Alqalam Journal of Medical and Applied Sciences. 2025;8(1):170-176
https://doi.org/10.54361/ajmas.258127

Original article

Navigating the Therapeutic Landscape of Head and Neck Burkitt's Lymphoma: A Comparative Analysis of Treatment Approaches and Associated Challenges.

Ali Eltair

Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Faculty of Medicine, Alasmarya Islamic University, Zliten, Libya
Corresponding Email. alieltair@asmarya.edu.ly

Abstract
Head and neck Burkitt lymphoma (HN-BL) requires tailored treatment strategies due to its unique anatomical location and aggressive nature. HN-BL poses distinctive diagnostic and therapeutic obstacles in contrast to its extranodal equivalents. This review comparatively analyzes current treatment approaches for HN-BL, including intensive chemotherapy regimens, radiation therapy strategies, and the emerging role of targeted therapies. We investigate the effectiveness and adverse effect profiles of these methodologies, emphasizing determinants that affect treatment choice including neoplasm stage, patient functional capacity, and the existence of comorbid conditions. Furthermore, the abstract discusses challenges in managing treatment-related complications, achieving optimal local control, and addressing the specific anatomical challenges posed by head and neck involvement. Finally, we explore areas requiring further investigation to improve outcomes and refine therapeutic strategies for this aggressive malignancy.
Keywords. Burkitt Lymphoma, Head and Neck, Adults, Pediatrics, Non-Hodgkin Lymphoma.

Introduction

Burkitt lymphoma (BL) is a highly aggressive B-cell non-Hodgkin lymphoma. It can present as three different variants, either sporadic, endemic, or immunodeficiency associated [1,2]. Each of these variants has its own clinical and epidemiological features. It's often associated with MYC gene translocation [3]. BL primarily affects the abdominal area. However, it develops in the head and neck region in 10% of cases, mainly at level of the lymph nodes, followed by the facial bones such as the maxilla and the mandible. [1,4] More rarely, a primary BL can affect the nasal cavity, nasopharynx, and paranasal sinuses. However, sporadic forms, affecting these localizations in young children are extremely rare [5]. They manifest with rhinological symptoms that are not specific to sinonasal BL, which can cause a delayed diagnosis. It is a rapidly proliferating malignancy with tumor cell doubling times between 24 and 48 hours [6]. Treatment-related mortality (TRM) is a significant concern in patients undergoing chemotherapy, particularly in the context of aggressive regimens for conditions like Burkitt Lymphoma (BL). TRM rates in BL patients were influenced by a combination of HIV status, chemotherapy regimen, age, performance status, CNS involvement, and the treatment setting. Understanding the causes and rates of TRM can inform treatment decisions and patient management strategies.
Worldwide, the incidence of head and neck cancer (HNC) varies between pediatric (0.25-15%) and adult patients (54,010 new cases estimated for 2021), due to marked differences in histopathological variants and risk factors for each age group. Non-Hodgkin lymphoma (NHL) is one of the most common HNC in infants (28%), with Burkitt lymphoma (BL) being the main histopathological subtype in some geographic areas such as Asia, Africa, and Brazil. NHL is also common in adults, but with only 5.6% comprising Burkitt lymphoma in the head and neck (BLHN) region [7,8]. BL accounts for approximately 10% of all cases of lymphoma affecting the head and neck region [1,4].

Classification and Geographic Distribution of Burkitt's Lymphoma (BL)

Burkitt lymphoma (BL) is a highly aggressive B cell lymphoma with rapid proliferation and three clinical variants: endemic, sporadic and immunodeficiency associated. These differ by anatomic site involved and global geographic distribution.[9] Three main clinical variants of BL have been described: endemic, sporadic, and immunodeficiency-associated; each of them presenting specific epidemiological and clinical features.
Endemic BL (eBL) commonly affects facial bones and adjacent soft tissues of Equatorial African pediatric patients [9,10]. Often presents as a jaw lesion or facial bone mass, accompanied by systemic symptoms like

Received: *01-12-2024* - ***Accepted***: *19-01-2025* - ***Published***: *27-01-2025*

fever and weight loss. [9] This variant is universally associated with Epstein-Barr virus (EBV), suggesting a direct causative role of the virus in lymphoma pathogenesis. Endemic BL is also largely restricted to geographic regions in which Plasmodium falciparum malaria is holoendemic. It has been proposed that chronic B-cell activation or promotion of the oncogenic potential of EBV in the setting of malaria coinfection promotes oncogenesis. [11,12] Endemic BL occurs with a 2:1 male predominance and at a median age of 6 years. [13]
Sporadic BL (sBL) occurs worldwide, affecting mainly the abdominal and ileocecal region of children and young adults; Typically involves the abdomen or bone marrow, with less than 25% involving the head and neck. [13] Sporadic BL frequently involves extranodal sites, particularly the central nervous system (CNS), which is often leptomeningeal rather than parenchymal, gastrointestinal tract, and bone marrow. [14] In a recent retrospective study of BL in adults in the United States, 19% of patients had CNS involvement at the time of diagnosis, 16% of which was leptomeningeal disease. [15] EBV infection is found in less than 30% of sBL cases. [9,10] Sporadic BL is more commonly seen in pediatric patients, where it represents 20% to 30% of lymphomas. In adults, sporadic BL rarely occurs, comprising ;1% of cases of NHL in the United States. [14]
Immunodeficiency-associated BL is seen primarily in association with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection, and EBV infection is seen in 25% to 40% of these cases. [9,10] This variant comprises ;20% of the cases of BL in the United States. [11]

High-Risk Groups for Head and Neck Burkitt Lymphoma

identifying high-risk groups can facilitate timely interventions and improve outcomes for patients with head and neck Burkitt lymphoma. Future research should focus on enhancing screening protocols in these populations. EBV infection is not exactly etiological agents, but act as cofactors in the development of BL. [16] EBV is closely associated with nasopharyngeal carcinoma (NPC), a subset of gastric carcinoma and several types of lymphoproliferative diseases (LPDs), such as endemic Burkitt lymphoma (BL), Hodgkin lymphoma (HL), nasal NK/T-cell lymphoma, diffuse large B cell lymphoma (DLBCL), AIDS-associated B-cell lymphoma and post-transplant lymphoproliferative disorder (PTLD). [17,18] Epstein-Barr virus is known to immortalize B cells and is postulated to provide a block in the apoptotic clearance of B cells with MYC-translocations, thereby helping in clonal evolution.
BL is most commonly diagnosed in children, particularly in endemic regions like equatorial Africa, where it accounts for a significant proportion of pediatric malignancies [19] Patients with HIV are at a higher risk for developing BL, including the head and neck variant, due to their compromised immune systems. [19,20] Endemic BL is associated with regions where malaria is prevalent, suggesting that environmental factors may contribute to increased risk. Malaria cooperates with EBV by modulating T-cell response in the pathogenesis of BL. [21]

Current Treatment Approaches

Burkitt lymphoma (BL) characterized by rapid tumor growth, a heterogeneous clinical presentation and a high sensitivity to chemotherapy [22]. It is also characterized by a high cure rate in children, but treatment in adults poses significant challenges due to toxicity and lower survival rates. Burkitt lymphoma (BL), characterized by its aggressive clinical course, is primarily managed with intensive, multi-agent chemotherapy. The cornerstone of most regimens is the inclusion of doxorubicin, alkylating agents, vincristine, and etoposide, reflecting the need for highly potent therapeutic agents to induce remission. Surgical resection and radiation therapy are generally reserved for specific circumstances, playing a minimal role in initial therapy [23].
The treatment landscape for Diffuse Large B-cell Lymphoma (DLBCL) has undergone substantial evolution. Early strategies, such as the CHOP regimen (cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, vincristine, and prednisone) combined with methotrexate, were plagued by high rates of treatment failure [24].
Burkitt lymphoma (BL), a rapidly proliferating malignancy, presented a substantial therapeutic challenge before the late 1980s. Since then, a paradigm shift in treatment has occurred with the advent of intensified multiagent chemotherapy regimens. These regimens have demonstrated remarkable efficacy in achieving high rates of remission and long-term survival, thereby altering the prognosis for patients with this aggressive lymphoma. [22]. Current treatment regimens, either short or longer duration, employ intensive, multi-agent regimens composed of doxorubicin, alkylators, vincristine, and etoposide [25].

Chemotherapy protocols

The use of the CHOP regimen (cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, vincristine, and prednisone), a common first-line therapy for aggressive lymphomas, has demonstrated poor overall survival rates in patients with Burkitt's lymphoma (<40%). While the addition of the anti-CD20 monoclonal antibody rituximab to CHOP (R-CHOP) has

Received*: 01-12-2024 -* ***Accepted****: 19-01-2025 -* ***Published****: 27-01-2025*

resulted in significant improvements in other B-cell non-Hodgkin lymphomas, its efficacy in Burkitt's lymphoma remains limited. This suggests that the underlying biological mechanisms that drive Burkitt's lymphoma may render it relatively resistant to both CHOP and R-CHOP, motivating the need for more targeted therapeutic approaches [26].

The therapeutic landscape for aggressive lymphomas has been significantly advanced by the introduction of the dose-adjusted EPOCH regimen (DA-EPOCH). This regimen, which combines etoposide, prednisone, vincristine, cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, and rituximab, and utilizes a dose-adjustment strategy based on individual patient tolerability, has shown substantial clinical promise. Specifically, the regimen is characterized by a high freedom from progression rate of 95%, highlighting its efficacy in achieving sustained disease control. The dose-adjustment element may play a critical role in this success by optimizing drug delivery and minimizing toxicity [26]. This regimen is associated with lower toxicity compared to traditional high-intensity treatments, making it suitable for older adults and those with HIV [26-28].

While CHOP-based regimens have been a mainstay in lymphoma treatment, the DA-EPOCH protocol presents a promising alternative with a demonstrated reduction in the incidence of severe toxicities, most notably a significantly lower rate of neutropenia [26,27]. The established toxicity profile of R-CHOP, particularly problematic in elderly patients, underscores the necessity for the development and adoption of risk-adapted strategies designed to minimize adverse events and improve treatment tolerability [29]. In a clinical trial comparing DA-EPOCH-R and SC-EPOCH-RR, the incidence of fever and neutropenia per treatment cycle was 22% and 10%, respectively. While DA-EPOCH-R exhibited a higher incidence of these adverse events, the absence of treatment-related mortality in both groups suggests that, overall, both regimens have a reasonable safety profile [30].

The treatment of localized cases with chemotherapy is associated with highly favorable outcomes, with long-term survival rates documented to reach up to 90% [31]. Patients with old age, advanced staged disease, bulky mass, high lactate dehydrogenase level, and CNS or marrow involvement, are known to have poor prognosis. The utilization of surgery is typically limited to diagnostic biopsy or the management of emergent complications, and radiation therapy is generally avoided in pediatric patients. Consequently, in cases of a poor prognosis, localized radiation may be considered for its potential to offer symptomatic relief, acknowledging the complex risk-benefit assessment [16].

Treatment Challenges

How do toxicity profiles of different treatment approaches impact patient outcomes and quality of life?

Cancer treatment, while necessary, often involves significant toxicities, which directly influence patient outcomes and quality of life. The imperative to optimize therapeutic strategies while minimizing adverse effects highlights the importance of understanding the toxicity profiles of different treatment regimens. This analysis delves into the toxicity profiles of diverse treatment approaches for lymphomas, exploring their implications for patient outcomes and quality of life.

Toxicity profiles in lymphoma treatments

High-intensity regimens

High-intensity regimens, exemplified by CODOX-M/IVAC, are characterized by a substantial incidence of severe toxicities, notably including grade 4 neutropenia and thrombocytopenia in a significant percentage of treated individuals [26]. The clinical effectiveness of these regimens is often contrasted with their poor tolerability in older adults, thus presenting a challenge and necessitating the development of alternative therapeutic approaches [27].

Intermediate-intensity approaches

The clinical potential of dose-adjusted EPOCH-R (DA-EPOCH-R), an intermediate-intensity regimen, is supported by its high cure rates and relatively low toxicity, making it a promising therapeutic option across all age groups [27]. The design of this regimen incorporates a novel approach, focusing on the sustained exposure of target tissues to the drug, as opposed to relying on transient peak concentrations. This strategy is designed to reduce treatment-related toxicity while simultaneously maintaining a high degree of therapeutic efficacy [26].

Low-intensity regimens

Low-intensity regimens based on EPOCH-R have emerged as a promising approach to cancer treatment, demonstrating significant reductions in treatment toxicity without compromising the achievement of high rates

Received*: 01-12-2024 -* ***Accepted****: 19-01-2025 -* ***Published****: 27-01-2025*

of durable response. The favorable toxicity profile, characterized primarily by grade 1 or 2 toxic effects, makes these regimens well-suited for outpatient settings and contributes to a notable improvement in overall patient quality of life [26].

Impact on patient outcomes

Complete remission rates

For patients with nasal extranodal natural killer/T-cell lymphoma (ENKTL), the combination of pegaspargase and concurrent chemoradiotherapy (CCRT) has yielded particularly favorable results. Specifically, this treatment approach has demonstrated a high complete remission (CR) rate of 90%, with concurrently low rates of systemic recurrence, suggesting a synergistic effect that significantly enhances treatment outcomes compared to either treatment alone [32]. In the spectrum of treatment options, intermediate-intensity regimens like dose-adjusted EPOCH-R (DA-EPOCH-R) have emerged as highly efficacious, demonstrating favorable progression-free survival (PFS) rates not only in low-risk patient groups but also in those considered high-risk, suggesting its broad applicability and effectiveness across varying disease severities [27].

Survival and relapse

The impact of treatment regimen toxicity on both survival and relapse underscores the need for careful consideration in cancer treatment planning. While the inclusion of rituximab in EPOCH-R regimens provides a modest survival benefit, its effect on toxicity is not substantial. This highlights the relevance of low-intensity regimens, which have shown the capacity to maintain high event-free survival rates while decreasing the occurrence of severe toxic events, thereby contributing to improved long-term patient outcomes. [26]

Quality of life considerations (toxicity management)

Preserving patient quality of life during cancer treatment necessitates a comprehensive approach to the management of treatment-induced toxicities. In this context, regimens like SC-EPOCH-RR, designed to reduce toxicity, have shown associations with decreased hospital admissions and lower rates of severe side effects such as neutropenia. Accordingly, the selection of a treatment plan requires a highly individualized approach, carefully considering a patient's age, pre-existing risk factors, and the potential for adverse effects, with the overarching goal of optimizing quality of life both during the active treatment phase and in the long-term follow-up. [26]

A robust body of evidence demonstrates that patient-related factors, including age and comorbid conditions, are influential in shaping healthcare providers' treatment choices. These elements can dramatically impact the selection of appropriate interventions, the intensity of therapeutic regimens, and the overall strategy for managing patients with diverse illnesses. The interplay between these factors and clinical decisions is especially relevant within oncology, necessitating a rigorous examination of their impact on treatment pathways. Further investigation into these relationships is crucial for developing evidence-based treatment algorithms that ensure patient-centered and equitable care.

Age as a determinant in treatment decisions

The risk of treatment-related mortality (TRM) is known to increase with age, making it a crucial variable for healthcare professionals in treatment decisions. This relationship requires clinicians to balance the potential efficacy of interventions against the patient’s vulnerability to adverse outcomes, highlighting the complexities of treatment planning in the context of aging. Younger individuals, specifically those within the age range of 40 to 59 years, generally exhibit a greater capacity to endure rigorous therapeutic interventions compared to their older counterparts, a factor that significantly impacts the determination to engage in such treatment modalities. The investigation indicates that individuals aged 70 years and older exhibit a diminished probability of undergoing intensive therapeutic interventions, attributable to age-associated determinants and geriatric-specific health assessments that are not adequately represented within the dataset [33]. Adult patients with Burkitt lymphoma (BL) face substantial difficulties due to the disease's rarity and its rapid, aggressive progression.

This combination of factors often mandates an urgent therapeutic approach, requiring quick and decisive clinical actions to achieve optimal outcomes. The well-documented challenges associated with the tolerability of conventional intensive treatment protocols, particularly among older adults and individuals with comorbid conditions, have stimulated extensive research into alternative therapeutic modalities. This ongoing effort is driven by the need to identify treatments that offer comparable efficacy while reducing the incidence of adverse effects and improving overall patient well-being [22].

Received*: 01-12-2024 -* ***Accepted****: 19-01-2025 -* ***Published****: 27-01-2025*

Comorbid conditions a determinant in treatment decisions
Influence of comorbidities on treatment choices
Comorbid conditions can significantly affect the choice of treatment for head and neck Burkitt's lymphoma. For instance, the presence of HIV is associated with Burkitt's lymphoma in approximately 30% of cases, which can complicate treatment decisions due to the immunocompromised status of the patient [34]. When systemic involvement becomes apparent, which includes the bone marrow and central nervous system, it often necessitates the adoption of more aggressive treatment approaches to improve treatment outcomes [35].

Impact on prognosis and treatment outcomes
Patients with comorbid conditions such as HIV or CNS involvement often have a poorer prognosis, which can influence the aggressiveness of the treatment regimen. Early diagnosis and management are crucial to reduce the risk of systemic spread and improve outcomes [35]. The presence of comorbidities can also affect the choice of chemotherapy regimens. For example, patients with HIV may require modified chemotherapy protocols to account for their immunocompromised state [34].

Treatment strategies and considerations
Chemotherapy regimens
Complex chemotherapy is the primary treatment modality for Burkitt's lymphoma, including drugs like cyclophosphamide, vincristine, methotrexate, and prednisone. These regimens are highly effective, with long-term survival rates of up to 90% in some cases [31]. In cases with comorbid conditions, such as HIV, treatment regimens may need to be adjusted to minimize toxicity and manage potential drug interactions

Role of early diagnosis
Early diagnosis represents a critical determinant in the effective management of Burkitt's lymphoma, especially in individuals presenting with concurrent medical conditions [31,35]. A high index of suspicion is necessary when evaluating patients with common otolaryngologic symptoms, as these can often mask more serious conditions like Burkitt's lymphoma [35].

CONCLUSION
In conclusion, the toxicity profiles of cancer treatments play a critical role in determining patient outcomes and quality of life. By balancing efficacy with manageable side effects, and through the development of innovative therapies, there is potential to significantly enhance the therapeutic landscape for patients with aggressive cancers. The toxicity profiles of lymphoma treatment regimens play a critical role in determining patient outcomes and quality of life. While high-intensity treatments may offer efficacy, their severe toxicities necessitate the exploration of intermediate and low-intensity alternatives. Future research should focus on refining these regimens to balance efficacy and toxicity, ultimately enhancing patient care and quality of life.
addressing the unmet needs in BL management requires a multifaceted approach, integrating novel therapeutic strategies, genomic insights, and innovative clinical trial designs. Future research should focus on developing targeted therapies and improving molecular diagnostics to enhance treatment precision and patient outcomes. Comorbid conditions play a significant role in determining treatment strategies for head and neck Burkitt's lymphoma. These conditions can influence both the choice of treatment and the prognosis, necessitating careful consideration in clinical decision-making. Future research should focus on developing tailored treatment protocols that account for the presence of comorbidities to improve patient outcomes.

Conflict of interest. Nil

References
1. Arboleda LPA, Rodrigues-Fernandes CI, Mariz BALA, Santos PSS, de Lima PMA, de Paula JN, et al. Burkitt lymphoma of the head and neck: an international collaborative study. J Oral Pathol Med. 2021 Jun;50(6):572-86.
2. Hong X, Khalife S, Bouhabel S, Boudreau D, Daniel SJ. Rhinologic manifestations of Burkitt Lymphoma in a pediatric population: case series and systematic review. Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol. 2019 May;121:127-36.
3. Kalisz K, Alessandrino F, Beck R, Smith D, Kikano E, Ramaiya NH, et al. An update on Burkitt lymphoma: a review of pathogenesis and multimodality imaging assessment of disease presentation, treatment response, and recurrence. Insights Imaging. 2019 Oct 23;10(1):102.
4. Goel AN, Filimonov A, Teruya-Feldstein J, Chan WJ, Laskin DM. Burkitt lymphoma of the nasopharynx causing life-threatening airway obstruction: a case report. Am J Otolaryngol Head Neck Med Surg. 2021 Jul-Aug;42(4):102977.

Received: *01-12-2024* - ***Accepted***: *19-01-2025* - ***Published***: *27-01-2025*

5. Xuereb G, Borg J, Apap K, Borg C. The snoring 2-year-old boy: a case of primary nasopharyngeal Burkitt's lymphoma. BMJ Case Rep. 2020 Jan 15;13(1):e233536.
6. Schmitz R, Ceribelli M, Pittaluga S, Wright G, Staudt LM. Oncogenic mechanisms in Burkitt lymphoma. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med. 2014 Feb 1;4(2):a014282.
7. Arboleda LPA, de Mendonça RMH, Lopez EEM, Araújo ALD, Palmier NR, de Pauli Paglioni M, Fonseca JM, Hoffmann IL, Cardinalli IA, Chaves ALF, Aranda S, Brandão TB, Lopes MA, Ribeiro ACP, Troconis CCM, Santos-Silva AR. Global frequency and distribution of head and neck cancer in pediatrics, a systematic review. Crit Rev Oncol Hematol. 2020 Apr;148:102892.
8. Alli N, Meer S. Head and neck lymphomas: A 20-year review in an Oral Pathology Unit, Johannesburg, South Africa, a country with the highest global incidence of HIV/AIDS. Oral Oncol. 2017 Apr;67:17-23.
9. Swerdlow SH, Campo E, Pileri SA, Harris NL, Stein H, Siebert R, et al. The 2016 revision of the World Health Organization classification of lymphoid neoplasms. Blood. 2016 May 19;127(20):2375-90.
10. Stefan DC, Lutchman R. Burkitt lymphoma: epidemiological features and survival in a South African centre. Infect Agents Cancer. 2014 Jul 10;9:19.
11. Gastwirt JP, Roschewski M. Management of adults with Burkitt lymphoma. Clin Adv Hematol Oncol. 2018 Dec;16(12):812-22.
12. Parroche P, Lauw FN, Goutagny N, Latz E, Monks BG, Visintin A, et al. Malaria hemozoin is immunologically inert but radically enhances innate responses by presenting malaria DNA to Toll-like receptor 9. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2007 Feb 6;104(6):1919-24.
13. Cabeçadas J, Martinez D, Andreasen S, Hjorth Mikkelsen L, Molina-Urra R, Hall D, et al. Lymphomas of the head and neck region: an update. Virchows Arch. 2019.
14. Crombie JL, LaCasce AS. Epstein Barr Virus Associated B-Cell Lymphomas and Iatrogenic Lymphoproliferative Disorders. Front Oncol. 2019;9:109.
15. Evens AM, Danilov A, Jagadeesh D, Sperling A, Kim SH, Vaca R, Wei C, Rector D, Sundaram S, Reddy N, Lin Y, Farooq U, D'Angelo C, Bond DA, Berg S, Churnetski MC, Godara A, Khan N, Choi YK, Yazdy M, Rabinovich E, Varma G, Karmali R, Mian A, Savani M, Burkart M, Martin P, Ren A, Chauhan A, Diefenbach C, Straker-Edwards A, Klein AK, Blum KA, Boughan KM, Smith SE, Haverkos BM, Orellana-Noia VM, Kenkre VP, Zayac A, Ramdial J, Maliske SM, Epperla N, Venugopal P, Feldman TA, Smith SD, Stadnik A, David KA, Naik S, Lossos IS, Lunning MA, Caimi P, Kamdar M, Palmisiano N, Bachanova V, Portell CA, Phillips T, Olszewski AJ, Alderuccio JP. Burkitt lymphoma in the modern era: real-world outcomes and prognostication across 30 US cancer centers. Blood. 2021 Jan 21;137(3):374-386.
16. Swain SK, Sahu A, Samal S. Primary nasopharyngeal Burkitt's lymphoma in paediatric patients in a non-endemic region: our experience. Pol J Pathol. 2021;72(3):265-70.
17. Xu M, Yao Y, Chen H, Zhang S, et al. Genome sequencing analysis identifies Epstein-Barr virus subtypes associated with high risk of nasopharyngeal carcinoma. Nat Genet. 2019 Jul;51(7):1131-36.
18. Rickinson AB, Kieff E. Epstein-Barr Virus. In: Fields B, Knipe DM, Howley PM, editors. Fields virology. 4th ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams and Wilkins; 2001. p. 2575-627.
19. Molyneux EM, Rochford R, Griffin B, Newton R, Jackson G, Menon G, et al. Burkitt's lymphoma. Lancet. 2012 Mar 31;379(9822):1234-44.
20. Linke-Serinsöz E, Fend F, Quintanilla-Martinez L. Human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) and Epstein-Barr virus (EBV) related lymphomas, pathology view point. Semin Diagn Pathol. 2017 Jul;34(4):352-63.
21. Hutcheson RL, Chakravorty A, Sugden B. Burkitt lymphomas evolve to escape dependencies on Epstein-Barr virus. Front Cell Infect Microbiol. 2021 Jan 29;10:606412.
22. Crombie J, LaCasce A. The treatment of Burkitt lymphoma in adults. Blood. 2021 Feb11;137(6):743-50.
23. Stein JE, Schwenn M, Jacir NN, Harris BH. Surgical restraint in Burkitt's lymphoma in children. J Pediatr Surg. 1991 Nov;26(11):1273-5.
24. Smeland S, Blystad AK, Kvaløy SO, Ikonomou IM, Delabie J, Kvalheim G, et al. Treatment of Burkitt's/Burkitt-like lymphoma in adolescents and adults: A 20-year experience from the Norwegian Radium Hospital with the use of three successive regimens. Ann Oncol. 2004 Jul;15(7):1072-8.
25. Jacobson C, LaCasce A. How I treat Burkitt lymphoma in adults. Blood. 2014 Nov 6;124(19):2913-20.
26. Dunleavy K, Pittaluga S, Shovlin M, Steinberg SM, Cole D, Grant C, et al. Low-intensity therapy in adults with Burkitt's lymphoma. N Engl J Med. 2014.
27. Dunleavy K. Approach to the diagnosis and treatment of adult Burkitt's lymphoma. JOP. J Pancreas. 2018 Dec;14(11):665-71. doi: 10.1200/JOP.18.00148.
28. Longo DL, Roschewski M, Staudt LM, Wilson WH. Burkitt's lymphoma. N Engl J Med. 2022.
29. Roschewski M, Dunleavy K, Abramson JS, Trotman J, Boutros T, Mulligan AM, et al. Multicenter study of risk-adapted therapy with dose-adjusted EPOCH-R in adults with untreated Burkitt lymphoma. J Clin Oncol. 2020 Aug 1;38(23):2519-29.
30. Wilson WH, Grossbard ML, Pittaluga S, et al. Dose-adjusted EPOCH chemotherapy for untreated large B-cell lymphomas: A pharmacodynamic approach with high efficacy. Blood. 2002 Apr 15;99(8):2685-93.
31. Nikgoo A, Mirafshariyeh SA, Kazeminajad B, Eshkevari PS, Fatemitabar SA. Burkitt's lymphoma of maxillary sinuses: Review of literature and report of bilateral case. J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2009 Aug;67(8):1755-63.

Received*: 01-12-2024 -* ***Accepted****: 19-01-2025 -* ***Published****: 27-01-2025*

32. Wang H, Wang L, Li C, Wuxiao Z, Chen G, Luo W, et al. Pegaspargase combined with concurrent radiotherapy for early-stage extranodal natural killer/T-cell lymphoma, nasal type: A two-center phase II study. Oncologist. 2020.
33. Evens AM, Danilov A, Jagadeesh D, Shah BD, Smith SM, Ansari M, et al. Burkitt lymphoma in the modern era: real-world outcomes and prognostication across 30 US cancer centers. Blood. 2021 Jan 21;137(3):374-86.
34. Rodrigues-Fernandes CI, Pérez-de-Oliveira ME, Aristizabal Arboleda LP, Fonseca FP, Lopes MA, Vargas PA, et al. Clinicopathological analysis of oral Burkitt's lymphoma in pediatric patients: A systematic review. Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol. 2020 Jul;134:110033.
35. Dozzo M, Carobolante F, Donisi PM, Scattolin A, Maino E, Sancetta R, et al. Burkitt lymphoma in adolescents and young adults: management challenges. Adolesc Health Med Ther. 2016 Dec 23;8:11-29.

المستخلص

يتطلب سرطان الغدد الليمفاوية البُركيتي في الرأس والعنق استراتيجيات علاجية مُخصصة نظرًا لموقعه التشريحي الفريد وطبيعته العدوانية. يطرح سرطان الغدد الليمفاوية البُركيتي في الرأس والعنق تحديات تشخيصية وعلاجية مميزة مقارنةً بنظائره خارج العقد الليمفاوية. تستعرض هذه المراجعة بشكل مُقارن الأساليب العلاجية الحالية لسرطان الغدد الليمفاوية البُركيتي في الرأس والعنق ، بما في ذلك نظم العلاج الكيميائي المكثفة، واستراتيجيات العلاج الإشعاعي، والدور الناشئ للعلاجات الموجهة. كما نبحث في فعالية هذه المنهجيات وملامح الآثار الجانبية لها، مع التركيز على المحددات التي تؤثر في اختيار العلاج، بما في ذلك مرحلة الورم، والقدرة الوظيفية للمريض، ووجود الظروف المرضية المصاحبة. علاوة على ذلك، يناقش الملخص التحديات في إدارة المضاعفات المرتبطة بالعلاج، وتحقيق السيطرة الموضعية المثلى، ومعالجة التحديات التشريحية الخاصة التي يفرضها إصابة الرأس والعنق. أخيرًا، نستكشف المجالات التي تتطلب مزيدًا من البحث لتحسين النتائج وصقل الاستراتيجيات العلاجية لهذا الورم الخبيث العدواني. تم إجراء مراجعة شاملة ومقارنة لفعالية أساليب العلاج المختلفة لسرطان الغدد الليمفاوية البُركيتي في الرأس والعنق، وملامح السمية المرتبطة بها، والتحديات المصاحبة لها، وتحديد المجالات التي تتطلب إجراء أبحاث مستقبلية وتحسين الاستراتيجيات العلاجية .تم تعزيز المعرفة الأساسية لتوجيه عملية صنع القرار السريري، وتعزيز الابتكار، وفي نهاية المطاف، تحسين النتائج السريرية عن طريق التحكم في النفقات في تقديم الرعاية الصحية.

Received*: 01-12-2024 -* ***Accepted****: 19-01-2025 -* ***Published****: 27-01-2025*