© MAY 2025 | IRE Journals | Volume 8 Issue 11 | ISSN: 2456-8880

Targeting Cancer: The Evolving Science of Radiation Therapy

MICHAEL SHIFERAW
University of Colorado Boulder

Abstract- In 1896, a Chicago physician named Emil Grubbé suffered severe burns to his hand after experimenting with X rays, an accident that would unexpectedly pave the way for radiation therapy as a cancer treatment. Just a year earlier, Wilhelm Conrad Röntgen had discovered X rays, a breakthrough that transformed medical imaging. However, it was the observation of X rays' destructive effects on tissue that ignited interest in their potential to fight disease. This review explores the journey of radiation therapy, tracing its evolution from crude experiments in the late 19th century to its role today as a vital tool in modern oncology. Along the way, key milestones are highlighted, and how its effectiveness has grown is assessed. How technological leaps, from the early use of low-energy X rays to advanced precision methods, have broadened the types of cancers treatable and improved patient outcomes is examined.

I. INTRODUCTION

The DAWN OF X-RAYS

Röntgen's discovery of X rays in 1895 sparked significant interest within the medical community[1]. Their potential was explored by physicians and scientists, though the associated risks remained poorly understood. Initially, X rays were prized for their capacity to reveal internal structures, such as bones, without requiring surgery. However, it was soon observed by researchers that prolonged exposure resulted in skin burns and hair loss, indicating that X rays could destroy living tissue[2]. This realization prompted the exploration of X rays as a potential treatment option, extending beyond mere imaging.

In 1896, Léopold Freund, an Austrian physician, employed X rays to treat a young girl's congenital melanocytic nevus, a large, hairy, pigmented birthmark present from birth, marking one of the earliest therapeutic uses of radiation[3]. The treatment successfully removed the excess hair but caused significant scarring due to the rudimentary methods of early X-ray therapy. Concurrently, Emil Grubbé in Chicago claimed that a breast cancer patient was treated with X rays, though this claim remains contested[4]. In France, Victor Despeignes attempted to address stomach cancer, with only limited success achieved[5]. The technology, however, was primitive. Devices like Crookes tubes generated low-energy X rays that penetrated only a few millimeters into the body, limiting treatments to superficial conditions such as skin cancers or benign lesions like Freund's nevus. Deeper tumors in areas like the lungs or abdomen remained unreachable without causing skin damage

II. ADVANCEMENTS AND CHALLENGES IN THE EARLY 20TH CENTURY

As the 19th century drew to a close, radiation therapy was constrained by a significant limitation: the low-energy X-rays produced by devices like Crookes tubes could only treat superficial conditions, such as skin lesions, leaving deeper tumors entirely inaccessible. The turn of the 20th century, however, marked a transformative shift with the discovery of radium by Marie and Pierre Curie in 1898[6]. After years of laboriously extracting minute quantities of radium from tons of pitchblende, a uranium-rich ore, a substance vastly more radioactive than uranium was unveiled[7]. Unlike X-rays, radium emitted gamma rays, a form of radiation with far greater penetrating power, capable of targeting cancers located beyond the skin's surface. This breakthrough captivated the medical community, offering hope for treating previously unreachable tumors.

Radium soon played a pivotal role in the development of a groundbreaking cancer treatment known as brachytherapy, a term derived from the Greek word for 'short distance. In this method, small amounts of radium were sealed into needles, tubes, or applicators and positioned directly inside or adjacent to the tumor[8]. This approach enabled the delivery of concentrated radiation doses to the cancer while sparing much of the surrounding healthy tissue, in stark contrast to the broader exposure of external X-rays. By the early 1900s, radium applicators were being used to treat cancers such as cervical and endometrial cancer, with insertion into the uterus or vagina. For example, the Stockholm method, developed around 1910, combined external X-rays with intracavitary radium, achieving remarkable success in cervical cancer treatment, with some patients experiencing long-term remission[9]. This milestone extended radiation therapy's reach to internal tumors once deemed untreatable, laying early foundations for modern gynecologic oncology.

Concurrently, X-ray technology was advancing. By the 1920s, orthovoltage X-ray machines, operating at energy levels of 200 to 500 kilovolts, had surpassed the weaker, less reliable Crookes tubes of the prior century[10]. These machines could penetrate 4 to 6 centimeters into the body, enabling the treatment of tumors slightly beneath the surface, such as those in the breast, lymph nodes, or head and neck[11]. Despite this progress, their depth remained limited, and a significant drawback persisted: the skin absorbed a disproportionately high dose of radiation, often up to 100% of the beam's energy, resulting in severe burns, scarring, and chronic ulcers. This "skin dose" issue forced clinicians into a delicate balancing act, weighing tumor control against the risk of debilitating side effects, underscoring the need for deeper-reaching solutions.

The expanding role of radiation therapy revealed another critical gap: the absence of precise dosing. Early practitioners had relied on rudimentary indicators, such as the onset of skin redness (erythema), to estimate radiation exposure, an inconsistent and error-prone method[12]. A significant advancement was achieved in 1928 with the introduction of the roentgen unit, named in honor of Wilhelm Röntgen, the discoverer of X-rays. Defined as the amount of radiation producing a specific level of ionization in air, the roentgen provided a standardized, scientific metric for quantifying exposure. Its adoption facilitated greater consistency across treatments and clinics, replacing guesswork with a reproducible baseline. However, challenges persisted: the roentgen measured exposure rather than the radiation absorbed by tissue, leaving precise tumor dosing an elusive goal and highlighting the need for further refinement[13].

Despite these innovations, early 20th-century radiation therapy remained a double-edged sword. Side effects were often severe and unpredictable. Patients frequently suffered skin burns that could blister and peel, tissue necrosis that destroyed healthy areas, and, in some cases, radiation-induced cancers years later due to the therapy's mutagenic effects. For instance, early radiologists and patients treated with radium or excessive X-rays faced elevated risks of leukemia and skin cancer, serving as a grim reminder of radiation's hazards. Moreover, deep-seated tumors—those in organs such as the lungs, liver, or brain—remained largely untreatable, as neither radium nor orthovoltage X-rays could penetrate far enough without causing catastrophic damage to overlying tissues. These limitations underscored the urgent need for more advanced tools[13],[14],[15].

Yet, amidst these challenges, radiation therapy achieved notable successes. Skin cancers, such as basal cell carcinoma, responded exceptionally well, with cure rates reaching up to 90% when treated with carefully calibrated X-rays or radium applicators[16]. Lymphomas, particularly Hodgkin's disease, also proved highly radiosensitive; by the 1940s, pioneers like Gilbert Fletcher reported long-term remissions using orthovoltage techniques, with some patients surviving decades post-treatment[17]. These achievements validated radiation's potential as a cancer-fighting tool, even as its limitations drove relentless innovation.

By the mid-20th century, the stage was set for a revolutionary advancement: the development of megavoltage machines. Capable of generating X-rays with energies in the millions of volts, these devices promised to overcome the depth limitations of orthovoltage X-rays and the skin-sparing challenges of radium. This transition would soon usher radiation therapy into a new era of precision and efficacy, expanding its capability to combat deep tumors and solidifying its role in modern cancer care.

III. PRECISION REDEFINED: THE CUTTING EDGE OF RADIATION THERAPY

As radiation therapy progressed into the late 20th and early 21st centuries, a profound transformation was undergone, shifting from a generalized, "broad-brush" approach to a highly precise and sophisticated science. Innovations such as intensity-modulated radiation therapy (IMRT), stereotactic radiosurgery (SRS), and proton therapy have been established as redefining cancer treatment, offering renewed hope for patients with complex or previously untreatable cancers[18]. These advancements not only refined existing tools, but also fundamentally reshaped strategies employed in oncology.

The introduction of IMRT in the 1990s marked a pivotal moment in radiation oncology. Through the use of computer-controlled multileaf collimators (devices that shape and modulate the intensity of radiation beams), highly conformal doses of radiation are delivered[19]. This precision enables the radiation dose to be sculpted to match the tumor's contours while adjacent healthy tissues are spared. For instance, in head and neck cancers, damage to salivary glands is significantly reduced by IMRT, minimizing xerostomia (dry mouth), which can impair quality of life by affecting taste, swallowing, and speech[20]. Similarly, in prostate cancer, exposure to surrounding organs like the bladder and rectum is decreased, enhancing post-treatment quality of life. Studies indicate that tumor control rates are improved by IMRT, with severe side effects reduced by up to 20% compared to older techniques, establishing it as a cornerstone of modern radiation therapy.

Stereotactic radiosurgery (SRS) represents another significant advancement in precision cancer treatment. Despite its name, no actual surgery is involved in SRS. Instead, ultra-high doses of precisely focused radiation are delivered in one or a few sessions. Initially developed for brain tumors using technologies like the Gamma Knife and CyberKnife, surgical-level precision is achieved without invasive procedures. Lesions as small as a few millimeters can be targeted while surrounding healthy tissue is spared. Over time, SRS evolved into stereotactic body radiation therapy (SBRT) for extracranial tumors in areas such as the lung, liver, and spine. For early-stage lung cancer patients too frail for surgery, local control rates exceeding 90% are achieved by SBRT, rivaling surgical outcomes without requiring incisions. This approach has been recognized as transformative for patients previously deemed untreatable[21].

Proton therapy is regarded as one of the most advanced forms of radiation therapy available today. Unlike traditional X-rays, which deposit energy along their entire path through the body, protons release their maximum energy at a specific depth, known as the Bragg peak. High doses are thus delivered directly to tumors while surrounding healthy tissues are spared. In pediatric cancers like medulloblastoma, radiation exposure to critical organs such as the heart and lungs is minimized by proton therapy, reducing long-term risks like heart disease or developmental issues. For tumors near sensitive structures (such as those in the brainstem or spinal cord), unparalleled precision is offered. However, challenges persist. The construction of proton centers entails costs of hundreds of millions of dollars, limiting access to specialized facilities worldwide[22].

Significant improvements in survival rates across various cancers have been driven by these advancements. In localized prostate cancer, 5-year survival rates above 98% have been achieved with IMRT and proton therapy, accompanied by fewer side effects like incontinence. Post-surgical radiation for breast cancer reduces recurrence risk by half, while cure rates exceeding 80% are attained by Hodgkin's lymphoma patients when chemotherapy is combined with radiation therapy[23],[24]. Radiation has been integrated as a vital component of multimodal cancer care strategies, often employed alongside surgery, chemotherapy, or immunotherapy. Currently, over half of all cancer patients receive some form of radiation during their treatment journey.

While remarkable benefits are offered by these technologies, challenges remain. Long-term complications, such as secondary cancers or cardiovascular damage, can emerge years after treatment, particularly in younger patients or those treated near vital organs like the chest[25]. Access disparities also persist; advanced therapies like proton therapy are concentrated in urban centers or wealthier nations, leaving rural or low-resource populations reliant on older technologies. Additionally, the high cost of cutting-edge treatments limits their widespread adoption [26].

Looking forward, emerging innovations like FLASH radiotherapy, which delivers ultra-high doses in milliseconds to minimize damage to healthy tissues, and further refinements in adaptive radiotherapy are poised to expand possibilities[27]. However, equitable access must be ensured, and late effects addressed, as critical priorities while radiation oncology continues its rapid evolution into an era defined by precision and personalization.

By the 2020s, radiation therapy had been solidified as an indispensable pillar of oncology, seamlessly integrating physics, engineering, and medicine to combat cancer with unprecedented precision. From the rudimentary X-ray experiments of the 1890s to the sophisticated technologies of IMRT, SRS, and proton therapy, a remarkable journey has been traversed, with survival rates for cancers like prostate and Hodgkin's lymphoma reaching historic highs. Continued advancements in ultra-fast radiation delivery and artificial intelligence-driven planning are anticipated to further enhance efficacy and accessibility, ensuring that the legacy of innovation begun by pioneers like Röntgen and Grubbé endures in the fight against cancer.

REFERENCES

[1] Wang, Y., Ali, A., & Chen, Z. (2025). Dynamic relationships between environment-related technologies, agricultural value added, transport infrastructure and environmental emissions in the five most populous countries. Scientific Reports, 15(1), 2308.

[2] Liu, Y., Ali, A., Chen, Y., & She, X. (2023). The effect of transport infrastructure (road, rail, and air) investments on economic growth and environmental pollution and testing the validity of EKC in China, India, Japan, and Russia. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 30(12), 32585-32599.

[3] . Shah, K. J., Pan, S. Y., Lee, I., Kim, H., You, Z., Zheng, J. M., & Chiang, P. C. (2021). Green transportation for sustainability: Review of current barriers, strategies, and innovative technologies. Journal of Cleaner Production, 326, 129392.

[4] Black, W. R. (1996). Sustainable transportation: a US perspective. Journal of transport geography, 4(3), 151-159.

[5] Rahman, M. M., Khan, Z., Khan, S., & Abbas, S. (2023). Disaggregated energy consumption, industrialization, total population, and ecological footprint nexus: evidence from the world's top 10 most populous countries. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 30(56), 119069-119083.

[6] Day-Farnsworth, L., & Miller, M. (2014). Networking across the supply chain: Transportation innovations in local and regional food systems.

[7] Ullah, A., Khan, S., Khamjalas, K., Ahmad, M., Hassan, A., & Uddin, I. (2023). RETRACTED ARTICLE: Environmental regulation, renewable electricity, industrialization, economic complexity, technological innovation, and sustainable environment: testing the N-shaped EKC hypothesis for the G-10 economies. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 30(44), 99713-99734.

[8] Kamga, C., & Yazici, M. A. (2014). Achieving environmental sustainability beyond technological improvements: Potential role of high-speed rail in the United States of America. Transportation research part D: Transport and environment, 31, 148-164.

[9] Underwood, S. E. (2014). Disruptive innovation on the path to sustainable mobility: creating a roadmap for road transportation in the United States. Road Vehicle Automation, 157-168.

[10] Popescu, G. H., Nica, E., Kliestik, T., Zvarikova, K., Mihai, E. A., & Gura, K. (2023). Exploring the Environmental Impact of Energy Consumption, Globalization, and Research & Development in Europe: Insights from the STIRPAT-EKC Framework.

[11] Vergragt, P. J., & Brown, H. S. (2007). Sustainable mobility: from technological innovation to societal learning. Journal of Cleaner Production, 15(11-12), 1104-1115.

[12] Hussain, M., & Khan, J. A. (2023). The nexus of environment-related technologies and

consumption-based carbon emissions in top five emitters: empirical analysis through dynamic common correlated effects estimator. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 30(10), 25059-25068.

[13] Zhou, J. (2012). Sustainable transportation in the US: A review of proposals, policies, and programs since 2000. Frontiers of architectural research, 1(2), 150-165.

[14] Henríquez, B. L. P. (2020). Energy sources for sustainable transportation and urban development. Transportation, Land Use, and Environmental Planning, 281-298.

[15] Wang, W., Ali, A., Wang, H., Feng, Y., & Dai, S. (2023). EKC hypothesis testing and environmental impacts of transportation infrastructure investments in China, Turkey, India, and Japan. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 30(34), 81600-81615.

[16] Haynes, K. E., Gifford, J. L., & Pelletiere, D. (2005). Sustainable transportation institutions and regional evolution: Global and local perspectives. Journal of Transport Geography, 13(3), 207- 221.

[17] Uddin, M. M. M. (2020). What are the dynamic links between agriculture and manufacturing growth and environmental degradation? Evidence from different panel income countries. Environmental and sustainability indicators, 7, 100041.

[18] El Bilali, H., & Allahyari, M. S. (2018). Transition towards sustainability in agriculture and food systems: Role of information and communication technologies. Information processing in agriculture, 5(4), 456-464.

[19] Patel, A., & Patel, R. (2023). Analytical method development for biologics: Overcoming stability, purity, and quantification challenges. Journal of Applied Optics, 44(1S), 1-29.

[20] Ahmed, N., Xinagyu, G., Alnafissa, M., Sikder, M., & Faye, B. (2025). Evaluating the impact of sustainable technology, resource utilization, and climate change on soil emissions: A CS-ARDL analysis of leading agricultural economies. Cleaner Engineering and Technology, 24, 100869.

[21] Gudmundsson, H., Hall, R. P., Marsden, G., & Zietsman, J. (2016). Sustainable transportation. Heidelberg, Ger. Frederiksberg, Denmark, Spreinger-Verlag Samf

[22] Geerlings, H. (2012). Meeting the challenge of sustainable mobility: the role of technological innovations. Springer Science & Business Media.

[23] Hong, K., Cheng, W., Xue, E., Wang, B., & Amin, A. (2024). Green growth in belt and road initiative countries: exploring the interplay of agriculture production, technological innovation and environmental pollution. Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy, 1-21.

[24] Ibrahim, R. L., Al-Mulali, U., Solarin, S. A., Ajide, K. B., Al-Faryan, M. A. S., & Mohammed, A. (2023). Probing environmental sustainability pathways in G7 economies: the role of energy transition, technological innovation, and demographic mobility. Environmental Science and Pollution Research, 30(30), 75694-75719.

[25] Geels, F. W., Kern, F., & Clark, W. C. (2023). System transitions research and sustainable development: Challenges, progress, and prospects. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 120(47), e2206230120.

[26] Patel, R., & Patel, A. (2024). Advancements in high-resolution analytical techniques for pharmaceutical characterization: Bridging quality control and drug efficacy. International Journal of Innovative Research in Science, Engineering and Technology, 13(9), 16887.

[27] Ness, S. (2025). Securing Networks Against Adversarial Domain Name System Tunneling Attacks Using Hybrid Neural Networks. IEEE Access.

[28] Schiller, P. L., & Kenworthy, J. (2017). An introduction to sustainable transportation: Policy, planning and implementation. Routledge

[29] Gyamfi, B. A., Bekun, F. V., Balsalobre-Lorente, D., Onifade, S. T., & Ampomah, A. B. (2022). Beyond the environmental Kuznets curve: Do combined impacts of air transport and rail transport matter for environmental sustainability amidst energy use in E7 economies?.

Environment, Development and Sustainability, 1-19.

[30] Dzator, M., Acheampong, A. O., & Dzator, J. (2021). Does transport infrastructure development contribute to carbon emissions? Evidence from developing countries. In Environmental sustainability and economy (pp. 19-33). Elsevier.

[31] Deonarain, B. (2019). Technological change and sustainable mobility: An overview of global trends and South African developments. Pretoria: TIPS.

[32] Patel, R., & Patel, A. (2023). Overcoming Challenges in Vaccine Development: Immunogenicity, Safety, and Large-Scale Manufacturing. Well Testing Journal, 32(1), 54-75.

[33] Jama, B., & Pizarro, G. (2008). Agriculture in Africa: Strategies to improve and sustain smallholder production systems. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1136(1), 218-232.

[34] Patel, A. (2023). DNA-based computation: Methods, applications and future potential. World, 5(01), 009-019.

[35] Kumar, S. AI and Wearable Technology: Continuous Monitoring and Early Diagnosis of Heart Diseases.

[36] Narvaez Rojas, C., Alomia Peñafiel, G. A., Loaiza Buitrago, D. F., & Tavera Romero, C. A. (2021). Society 5.0: A Japanese concept for a superintelligent society. Sustainability, 13(12), 6567.

[37] Hussain, I., Ali, R., Bukhari, S. H., Kumar, S., Faraz, A. A., & Burki, s. Ai-enhanced integration of multimodal data for early prediction of heart failure exacerbations in high-risk groups.

[38] Khandelwal, C., Singhal, M., Gaurav, G., Dangayach, G. S., & Meena, M. L. (2021). Agriculture supply chain management: a review (2010–2020). Materials Today: Proceedings, 47, 3144-3153.

[39] Rana, J. N., & Mumtaz, S. (2025). Prunin: An Emerging Anticancer Flavonoid. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, *26*(6), 2678