. Hyperthermia-induced DNA damage and genomic instability lead to the accumulation of cytosolic double-stranded DNA (dsDNA) [3]. This is detected by cGAS, triggering the STING pathway, which subsequently drives a massive production of Type I Interferons (IFN-α/β) [69]. This innate immune activation is essential for bridging the gap to adaptive immunity, directly enhancing the efficacy of subsequent immune checkpoint blockade [57, 69].

## B.3. Remodeling the TME:

MDSC Reprogramming and Treg Depletion Solid tumors evade immune surveillance by establishing an immunosuppressive TME dominated by Regulatory T cells (Tregs) and Myeloid-Derived Suppressor Cells (MDSCs) [57]. Recent preclinical data show that thermal treatments significantly limit MDSC accumulation by mitigating beta-adrenergic stress signaling [68]. Furthermore, localized heating reduces the viability and suppressive function of intra-tumoral Tregs, shifting the critical CD8+/Treg ratio heavily in favor of anti-tumor effector cells, promoting a Th1-polarized microenvironment [57].

## B.4. Systemic Immune Activation:

WBH and Accelerated Lymphocyte Trafficking Fever-range Whole-Body Hyperthermia (WBH) profoundly accelerates systemic immune surveillance [60]. Under physiological conditions, the entire pool of naive T cells within a murine or human lymph node turns over approximately 3 times per day [60]. WBH (38.5°C–40.0°C) dramatically accelerates this kinetic turnover [60 , 61]. Thermal stress activates Interleukin-6 (IL-6) trans-signaling, which selectively remodels High Endothelial Venules (HEVs) in secondary lymphoid organs by increasing L-selectin and alpha4beta7 integrin-dependent lymphocyte tethering [61]. This causes a 3- to 4-fold increase in lymphocyte trafficking across HEVs, mathematically maximizing the probability that a naive T-cell will encounter its specific tumor antigen [61].

## B.5. Synergy with Next-Generation Immune Checkpoints

While the synergy between HT and PD-1/PD-L1 is well documented, groundbreaking 2025/2026 reviews highlight that hyperthermia modulates a much broader range of next-generation immune checkpoints [58]. Thermal stress has been shown to upregulate the expression of co-stimulatory and inhibitory molecules including TIGIT/CD155, Tim-3/Gal-9, OX40, 4-1BB, and CD47/SIRPα [58]. By exposing these previously hidden targets on the surface of exhausted T cells and macrophages, hyperthermia effectively primes the tumor for dual-checkpoint blockade and novel agonistic antibody therapies, positioning it as a universal sensitizer for future immunotherapeutics [58].

## B.6. The Abscopal Effect and Memory Stem T Cells (TSCM)

The localized thermal destruction of the primary tumor, paired with checkpoint blockade, generates systemic, tumor-specific memory T-cells [70, 62]. Emerging evidence indicates that hyperthermia promotes the induction of T memory stem cells (TSCM)—a rare, long-lived subset of T cells with immense self-renewal capacity [70]. The generation of TSCMs ensures durable, long-term antitumor immunity, providing the mechanistic basis for the abscopal effect observed in clinically responding patients [62].

---

# Appendix C: Preclinical Rationale (Biological Plausibility Only).

*Introductory Note: While the clinical efficacy of oncological hyperthermia is established through Phase III randomized trials, its underlying mechanisms—including heat-shock protein (HSP70) release, immunomodulation, and radiosensitization—are supported by extensive preclinical research. The following data provides the biological context for the synergistic effects observed in clinical practice.*

*"Disclaimer: None of the references in this annex is used to support any clinical efficacy claim in the main body."*

**B. Postulated Mechanisms (Preclinical / In Vitro Evidence)** The following mechanisms are extensively supported by *in vitro* and murine models, providing the biological rationale for ongoing human trials:

- **HSP Release & Danger Signaling:** Preclinical models demonstrate that thermal stress induces the massive release of Heat Shock Proteins (e.g., HSP70, HSP110). These proteins act as endogenous adjuvants, facilitating tumor antigen uptake by Dendritic Cells (DCs) [8, 9, 36].
- **Enhanced Lymphocyte Infiltration:** Murine models show that fever-range hyperthermia improves CD8+ T-cell infiltration into tumors by activating IL-6 trans-signaling in tumor vessels [39].
- **NK Cell Activation:** *In vitro* evaluations suggest an enhancement of Natural Killer (NK) cell cytotoxic activity following mild thermal stress [10].
- **Calreticulin (CRT) Translocation & Immunomodulation:** Comprehensive reviews of preclinical data suggest HT triggers the "Eat-Me" signal on the cell surface, making cancer cells visible to the immune system [37].

# Annex 1 Official Memorandum of Endorsement and Academic Consensus

**Subject:** Institutional Seal and Reference Framework for the SRHO National Whitepaper
**Document Reference:** Therapeutic Integration of Hyperthermia in Modern Oncology

This Memorandum serves as the official foundation for the institutional recognition of Oncological Hyperthermia in Romania. The attached Whitepaper has undergone a rigorous peer-review and validation process to ensure strict alignment with European standards (QA/QC).

We, the undersigned—authors, international society presidents, clinical experts, and academic reviewers—certify that this document provides a validated medical and legal roadmap to integrate this Level 1A evidence-based therapy into the national healthcare system. This document represents our shared intellectual property and agreed clinical consensus.

**Primary Authors & SRHO Coordination**

**Cristian Gologan, M.Sc.** Founder, Romanian Society of Oncological Hyperthermia (SRHO)

---

**Dr. Med. Veronica Iatan** Co-Founder, SRHO

---

**Senior International Coordinators & Institutional Validation**

**Prof. Dr. Giammaria Fiorentini** President, Italian Society of Oncological Hyperthermia (SIIO)

---

**Dr. Hüseyin Sahinbas, MD** President, German Hyperthermia Society (DGHT e.V.)

---

**Prof. Dr. Johannes Crezee** President, European Society for Hyperthermic Oncology (ESHO)

---

**Dr. Jorge Contreras Martínez** President, Spanish Society of Radiotherapy Oncology (SEOR)

---

**SRHO Scientific Advisory Board (Leadership & Clinical Experts)**

_____**Ph.D. Virgiliu Vlaescu George** (President SAB)
_____**Prof. Dr. Codruț Munteanu** (Academic Coordinator)
_____ **Ph.D. Dr. med. Laurențiu Broscaru**
_____ **Dr. med. Daniel Dâmboiu**
_____ **Dr. med. Anca Nițulescu**
_____ **Dr. med. Claudiu Mihăescu**
_____ **Dr. med. Cristina Bălan**
_____ **Prof. Dr. Constantin Volovăț**
_____ **Dr. med. Ciprian Geneș**
_____ **Ph.D. Dr. med. Valentin Popescu**
_____ **Dr. med. Dragoș Matei**
_____ **Dr. med.**
_____ **Dr. med.**
_____ **Dr. med.**
_____ **Dr. med.**
_____ **Dr. med.**

**International Peer-Reviewers & Data Contributors**

*DGHT & German Institutional Members:*

_____ **Dr. med. Alexander von Ardenne**
_____ **Dipl.ing. Andrej Wolf**
_____ **PhD Dr. Noah Molinski**
_____ **Dr. med. Wilfried Stücker, Ph.D.**
_____ **Dr. med. Peter van de Vliet, Ph.D.**
_____ **Dr. med. Montassar Cherif**
_____ **Dr. med. Peter Wolf**
_____ **Dr. Samuel Alexander Meister**
_____ **Dr. med. Wolfgang Wöppel**
_____ **Dr. med.**
_____ **Dr. med.**

*SIIO & Italian Institutional Members:*

_____ **Dr. med. Salvatore Conte**
_____ **ing. Ciro Zaccagnini**

_____ **Dr. med.**

_____ **Dr. med.**

_____ **Dr. med.**

_____ **Dr. med.**

_____ **Dr. med.**

_____ **Dr. med.**

_____ **Dr. med.**

_____ **Dr. med.**

_____ **Dr. med.**

*SEOR & Spanish Institutional Members:*

_____ **Dr. med.**

_____ **Dr. med.**

_____ **Dr. med.**

_____ **Dr. med.**

_____ **Dr. med.**

_____ **Dr. med.**

_____ **Dr. med.**

_____ **Dr. med.**

_____ **Dr. med.**

_____ **Dr. med.**

_____ **Dr. med.**