



Pattern of nutritional status in node-negative versus node-positive head and neck cancer patients undergoing treatment: a prospective cohort study

Anshika Arora³ · Sunil Saini¹ · Meenu Gupta²

Received: 13 November 2021 / Accepted: 20 June 2022 / Published online: 29 June 2022
© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2022

Abstract

Purpose The aim of this study was to study the nutritional profile of node-negative and node-positive patients undergoing treatment for head and neck squamous cell cancer (HNSCC).

Methods This prospective cohort study was conducted between 2018 and 2020. Patients diagnosed with HNSCC, planned for treatment, were enrolled after written informed consent. In node-negative (N0) and node-positive (N+) cohorts of patients, nutritional status was determined using anthropometric measures and Subjective Global Assessment (SGA) scale pre-treatment, and during and after treatment. Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS version 22. Data was analyzed using parametric and non-parametric tests, and *p* value of 0.05 was considered significant.

Results In total, 161 patients were analyzed, 73 N0 and 88 N+ cohorts. Pre-treatment, 9.6 to 20.4% patients in N0 and 23.9 to 32.8% patients in N+ cohorts were malnourished. Incidence of malnutrition at completion of treatment was 40.8 to 52.5% overall, 20.5 to 41.1% N0, and 39.5 to 62.8% N+. Mean reduction in weight ($11.1\% \pm 7.82$ vs $6.26\% \pm 8.3$, $p=0.000$), mean reduction in BMI (2.57 ± 1.87 vs 1.29 ± 1.62 , $p=0.000$), median reduction in MUAC (2 cm vs 1 cm, $p=0.000$), and median increase in SGA score (13 vs 6, $p=0.000$) were higher in multi-modality as compared to those in a single-modality treatment. Similar findings were noted in N0 and N+ cohorts.

Conclusion As compared to N0, N+ patients had higher burden of malnutrition at diagnosis, and more worsening of nutritional parameters during treatment. More decline in nutritional status was seen in patients receiving multi-modality as compared to single-modality treatment.

Keywords Malnutrition in cancer · Node-positive head and neck cancer · Subjective Global Assessment scale · Nutrition support in cancer

Background

Head and neck squamous cell cancer (HNSCC) is the 6th most common cancer in the world; in 2018, there were 890,000 new cases and 450,000 deaths. The incidence is anticipated to increase by 30% by 2030 (Global Cancer Observatory (GLOBOCAN)) [1–3]. In India, the estimated age-standardized rate for incidence of HNSCC was > 10.7 per 100,000 (GLOBOCAN 2018); in the USA, this is 7.5–10.7 per 100,000. The high incidence in the South Asian region is associated with consumption of carcinogenic-containing products like oral tobacco and areca nut, and alcohol abuse, whereas oropharyngeal infection with HPV contributes to the high incidence in the West [4–6]. HNSCC is treated with a single-modality or multi-modality

✉ Sunil Saini
anshikaarora@srhu.edu.in

¹ Department of Surgical Oncology, Cancer Research Institute, Himalayan Institute of Medical Sciences, Swami Rama Himalayan University, Dehradun, India

² Department of Radiation Oncology, Cancer Research Institute, Himalayan Institute of Medical Sciences, Swami Rama Himalayan University, Dehradun, India

³ Department of Oncological Sciences, Associate Professor, Department of Surgical Oncology, Cancer Research Institute, Himalayan Institute of Medical Sciences, Swami Rama Himalayan University, Dehradun, India

approach—surgical resection, radiation, or chemotherapy plus radiation depending on the disease stage.

Malnutrition is seen in 30–50% of HNSCC patients; around 30% patients have severe malnutrition and weight loss since 6 months prior to diagnosis. Chemotherapy worsens the nutritional intake due to digestive tract-related symptoms like loss of taste, mucositis, nausea, and vomiting [7]. Impairment related to swallowing and speech and xerostomia occur in ~50% of HNSCC patients following radiotherapy and these are often persistent long term [8]. The 2-year prevalence of dysphagia in HNSCC survivors is 45%; this is 4–8 times more than those who never had cancer [9]. Several studies have shown higher rates of treatment interruptions and less treatment effectiveness with high-grade mucositis [10]. Increased mortality and worse prognosis have been proposed to be associated with fat-free body mass loss related to malnutrition in cancer patients [11]. Indian data on nutritional profile of patients undergoing treatment for HNSCC with regard to node-negative and node-positive cohorts is lacking.

The aim of this study was to study the nutritional profile of node-negative and node-positive patients undergoing treatment for HNSCC.

Methods

This prospective cohort study was carried out at Cancer Research Institute, Himalayan Institute of Medical Sciences, Swami Rama Himalayan University, Dehradun, India, between 2018 and 2020, under Institutional Ethics Committee clearance number SRHU/HIMS/ETHICS/2018/115. The study population were patients starting treatment for HNSCC.

Inclusion criteria

Patients with diagnosed and previously untreated HNSCC planned for treatment.

Exclusion criteria

1. Previously treated for HNSCC with surgery, radiotherapy, or chemotherapy.
2. Metastatic disease at presentation.
3. Patient with skin, nasopharynx, or esophagus cancer or with metastasis from primary sites other than the head and neck.
4. Age less than 18 years.

Patients once diagnosed with HNSCC and planned for curative or palliative oncological treatment with single or multi-modality were approached for enrollment in the study and an informed written consent was obtained. They were

assessed for nutritional status before starting treatment, at the end of each treatment modality, and at completion of planned treatment. The following data were recorded:

- (a) Baseline data regarding patient demographics, disease, and treatment plan.
- (b) ECOG performance status (PS).
- (c) Nutritional status: weight, Subjective Global Assessment (SGA) score, mid-upper arm circumference (MUAC), body mass index (BMI), and hemoglobin

Based on the assumption that nutritional status may be different in patients with or without neck nodal metastasis, two cohorts were made based on the neck node status of the patient:

- (a) N0 cohort: patients with no node metastasis at presentation
- (b) N+ cohort: patients with node metastasis at presentation

The data were recorded, anonymized, and analyzed using the following statistical methods.

Statistical analysis

The data were entered in MS Excel 2010. Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS software version 22. The one-sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov test was used to determine whether datasets were different from normal distribution. Normally distributed data was analyzed using a parametric test: unpaired Student *T* test, paired-sample *T* test; non-normally distributed data using non-parametric tests: Mann–Whitney *U* test, Wilcoxon-signed rank test, marginal homogeneity test; and categorical data using Pearson Chi-square test. The level of significance was taken as $p < 0.05$.

Results

A total of 161 patients were enrolled in the study: 73 in N0 and 88 in N+cohorts, 88.2% were male, mean age 56.32 (± 13.27 SD) years, 60.8% in T3/4 stage, 40.4% patients received single-modality and 59.6% multi-modality treatment. The pre-treatment mean weight was 57.75 (± 11.77 SD) kg; BMI 21.58 (± 4.2 SD); hemoglobin 13.42 (± 1.77 SD) g/dl; MUAC 24.71 (± 3.78 SD) cm. The distribution of central tendencies of these parameters was similar in N0 and N+cohorts. Pre-treatment mean weight loss in N0 and N+cohorts was 4.25% and 7.93% ($p = 0.004$), mean SGA score 36.95 and 42.74 ($p = 0.000$) respectively (Table 1). In N0 and N+cohorts,

Table 1 Pre-treatment nutritional parameters (central tendencies) compared in node-negative and node-positive cohorts

Variable		Overall (N=161)	Node negative (N=73)	Node positive (N=88)	p value*
Weight (kg)	Mean	57.750	59.121	56.614	0.179
	Median	56	57	55	
	Range	30–97	38–97	30–85	
	SD	11.7713	12.0118	11.5125	
BMI	Mean	21.5822	22.2396	21.0368	0.070
	Median	21	22	21.0368	
	Range	12.84–37.02	14.86–34.0	12.84–37.02	
	SD	4.19650	4.36728	3.99239	
Percentage pre-treatment weight loss	Mean	6.26	4.25	7.93	0.004
	Median	4.00	0	6	
	Range	0–36	0–32	0–36	
	SD	8.081	6.658	8.786	
Hemoglobin (g/dl)	Mean	13.4213	13.3928	13.4445	0.854
	Median	13.4100	13.4250	13.3400	
	Range	7.0–18.0	7.0–18.0	9.0–17.50	
	SD	1.76753	1.87076	1.68890	
MUAC (cm)	Mean	24.711	25.219	24.290	0.121
	Median	25	25	24	
	Range	16–49	20–34	16–49	
	SD	3.7793	2.9368	4.3283	
SGA score	Mean	40.11	36.95	42.74	0.000
	Median	39	34	42	
	Range	26–65	26–59	27–65	
	SD	10.304	8.839	10.732	

*Unpaired Student *T* test for mean*BMI* body mass index, *SGA* Subjective Global Assessment, *SD* standard deviation

13.7% and 28.4% ($p=0.034$) patients had lost more than 10% weight pre-treatment, 9.6% and 22.8% ($p=0.036$) patients had low MUAC, 10.9% and 27.2% ($p=0.015$) had SGA score of ≥ 50 , and 4.1% and 18.2% ($p=0.006$) patients had Bitot spots respectively (Table 2).

Nutritional parameters in node-negative and node-positive cohorts

gMean weight in kilograms (\pm SD) reduced from 57.83 (11.79) to 52.22 (10.51) ($p=0.000$), 58.94 [12] to 53.66 (11.24) ($p=0.000$), and 56.74 (11.56) to 51 (9.75) ($p=0.000$) in overall, N0, and N+ cohorts (Tables 3, 4, 5). Mean % reduction in weight in kilograms (SD) at the end of the first treatment modality was 4.69 (6.46) overall, 6.21 (5.84) N0, and 3.59 (6.73) N+; at the end of the second treatment modality was 7.49 (6.99) overall, 6.71 (8.19) N0, and 8.04 (6.03) N+; at completion of all treatment 9.17 (8.33) overall, 8.93 (7.97) N0, and 9.37 (8.66) N+. Weight loss $\geq 10\%$ was seen at the end of the first treatment modality in 27.2% patients overall, 26.4% N0, and 27.9% N+; at the end of the second modality treatment in 38.1% overall,

37% N0, and 38.9% N+; at completion of all treatment 45.3% overall, 41.1% N0, and 48.8% N+. Mean reduction in BMI (95% confidence interval) at the end of the first treatment modality was 1.45 (1.2–1.7) overall, 1.52 (1.2–1.9) N0, and 1.39 (1.0–1.7) N+; at the end of the second treatment modality was 2.71 (2.2–3.2) overall, 2.83 (2.0–3.7) N0, and 2.62 (1.9–3.3) N+. Low BMI was present at baseline in 22.8% patients overall, 20.9% N0, and 24.4% N+; at the end of the first treatment modality 38% overall, 33.3% N0, and 41.9% N+; at the completion of all treatment 43.4% overall, 35.5% N0, and 50% N+. Low MUAC was found at baseline in 17.2% patients overall, 9.6% N0, and 22.7% N+; at the end of the first treatment 27.2% overall, 18.1% N0, and 34.9% N+; at the completion of all treatment 30.8% overall, 20.5% N0, and 39.5% N+. The median SGA score at baseline was 39 overall, 34 N0, and 42 N+; at the end of the first treatment 47 overall, 46.5 N0, and 48 N+; at completion of all treatment 50 overall, 48 N0, and 53 N+. SGA score of > 40 was found in 47.2% patients overall, 34.2% N0, and 58% N+ at baseline; 69.6% overall, 63.9% N0, and 74.4% N+ at the end of the first treatment; 87.4% overall, 79.5% N0, and 94.2%

Table 2 Pre-treatment nutritional parameters compared in node-negative and node-positive cohorts

Variable	Number of patients			<i>p</i> value*	
	Overall <i>n/N</i> (%)	Node negative (<i>N</i> =73) <i>n/N</i> (%)	Node positive (<i>N</i> =88) <i>n/N</i> (%)		
Weight (kg)	< 50	37/161(23)	13/73(17.8)	24/88(27.3)	0.612
	≥ 50	124/161(77)	60/73(82.2)	64/88(72.2)	
Pre-treatment weight loss ≥ 10%		35/161(21.7)	10/73(13.7)	25/88(28.4)	0.034
BMI	≥ 18.5	122/161(75.8)	57/73(78.1)	65/88(73.9)	0.602
	< 18.5	36/161(22.4)	15/73(20.5)	21/88(23.9)	
	Missing value	3/161(1.9)	1/73(1.3)	2/88(2.3)	
MUAC (cm)	> 21	134/161(83.2)	66/73(90.4)	68/88(77.2)	0.036
	≤ 21	27/161(16.8)	7/73(9.6)	20/88(22.7)	
SGA score	24–29	33/161(20.5)	18/73(24.6)	15/88(17)	0.015
	30–39	52/161(32.3)	30/73(41.1)	22/88(25)	
	40–49	44/161(27.3)	17/73(23.3)	27/88(30.7)	
	50–59	26/161(16.1)	8/73(10.9)	18/88(20.4)	
	60–71	6/161(3.7)	0	6/88(6.8)	
Pallor	Present	10/161(6.2)	4/73(5.5)	6/88(6.8)	0.757
Bitot spots	Present	19/161(11.8)	3/73(4.1)	16/88(18.2)	0.006
Hemoglobin	Normal	110/161(68.3)	52/73(71.2)	58/88(65.9)	0.236
	Mild anemia	39/161(24.2)	14/73(19.2)	25/88(28.4)	
	Moderate/severe anemia	10/161(6.2)	5/73(6.8)	5/88(5.7)	
	Missing value	2/161(1.2)	2/73(2.7)	0	

*Pearson chi-square test

BMI body mass index, *MUAC* mid-upper arm circumference, *SGA* Subjective Global Assessment

N + at completion of all treatment. Moderate to severe anemia was found at baseline in 6.3% patients overall, 7.1% N0, and 5.7% N + ; at the end of the first treatment 16.3% overall, 12.5% N0, and 18.6% N + ; at completion of treatment 16.9% overall, 14.1% N0, and 19% N + .

Pattern of change in nutritional parameters in patients having received single-modality versus multi-modality treatment

Overall, there was no significant difference in PS, mean weight, mean BMI, median MUAC, mean hemoglobin, or median SGA score at completion of treatment between single- and multi-modality groups. Mean reduction of weight was higher ($11.1\% \pm 7.82$ vs $6.26\% \pm 8.3$, $p=0.000$), mean reduction in BMI was higher (2.57 ± 1.87 vs 1.29 ± 1.62 , $p=0.000$), median reduction in MUAC was higher (2 cm vs 1 cm, $p=0.000$), and median increase in SGA score was higher (13 points vs 6 points, $p=0.000$) in the multi-modality group (Table 6). In the node-negative cohort, mean reduction of weight was higher ($10.85\% \pm 8.13$ vs $6.79\% \pm 7.31$, $p=0.028$), mean reduction in BMI was higher (2.66 ± 1.98 vs 1.44 ± 1.64 , $p=0.006$), median reduction in MUAC was higher (2 cm vs 1 cm, $p=0.009$), and median increase in SGA score was higher (15 points vs 8 points, $p=0.009$)

in the multi-modality group. In the node-positive cohort, mean reduction of weight was higher ($11.12\% \pm 87.69$ vs $6.95\% \pm 5.12$, $p=0.005$), mean reduction in BMI was higher (2.52 ± 1.81 vs 1.1 ± 1.61 , $p=0.001$), median reduction in MUAC was higher (3 cm vs 2 cm, $p=0.001$), and median increase in SGA score was higher (12 points vs 4 points, $p=0.009$) in the multi-modality group.

Discussion

The center where this study was conducted is a tertiary care cancer center, located at the foot of Himalayas in India. Approximately 1200 new cancer patients are treated at this center every year, 300 diagnosed with head and neck cancer. The patients are usually from low to middle socioeconomic strata. The median age at diagnosis for non-HPV-associated HNSCC is 66 years and that of HPV-associated oropharyngeal cancer is ~ 53 years in literature [12]. In the present study, the mean age was 56.3 years, as in India HNSCC is usually more non-HPV related, patients in this study were a decade younger. A majority of patients in this study were T3/4 stage, which is in keeping with other reports [13], and required multi-modality treatment in ~ 60% patients. Malnutrition in head and neck cancer affects 30–50% of patients

Table 3 Pattern of change in nutritional parameters before, during, and after completion overall (N= 161)

Variable		Baseline	End of first treatment modality	p value	End of second treatment modality	p value	At completion of treatment modality	p value
PS	Median	0	2		2		2	
Weight (kg)	Mean (SD)	57.83 (11.79)	53.88 (11.3)	0.000*	53.07 (8.72)	0.000*	52.22 (10.51)	0.000*
< 50	n/N(%)	37/161 (23)	59/158 (37.3)	0.000***	22/64 (34.4)		67/159 (42.1)	0.000***
≥ 50		124/161 (77)	99/158 (62.7)		42/64 (65.6)		92/159 (57.9)	
Mean reduction in weight in kg from baseline (95%CI)			3.863 (3.19–4.53)	0.000*	7.428 (6.04–8.82)	0.000*	5.615 (4.82–6.41)	0.000*
Mean reduction in % weight from baseline (SD)			4.69 (6.46)	0.000*	7.48 (6.99)	0.032*	9.17 (8.33)	0.000*
Change in weight from baseline n/N(%)	≥ 10% loss of weight		43/158 (27.2)	0.000*	24/63 (38.1)	0.016***	72/159 (45.3)	0.000***
	< 10% loss of weight		85/158 (53.8)		31/63 (49.2)		68/159 (42.8)	
	No change/increase in weight		30/158 (19)		7/63 (11.1)		19/159 (11.9)	
BMI n/N(%)	Mean (SD)	21.59 (4.19)	20.14 (4.03)	0.000*	19.91 (3.13)	0.000*	19.54 (3.79)	0.000*
	Mean reduction from baseline (95%CI)		1.45 (1.2–1.7)	0.000*	2.71 (2.2–3.2)	0.000*	2.09 (1.79–2.4)	0.000*
	≥ 18.5	122/158 (77.2)	98/158 (62)	0.000***	44/64 (68.8)	0.000*	90/159 (56.6)	0.000***
	< 18.5	36/158 (22.8)	60/158 (38)		20/64 (31.2)		69/159 (43.4)	
MUAC (cm)	Median (IQR)	25 (22.5–26)	23 (21–25)	0.000**	23 (22–24)	0.000**	23 (21–24)	0.000**
n/N(%)	Normal	134/161 (83.2)	115/158 (72.8)	0.000***	52/64 (81.3)	0.003***	110/159 (69.2)	0.000***
	Malnutrition	27/161 (16.8)	43/158 (27.2)		12/64 (18.7)		49/159 (30.8)	
SGA score	Mean (SD)	40.11 (10.3)	46.18 (10.4)		49.63 (8.6)		49.88 (8.8)	
	Median (IQR)	39 (31–48.5)	47 (37–54)	0.000**	49.5 (43–56.75)	0.000**	50 (44–58)	0.000**
24–29	n/N(%)	33/161 (20.5)	9/158 (5.7)	0.000***	1/64 (1.6)	0.000***	2/159 (1.3)	0.000***
30–39		52/161 (32.3)	39/158 (24.7)		5/64 (7.8)		18/159 (11.3)	
40–49		44/161 (27.3)	49/158 (31)		26/64 (40.6)		56/159 (35.2)	
50–59		26/161 (16.1)	41/158 (25.5)		21/64 (32.8)		55/159 (34.6)	
60–71		6/161 (3.7)	20/158 (12.7)		11/64 (17.2)		28/159 (17.6)	
Hemoglobin (g/dl)	Mean (SD)	13.5 (1.8)	12.5 (1.8)	0.000*	12.6 (1.4)	0.000*	12.5 (1.8)	0.000*
	Normal	110/159 (69.2)	62/147 (42.2)	0.000***	24/59 (40.7)	0.000***	59/148 (39.9)	0.000***
n/N(%)	Mild anemia	39/159 (24.5)	61/147 (41.5)		28/59 (47.5)		64/148 (43.2)	
	Moderate/severe anemia	10/159 (6.3)	24/147 (16.3)		7/59 (11.9)		25/148 (16.9)	
Bitot spots present		19/161 (11.8)	17/158 (10.8)		3/64 (4.7)		19/161 (11.8)	

*Paired-sample T test, **related-samples Wilcoxon signed rank test, ***related-samples marginal homogeneity test

SD standard deviation, CI confidence interval, IQR inter-quartile range, PS performance status, BMI body mass index, MUAC mid-upper arm circumference, SGA Subjective Global Assessment

Table 4 Pattern of change in nutritional parameters before, during, and after completion of treatment in the node-negative cohort

Variable	Baseline	End of first treatment modality	<i>p</i> value	End of second treatment modality	<i>p</i> value	At completion of treatment modality	<i>p</i> value
PS	0	2		2		2	
Weight (kg)	58.94 (12.0)	54.91 (11.6)	0.000*	53.67 (9.5)	0.000*	53.66 (11.24)	0.000*
< 50	13/73 (17.8)	23/72 (31.9)	0.000***	9/27 (33.3)		28/73 (38.4)	0.000***
≥ 50	60/73 (82.2)	49/72 (68.1)		18/27 (66.7)		45/73 (61.6)	
Mean reduction in weight from baseline (kg) (95%CI)		4.03 (3.05–5.01)	0.000*	7.81 (5.71–9.92)	0.000*	5.46 (4.27–6.65)	0.000*
Mean % reduction in weight from baseline (SD)		6.21 (5.84)	0.000*	6.71 (8.19)	0.821*	8.93 (7.97)	0.000*
Change in weight from baseline n/N(%)		19/72 (26.4)		10/27 (37)		30/73 (41.1)	0.009***
≥ 10% loss of weight		40/72 (55.6)		13/27 (48.1)		34/73 (46.6)	
< 10% loss of weight		13/72 (18)		4/27 (14.8)		9/73 (12.3)	
No change/increase in weight		20.65 (4.06)	0.000*	20.33 (2.92)	0.000*	20.23 (4.01)	0.000*
BMI n/N(%)	22.17 (4.35)	1.52 (1.15–1.88)	0.000*	2.83 (2.01–3.65)	0.005*	2.01 (1.55–2.46)	0.000*
Mean reduction from baseline (95%CI)		57/72 (79.2)	0.000***	21/27 (77.8)		47/73 (64.4)	0.000***
≥ 18.5		15/72 (20.8)		6/27 (22.2)		26/73 (35.6)	
< 18.5		25 (23.75–26.75)	0.000**	23 (22–24)	0.000**	23 (22–24)	0.000**
Median (IQR)		66/73	0.034***	23/27	0.157***	58/73	0.011***
Normal		7/73 (9.6)		4/27 (14.5)		15/73 (20.5)	
Malnutrition		36.95 (8.84)		48.81 (8.64)		47.42 (8.76)	
Mean (SD)		34 (29.5–43.5)	0.000**	48 (42–54)	0.000**	48 (40.5–53.5)	0.000**
Median(IQR)		18/73 (24.7)		0		0	
24–29		30/73 (41.1)		3/27 (11.1)		15/73 (20.5)	
30–39		17/73 (23.3)		12/27 (44.4)		29/73 (39.7)	
40–49		8/73 (11)		8/27 (29.6)		21/73 (28.8)	
50–59		0		4/27 (5.5)		8/73 (11)	
60–71		13.5 (1.9)	0.001*	12.77 (1.58)	0.117*	12.86 (1.8)	0.001*
Mean(SD)		52/71 (73.2)		13/25 (52)		33/64 (51.6)	
Normal		14/71 (19.7)		8/25 (32)		22/64(34.4)	
Mild anemia		5/71 (6)		4/25 (16)		9/64 (14.1)	
Moderate/severe anemia		3/73 (4.1)		1/27 (3.7)		4/73 (5.5)	
Present							

*Paired-sample *T* test, **related-samples Wilcoxon signed rank test, ***related-samples marginal homogeneity test

SD standard deviation, CI confidence interval, IQR inter-quartile range, PS performance status, BMI body mass index, MUAC mid-upper arm circumference, SGA Subjective Global Assessment

Table 5 Pattern of change in nutritional parameters before, during, and after completion of treatment in the node-positive cohort

Variable		Baseline	End of first treatment modality	<i>p</i> value	End of second treatment modality	<i>p</i> value	At completion of treatment modality	<i>p</i> value
PS	Median	0	2		3		3	
Weight (kg)	Mean(SD)	56.74 (11.56)	53.02 (11.04)	0.000*	53.1 (8.58)	0.000*	51 (9.75)	0.000*
n/N(%)	< 50	24/88 (27.3)	36/86 (41.9)	0.000***	13/37 (35.1)		39/86 (45.3)	0.000***
	≥ 50	64/88 (72.7)	50/86 (58.1)		24/37 (64.9)		47/86 (54.7)	
Mean reduction in weight from baseline (kg)	(95%CI)		3.72 (2.79–4.65)	0.000*	7.15 (5.22–9.07)	0.000*	5.74 (4.65–6.84)	0.000*
Mean % reduction in weight from baseline (SD)			3.59 (6.73)	0.000*	8.04 (6.03)	0.005*	9.37 (8.66)	0.000*
Change in weight from baseline	≥ 10% loss of weight		24/86 (27.9)		14/36 (38.9)		42/86 (48.8)	0.000***
	< 10% loss of weight		45/86 (52.3)		18/36 (50)		34/86 (39.5)	
	No change/increase in weight		17/86 (19.8)		4/36 (11.1)		6/86 (7)	
BMI	Mean(SD)	21.11 (4.01)	19.72 (3.98)	0.000*	19.59 (3.28)	0.000*	18.95 (3.51)	0.000*
n/N(%)	Mean reduction from baseline (95%CI)		1.39 (1.04–1.74)	0.000*	2.62 (1.9–3.33)	0.000*	2.16 (1.74–2.57)	0.000*
	≥ 18.5	65/86 (75.6)	50/86 (58.1)	0.000***	23/37 (62.1)		43/86 (50)	0.000***
	< 18.5	21/86 (24.4)	36/86 (41.9)		14/37 (37.8)		43/86 (50)	
MUAC (cm)	Median (IQR)	24 (22–26)	23 (20–25)	0.000**	23 (22–24.25)	0.000**	22 (20–24)	0.000**
n/N(%)	Normal	68/88 (77.3)	56/86 (65.1)	0.001***	29/37 (78.4)	0.008***	52/86 (60.5)	0.000***
	Malnutrition	20/88 (22.7)	30/86 (34.9)		8/37 (21.6)		34/86 (39.5)	
SGA	Mean(SD)	42.74 (10.73)	47.3 (10.58)		50.22 (8.57)		51.97 (8.42)	
n/N(%)	Median (IQR)	42 (32.25–50.75)	48 (38–57)	0.000**	50 (44.5–58)	0.000**	53 (47–59)	0.000**
	24–29	15/88 (17)	4/86 (4.7)	0.000***	1/37 (2.7)	0.000***	2/86 (2.3)	0.000***
	30–39	22/88 (25)	18/86 (20.9)		2/37 (5.4)		3/86 (3.5)	
	40–49	27/88 (30.7)	27/86 (31.4)		14/37 (37.8)		27/86 (31.4)	
	50–59	18/88 (20.5)	24/86 (27.9)		13/37 (35.1)		34/86 (39.5)	
	60–71	6/88 (6.8)	13/86 (15.1)		7/37 (18.9)		20/86 (23.3)	
Hemoglobin (g/dl)	Mean(SD)	13.43 (1.73)	12.17 (1.81)	0.000*	12.41 (1.16)	0.000*	12.13 (1.67)	0.000*
n/N(%)	Normal	58/88 (65.9)	30/83 (36.1)		11/34 (32.4)		26/84 (31)	
	Mild anemia	25/88 (28.4)	37/86 (44.6)		20/34 (58.8)		42/84 (50)	
	Moderate/severe anemia	5/88 (5.7)	16/86 (18.6)		3/34 (8.8)		16/84 (19)	
Bitot spots present		16/88 (18.2)	14/86 (16.3)		2/37 (5.4)		15/88 (17)	

*Paired-sample *T* test, **related-samples Wilcoxon signed rank test, ***related-samples marginal homogeneity test

SD standard deviation, *CI* confidence interval, *IQR* inter-quartile range, *PS* performance status, *BMI* body mass index, *MUAC* mid-upper arm circumference, *SGA* Subjective Global Assessment

Table 6 Nutritional parameters at completion of treatment compared in patients that received single- versus multi-modality treatment

Variable	Overall			Node-negative group			Node-positive group		
	Single modality	Multi-modality	<i>p</i> value	Single modality	Multi-modality	<i>p</i> value	Single modality	Multi-modality	<i>p</i> value
PS n/N(%)	0–1 18/63 (28.57)	17/96 (17.71)	0.075*	13/36 (36.11)	13/36 (36.11)	0.075*	5/27 (18.52)	7/59 (11.86)	0.459*
Mean weight kg (SD)	2–4 45/63 (71.43)	79/96 (82.29)	0.349**	23/36 (63.89)	23/36 (63.89)	0.913**	22/27 (81.48)	52/59 (88.14)	0.042**
Change in weight kg (SD)	51.25 (11.95)	52.85 (9.46)	0.000**	53.81 (13.21)	53.51 (9.1)	0.019**	47.85 (9.21)	52.44 (9.73)	0.000**
Mean reduction kg (SD)	3.64 (4.25)	6.89 (5.15)	0.000**	4.07 (4.45)	6.78 (5.18)	0.028**	3.07 (3.99)	5.56 (9.57)	0.000**
Mean reduction % (SD)	6.26 (8.3)	11.01 (7.82)	0.000**	6.79 (7.31)	10.86 (8.13)	0.006**	6.95 (5.12)	11.12 (7.69)	0.005**
BMI	19.19 (4.33)	19.77 (3.39)	0.347**	20 (4.72)	20.46 (3.22)	0.006**	18.11 (3.56)	19.34 (3.46)	0.133**
Mean reduction (SD)	1.29 (1.62)	2.57 (1.87)	0.000**	1.44 (1.64)	2.66 (1.98)	0.832***	1.1 (1.61)	2.52 (1.81)	0.001**
Median (IQR)	23 (20–24)	23 (21–24)	0.466***	23.5 (22–24.75)	23 (22–24.25)	0.009***	21 (18–23)	23 (20.5–24)	0.067***
Median reduction (IQR)	1 (0–2)	2 (1–4)	0.000***	1 (0–2)	2 (0.88–4)	0.879**	2 (0–2)	3 (1–4)	0.001***
Hemoglobin (g/dl)	12.35 (2.04)	12.51 (1.58)	0.579**	12.82 (1.98)	12.89 (1.66)	0.320**	11.79 (2)	12.27 (1.5)	0.228**
Mean reduction (SD)	0.84 (1.27)	1.17 (1.43)	0.161**	0.49 (1.25)	0.86 (1.62)	0.068**	1.25 (1.19)	1.37 (1.27)	0.688**
SGA score	48.9 (10.16)	50.52 (7.85)	0.261**	45.53 (9.48)	49.27 (7.68)	0.004**	53.41 (9.42)	51.31 (7.92)	0.285**
Mean increase (SD)	4.4 (12.86)	12.36 (8)	0.000**	8.03 (6.19)	12.86 (7.69)	0.082***	–0.1 (17.1)	12.05 (8.25)	0.000**
Median (IQR)	49 (40–58)	50.5 (46–57)	0.380***	47 (37.25–50)	49 (44.5–54)	0.009***	55 (47–62)	51 (47–58)	0.168***
Median increase (IQR)	6 (2–10)	13 (7–18)	0.000***	8 (3.25–11.75)	15 (6.5–19)	0.358*	4 (0–9)	12 (8–17)	0.000***
Bitot spots present	12/65 (18.46)	7/96 (7.29)	0.045*	3/36 (8.33)	1/37 (2.7)	0.019*	9/29 (31.03)	6/59 (10.17)	0.019*

*Pearson chi-square test, **unpaired Student *T* test, ***independent-samples Mann–Whitney *U* test*PS* performance status, *SD* standard deviation, *IQR* inter-quartile range, *BMI* body mass index, *MUAC* mid-upper arm circumference, *SGA* Subjective Global Assessment

[10, 13]. In a review article published in 2017 [14], it was noted that up to 80% of HNSCC patients are malnourished because of one their lifestyle and second the risk factors associated with HNSCC. In the present study among node-negative patients, only 13.7% had lost the critical $\geq 10\%$ weight within 6 months prior to starting treatment, only 10.9% had SGA score ≥ 50 , only 9.6% had low MUAC, and 20.4% patients had low BMI. Thus, 9.6 to 20.4% patients were observed to suffer from malnutrition at diagnosis in the node-negative cohort. This is lower than the international literature. In the node-positive cohort, 28.4% patients had lost $\geq 10\%$ weight within 6 months prior to starting treatment, 27.2% had SGA score ≥ 50 , 32.8% had low MUAC, and 23.9% low BMI. Thus, 23.9 to 32.8% patients were malnourished in the node-positive cohort at diagnosis. The burden of malnutrition was found to be higher in node-positive patients; this could be due to multiple factors like a more advanced disease causing symptoms like swallowing or chewing difficulty, longer duration of disease with longer nutritional challenges, pain, and other symptoms associated with advanced disease which reduce oral intake. In HNSCC patients, cancer is close to structures vital for eating, leading to numerous nutritional challenges before, during, and after treatment. They experience treatment side effects, like odynophagia, dysphagia, xerostomia, dysgeusia, mucositis, sticky saliva, fatigue, nausea, and vomiting [15]. These further impair patient's ability to sustain adequate intake orally. A systematic review found "dysphagia" to be the most commonly studied symptom during treatment for HNSCC [16]. During or after treatment, malnutrition and unintentional weight loss in HNSCC patients are associated with increased morbidity and mortality, poor treatment outcome, and poor quality of life [17]. The nutritional journey, as experienced by HNSCC patients undergoing treatment, may be different from the measured nutritional parameters. A qualitative study on 10 HNSCC patients undergoing treatment aimed to study the experience of patients regarding their nutritional situation and perception of nutritional support during treatment. Patients experienced surgery as a poor starting point for radiotherapy from the nutritional aspect. Patients customized their diet as radiotherapy started; they experienced virtually no oral food intake about halfway into radiotherapy. This leads to tube-feeding and hospital admissions. All patients were recommended ONS, but supplements became unbearable eventually. After completion of radiotherapy, patients experienced discouragement from persistent side effects; this prevented patients from eating [18].

The response to treatment, in HNSCC patients, is affected by their unique nutritional problems. To adequately manage these patients, the treating team must accurately and systematically assess nutritional status and execute timely metabolic treatment [19]. In the present study, all nutritional parameters declined significantly from baseline during the

treatment. At the end of treatment, the mean reduction in weight was 9.17% (± 8.33 SD) from baseline weight; $\geq 10\%$ weight loss was present in 45.3% patients, low BMI 43.4% patients, low MUAC 40.8% patients, ≥ 50 SGA score 52.5% patients, and moderate to severe anemia 16.9% patients. The incidence of malnutrition at completion of treatment in this study was 40.8 to 52.5% overall, in the node-negative cohort 20.5 to 41.1%, and in the node-positive cohort 39.5 to 62.8%. In the node-positive cohort, 15% more patients had low BMI, 19% more patients low MUAC, and 23% more patients ≥ 50 SGA score at completion of treatment as compared to the node-negative cohort. The nutritional challenges for patients undergoing treatment for node-positive HNSCC are far greater than those for node-negative patients. A retrospective study published in 2019 aimed to assess the impact of prophylactic feeding gastrostomy (FG) and predictors of malnutrition in patients undergoing treatment for HNSCC [20]. They studied 111 patients and found that patients without prophylactic FG had more hospital readmissions ($p=0.042$), greater relative weight loss at 6 weeks ($p<0.0001$), symptoms like dysphagia, and higher rate of severe malnutrition. They found factors like node-positive status, oral intake difficulty, concomitant chemo-radiotherapy, primary tumor sites like nasopharynx, and hypopharynx tumor site were significantly associated with malnutrition. A systematic review [21] published much prior (in 2013) analyzed the effect of nutritional interventions like individualized dietary counseling, oral nutritional supplements (ONS), nasogastric (NG) tube feeding, and percutaneous endoscopic gastronomy (PEG) on nutritional status, quality of life (QoL), and mortality in HNSCC patients receiving radiotherapy or chemo-radiotherapy. They found beneficial effects on nutritional status and QoL for individualized dietary counseling only; ONS, NG tube, and PEG tube feeding were not consistently associated with benefit.

The detrimental effects of treatment for HNSCC on the nutritional status of a patient may vary according to the oncological treatment. Early-stage HNSCC is usually treated with single-modality treatment like surgery or radiotherapy, whereas locally advanced HNSCC is treated with a multi-modality treatment like surgery followed by radiotherapy or chemo-radiotherapy or radical chemo-radiotherapy, depending on the location of primary tumor. Some patients, with locally advanced HNSCC, receive a single-modality treatment with a palliative intent. Nutritional parameters of a single-modality treatment and multi-modality treatment groups were compared in the present study. At completion of treatment, we found that the ECOG performance status and mean weight were not different in both groups. But the mean reduction in weight was 4.75% more, mean reduction in BMI was 1.28 kg/m² more, and median increase in SGA score was 7 points more in the multi-modality group as compared to those of a single-modality group (all statistically significant).

Similar findings were noted in both node-negative and node-positive cohorts. In a prospective study published in the year 2020 [22], patients undergoing a single-modality treatment with radiotherapy for HNSCC were followed up for nutritional status and nutrition impact factors. Similar to the present study, they used a SGA score and found that 56% patients were malnourished at baseline and this increased to 100% after completion of treatment, and the mean weight loss was 4.53 ± 0.41 kg, 7.39%. They also reported taste changes and dry mouth in 100% patients. Another study published in the same year compared the health-related QoL in 19 HNSCC patients undergoing multi-modality treatment with chemo-radiotherapy. They found that well-nourished patients had fewer QoL issues like pain, sticky saliva, fatigue, chewing difficulty, appetite loss, and social eating as compared to malnourished ($p < 0.05$). They found a statistically significant association (but weak strength, $r = -0.37$, $p = 0.012$) between global QoL score and SGA score [23]. A randomized controlled trial [24] on HNSCC patients receiving radiotherapy compared nutritional counseling alone versus ONS along with nutritional counseling. ONS resulted in smaller weight loss (mean 1.6 kg, 95%CI 0.5–2.7, $p = 0.006$), improved QoL and higher protein-calorie intake, and reduced need for plan changes in oncological treatment (HR = 0.40, 95%CI 0.18–0.91, $p = 0.029$). The QoL of a patient is inter-related with psychological distress; an RCT aimed to improve the nutritional status of HNSCC patients receiving radiotherapy, using the psychological technique “Eating as Treatment” (EAT) program, delivered by the dietitians. The control group had 151 patients and the intervention group, 156. SGA score was used to assess the primary end point, nutritional status. Intervention group had better SGA score, less percent weight loss, less treatment interruptions, lower depression scores, and higher QoL [25]. This RCT demonstrated effectiveness of psychological intervention (EAT) in improving nutrition in HNSCC patients undergoing treatment. The negative impact of treatment usually continues in the survivorship period too. In a qualitative study, 31 HNSCC survivors were interviewed to acquire a comprehensive understanding of their lived experience of chronic Nutrition Impact Symptoms (NIS) burden [26]. It was interesting to note that they found at least one or more chronic NIS in all survivors, but before treatment 40% were unaware of the potential for chronically persistent NIS. The present study highlights the need for supportive therapies in cancer care, especially nutritional services. Low- and middle-income countries like India face disparities in health care systems with regard to these supportive care services. There are limitations in availability of nutrition specialists, cancer dietitians, and even nutritional supplements in low-cost cancer centers, where a majority of cancer patients are treated.

In 2016, “Nutritional management in head and neck cancer: United Kingdom National Multidisciplinary

Guidelines” was published [27]. The following recommendations were made regarding treatment of HNSCC:

- The multidisciplinary team should include a specialist dietitian.
- Nutritional assessment should be performed using a validated tool before starting treatment and at regular intervals.
- High-risk patients should be referred for early dietary intervention.
- Appropriate nutritional support and malnutrition treatment should be offered without delay.
- They recommended SGA and patient-generated SGA as validated tools for nutritional assessment.
- Pre-treatment nutritional assessment should be offered.
- Patients well-nourished pre-treatment should receive regular dietary assessment and intervention.
- They recommended energy intake of a minimum 30 kcal/kg/day and protein intake 1.2 g/kg/day.
- Enteral nutrition to be started in the food intake is $< 60\%$ of the estimated energy expenditure.
- Gastrostomy is recommended over NG tube if long-term (4 weeks) tube feeding is anticipated.
- Nutritional interventions like dietary counseling and diet supplements should be offered up to 3 months after treatment.
- QoL parameters related to nutrition should be estimated pre-treatment, during treatment, and post-treatment at regular intervals.

In conclusion, HNSCC patients may be malnourished at presentation, and the nutritional status deteriorated in a vast proportion of patients during treatment. Node-positive patients had a higher burden of malnutrition at diagnosis, and higher worsening of nutritional parameters during treatment as compared to node-negative patients. A higher decline in nutritional status was seen in patients receiving a multi-modality as compared to a single-modality treatment. Thus, node-positive HNSCC patients receiving a multi-modality treatment have the highest burden of malnutrition.

Author contribution All the authors contributed to the study conception and design. Material preparation, and data collection and analysis were performed by Anshika Arora, Sunil Saini, and Meenu Gupta. The first draft of the manuscript was written by Anshika Arora and all the authors commented on previous versions of the manuscript. All the authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Data availability Available.

Code availability SPSS version 22.

Declarations

Ethics approval Ethics committee approval number: SRHU/HIMS/ETHICS/2018/115.

Consent to participate A written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Consent for publication Consent for publication was obtained from the Institutional Research Committee.

Conflict of interest The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Ferlay J et al (2019) Estimating the global cancer incidence and mortality in 2018: GLOBOCAN sources and methods. *Int J Cancer* 144:1941–1953
2. Bray F et al (2018) Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA Cancer J Clin* 68:394–424
3. Ferlay J et al (2018) Global Cancer Observatory: cancer today. Lyon, France: International Agency for Research on Cancer (accessed 18 September 2020). IARC. <https://gco.iarc.fr/today>
4. Hashibe M et al (2007) Alcohol drinking in never users of tobacco, cigarette smoking in never drinkers, and the risk of head and neck cancer: pooled analysis in the International Head and Neck Cancer Epidemiology Consortium. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 99:777–789
5. Mehanna H et al (2013) Prevalence of human papillomavirus in oropharyngeal and nonoropharyngeal head and neck cancer—systematic review and meta-analysis of trends by time and region. *Head Neck* 35:747–755
6. Jiang H et al (2019) Can public health policies on alcohol and tobacco reduce a cancer epidemic? Australia's experience. *BMC Med* 17:213
7. Isenring EA, Capra S, Bauer JD (2004) Nutrition intervention is beneficial in oncology outpatients receiving radiotherapy to the gastrointestinal or head and neck area. *Br J Cancer* 91(3):447–452
8. Rinkel RN et al (2016) Prevalence of swallowing and speech problems in daily life after chemoradiation for head and neck cancer based on cut-off scores of the patient-reported outcome measures SWAL-QOL and SHI. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol* 273:1849–1855
9. Hutcheson KA et al (2019) Two-year prevalence of dysphagia and related outcomes in head and neck cancer survivors: an updated SEER-Medicare analysis. *Head Neck* 41:479–487
10. De Luis DA, Izaola O, Aller R (2007) Nutritional status in head and neck cancer patients. *Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci* 11(4):239–243
11. Tchekmedyian NS, Zahyna D, Halpert C, Heber D (1992) Assessment and maintenance of nutrition in older cancer patients. *Oncology (Williston Park)* 6(2 Suppl):105–111
12. Windon MJ et al (2018) Increasing prevalence of human papillomavirus-positive oropharyngeal cancers among older adults. *Cancer* 124:2993–2999
13. Bossola M (2015) Nutritional interventions in head and neck cancer patients undergoing chemoradiotherapy: a narrative review. *Nutrients* 7(1):265–276
14. Urs Müller-Richter C, Betz S, Hartmann et al (2017) Nutrition management for head and neck cancer patients improves clinical outcome and survival. *Nutr Res* 48:1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nutres.2017.08.007>
15. Bossola M (2015) Nutritional interventions in head and neck cancer patients undergoing chemoradiotherapy: a narrative review. *Nutrients* 7(1):265–276. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu7010265>
16. Bressan V, Stevanin S, Bianchi M et al (2016) The effects of swallowing disorders, dysgeusia, oral mucositis and xerostomia on nutritional status, oral intake and weight loss in head and neck cancer patients: a systematic review. *Cancer Treat Rev* 45:105–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ctrv.2016.03.006>
17. Ackerman D, Laszlo M, Provisor A et al (2018) Nutrition management for the head and neck cancer patient. *Cancer Treat Res* 174:187–208. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-65421-8_11
18. Sandmael JA, Sand K, Bye A et al (2019) Nutritional experiences in head and neck cancer patients. *Eur J Cancer Care (Engl)* 28(6):e13168. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ecc.13168>
19. Wood RM, Lander VL, Mosby EL et al (1989) Nutrition and the head and neck cancer patient. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol* 68(4):391–395. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-4220\(89\)90134-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-4220(89)90134-5)
20. Yanni A, Dequanter D, Lechien JR et al (2019) Malnutrition in head and neck cancer patients: impacts and indications of a prophylactic percutaneous endoscopic gastrostomy. *Eur Ann Otorhinolaryngol Head Neck Dis* 136(3S):S27–S33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anorl.2019.01.001>
21. Langius JAE, Zandbergen MC, Eerenstein SEJ et al (2013) Effect of nutritional interventions on nutritional status, quality of life and mortality in patients with head and neck cancer receiving (chemo) radiotherapy: a systematic review. *Clin Nutr* 32(5):671–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clnu.2013.06.012>
22. Neoh MK, Zaid ZA, Daud ZAM et al (2020) Changes in nutrition impact symptoms, nutritional and functional status during head and neck cancer treatment. *Nutrients* 12(5):1225. <https://doi.org/10.3390/nu12051225>
23. Mulasi U, Vock D, Jager-Wittenaar H et al (2020) Nutrition status and health-related quality of life among outpatients with advanced head and neck cancer. *Nutr Clin Pract* 35(6):1129–1137. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ncp.10476>
24. Cereda E, Cappello S, Colombo S et al (2018) Nutritional counseling with or without systematic use of oral nutritional supplements in head and neck cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy. *Radiother Oncol* 126(1):81–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2017.10.015>
25. Britton B, Baker AL, Wolfenden L et al (2019) Eating As Treatment (EAT): a stepped-wedge, randomized controlled trial of a health behavior change intervention provided by dietitians to improve nutrition in patients with head and neck cancer undergoing radiation therapy (TROC 1203). *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 103(2):353–362. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2018.09.027>
26. Crowder SL, Najam N, Sarma KP et al (2020) Head and neck cancer survivors' experiences with chronic nutrition impact symptom burden after radiation: a qualitative study. *J Acad Nutr Diet* 120(10):1643–1653. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jand.2020.04.016>
27. Talwar B, Donnelly R, Skelly R et al (2016) Nutritional management in head and neck cancer: United Kingdom National Multidisciplinary Guidelines. *J Laryngol Otol* 130(S2):S32–S40. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022215116000402>

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.