

Public perception of immune-based treatments in oncology: Navigating hope, hype, and hesitation.

Luca Anto*

Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Columbia University, United States

Correspondence to: Luca Anto, Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Columbia University, United States, E-mail: luca.anto77@medmcs.unipi.it

Received: 02-Aug-2025, Manuscript No. AAICR-25-171209; **Editor assigned:** 03-Aug-2025, Pre QC No. AAICR-25-171209(PQ); **Reviewed:** 18-Aug-2025, QC No. AAICR-25-171209; **Revised:** 24-Aug-2025, Manuscript No. AAICR-25-171209(R); **Published:** 30-Aug-2025, DOI: 10.35841/aaicr-8.3.209

Introduction

Immune-based treatments in oncology—collectively known as cancer immunotherapies—have transformed the landscape of cancer care. From immune checkpoint inhibitors to CAR T-cell therapies and cancer vaccines, these approaches harness the body's immune system to target and destroy malignant cells. While clinical outcomes have been promising, public perception of these therapies is shaped by a complex interplay of scientific communication, media narratives, patient experiences, and cultural beliefs. Understanding how the public views immune-based cancer treatments is essential for improving education, access, and informed decision-making. The approval of immune checkpoint inhibitors such as pembrolizumab and nivolumab for melanoma, lung cancer, and other malignancies marked a turning point in oncology. These therapies were hailed as “game-changers,” with headlines touting miraculous recoveries and long-term remissions. Media coverage, celebrity endorsements, and high-profile clinical successes contributed to widespread awareness and optimism [1].

As immunotherapy continues to evolve, public perception will be shaped by emerging trends: Integrating immunotherapy with chemotherapy, radiation, or targeted drugs may improve outcomes and broaden applicability. Advances in genomics and immunology will enable more precise patient selection, enhancing efficacy and reducing disappointment. Apps, telemedicine, and online platforms can support education, monitoring, and engagement. Efforts to raise awareness and access in underserved regions will ensure that immunotherapy's promise is realized equitably. However, this enthusiasm often outpaces understanding. Many patients and caregivers

perceive immunotherapy as a universal cure, overlooking its limitations, side effects, and variability in response. This gap between expectation and reality can lead to disappointment and mistrust when outcomes fall short. Media plays a pivotal role in shaping public opinion. Stories emphasizing dramatic recoveries or “miracle cures” can create unrealistic expectations. Conversely, reports of adverse events or treatment failures may fuel fear and skepticism. Balanced, evidence-based reporting is crucial to fostering informed perceptions [2].

Patient narratives are powerful tools for education and advocacy. Survivors who benefit from immunotherapy often become vocal champions, sharing their experiences through blogs, social media, and support groups. While these stories inspire hope, they may also inadvertently suggest that immunotherapy is effective for all cancers or patients. Understanding the mechanisms and limitations of immune-based treatments requires a degree of scientific literacy. Misconceptions—such as equating immunotherapy with natural or side-effect-free treatment—are common. Public education campaigns and clinician-patient communication must address these gaps to support informed consent and realistic expectations [3].

Immunotherapy is often seen as tailored and precise, appealing to patients seeking individualized care. Long-term remission in some patients reinforces the perception of immunotherapy as a breakthrough: Compared to chemotherapy, many immune-based treatments have fewer systemic side effects, improving quality of life. The cutting-edge nature of immunotherapy attracts interest and trust in modern medicine. Immunotherapies are expensive and may not be covered by insurance or available in low-resource

settings, leading to frustration and inequity. Not all patients respond to immunotherapy, and biomarkers predicting success are still evolving. Immune-related adverse events, such as colitis, pneumonitis, or endocrinopathies, can be severe and unexpected. Cultural attitudes toward medicine, immunity, and cancer influence how immune-based treatments are perceived. In some communities, the idea of “boosting the immune system” aligns with traditional health beliefs, enhancing acceptance. In others, skepticism toward biotechnology or unfamiliar medical concepts may hinder uptake [4].

CAR T-cell therapy and other advanced modalities require specialized centers and intensive monitoring, which may be daunting for patients. Oncologists and healthcare teams play a critical role in shaping patient perceptions. Clear communication about risks, benefits, and alternatives is essential. Shared decision-making, supported by educational materials and counseling, helps patients navigate the emotional and clinical complexities of immunotherapy. Studies show that patients who receive comprehensive information are more likely to adhere to treatment, report satisfaction, and experience better psychological outcomes. Providers must also be sensitive to cultural beliefs and health literacy levels when discussing immune-based therapies [5].

Conclusion

Immune-based treatments in oncology have captured public imagination, offering hope in the face of cancer’s formidable challenge. Yet, perception is a double-edged sword—shaped by

optimism, tempered by experience, and influenced by communication. Bridging the gap between scientific reality and public understanding is essential to harness the full potential of immunotherapy. Through education, transparency, and equitable access, we can ensure that immune-based treatments are not only revolutionary in the clinic but also responsibly embraced by the communities they aim to serve.

References

1. Wang Z, MacLeod DT, Di Nardo A. Commensal bacteria lipoteichoic acid increases skin mast cell antimicrobial activity against vaccinia viruses. *J Immunol.* 2012;189(4):1551–8.
2. Yamasaki K, Kanada K, Macleod DT, et al. TLR2 expression is increased in rosacea and stimulates enhanced serine protease production by keratinocytes. *J Invest Dermatol.* 2011;131(3):688–97.
3. Sanchez R, Mohr I. Inhibition of cellular 2'-5' oligoadenylate synthetase by the herpes simplex virus type 1 Us11 protein. *J Virol.* 2007;81(7):3455–64.
4. Peng T, Zhu J, Klock A, et al. Evasion of the mucosal innate immune system by herpes simplex virus type 2. *J Virol.* 2009;83(23):12559–68.
5. Sieprawska-Lupa M, Mydel P, Krawczyk K, et al. Degradation of human antimicrobial peptide LL-37 by *Staphylococcus aureus*-derived proteinases. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2004;48(12):4673–9.