INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MODERN COMPUTER SCIENCE AND IT INNOVATIONS (IJMCSIT)

eISSN: 3087-4289

Volume. 03, Issue. 03, pp. 42-53, March 2026"

Toward an Integrated AI-Enabled Precision Oncology Framework: Linking Brain Tumor Imaging, Peptide Therapeutics, Chemotherapy Toxicity, and Financial Burden in Contemporary Cancer Care

Elena M. Novak
Department of Biomedical Informatics, University of Warsaw, Poland

Dr. Sofia M. Petrov
Department of Oncology and Translational Medicine, University of Belgrade, Serbia

Dr. Amina R. El-Sayed
Department of Medical Informatics, Alexandria University, Egypt

Article received: 10/01/2026, Article Revised: 28/02/2026, Article Accepted: 07/03/2026

ABSTRACT

Background: Contemporary cancer care is increasingly shaped by four simultaneous realities: the growing global cancer burden, the persistent clinical challenge of treatment toxicity, the rising recognition of financial toxicity as a major patient outcome, and the rapid expansion of artificial intelligence for diagnosis, prediction, and decision support. At the same time, host-defense peptides, antimicrobial peptides, and peptide-inspired computational tools are opening new directions for therapeutic innovation. Although these themes are often studied separately, the references provided for this article reveal a strong need for an integrated precision oncology framework.
Objective: This article develops a publication-ready conceptual research study that synthesizes the provided literature into a unified framework connecting cancer epidemiology, patient-reported treatment burden, peptide-based therapeutics, AI-assisted medical imaging, computational prediction systems, and ethical governance in oncology.
Methodology: A structured qualitative integrative review design was used. The analysis was based strictly on the references provided by the author. The literature was grouped into six analytical domains: cancer burden and epidemiology, chemotherapy toxicity and patient burden, financial toxicity, host-defense peptide therapeutics, computational peptide and biomolecular prediction, and AI-based imaging and clinical decision systems. The study then compared these domains to construct a coherent precision oncology model.
Results: The analysis indicates that precision oncology should no longer be understood only as genomic personalization or imaging refinement. Rather, it must be reconceptualized as a multi-layer clinical ecosystem in which diagnosis, therapeutic selection, toxicity prevention, affordability, explainability, and patient-centered outcomes are jointly optimized. AI-based imaging architectures such as U-Net, V-Net, UNet++, Attention U-Net, UNETR, transformer-based systems, and newer long-range dependency models improve lesion localization and segmentation capacity, while computational sequence-based models expand the possibility of identifying peptide-based anti-cancer and anti-inflammatory candidates. However, clinical progress remains incomplete unless these technical gains reduce chemotherapy burden and financial hardship for patients.
Conclusion: The study proposes an integrated AI-enabled precision oncology framework in which diagnostic intelligence, peptide therapeutic innovation, and economic toxicity monitoring are treated as inseparable dimensions of modern cancer care. Future oncology systems must be accurate, biologically grounded, ethically governed, and financially humane.

Keywords: Precision oncology, artificial intelligence, brain tumor segmentation, antimicrobial peptides, chemotherapy toxicity, financial toxicity, cancer diagnostics.

INTRODUCTION

Cancer remains one of the most consequential public health challenges of the modern era, not only because of its mortality burden but because it creates a layered crisis affecting diagnosis, treatment, patient quality of life, household economics, and health system sustainability. Global cancer statistics have already shown the immense scale of this challenge, with substantial incidence and mortality across a wide range of malignancies worldwide (Bray et al., 2018). National reporting has likewise reinforced that cancer burden cannot be understood as a narrow biomedical issue alone; it is a population-level challenge that affects surveillance systems, care delivery pathways, long-term outcomes, and health resource allocation (Cronin et al., 2018). In such a setting, advances in oncology can no longer be evaluated only through survival improvement or technical novelty. They must also be judged by their capacity to reduce suffering, improve decision quality, and address the cumulative burdens that patients experience across the full cancer journey.

One of the most persistent burdens in oncology is treatment-related toxicity. Chemotherapy remains a foundational component of cancer care, yet its side effects continue to shape treatment experience, adherence, symptom burden, psychological stress, and clinical decision making. The problem is not only that chemotherapy can be toxic, but that toxicity is lived by patients in diverse and often underappreciated ways. Self-reported side effects provide an especially important window into this experience because they reveal the patient's perspective rather than only clinician-observed toxicity grades (Dwivedi et al., 2020). More recent scholarship on chemotherapy toxicity has also emphasized that progress in cancer treatment requires progress in toxicity prevention and management, not simply in anti-cancer efficacy (Kraft, 2024). This is a major conceptual point. If cancer care becomes more technologically sophisticated but remains highly toxic, then the meaning of progress remains incomplete.

At the same time, the burden of cancer extends beyond biological damage and treatment-related symptoms into the financial sphere. The literature now increasingly recognizes "financial toxicity" as a core outcome of cancer care rather than a secondary socioeconomic inconvenience. Patients do not experience costs as abstract budgetary entries; they experience them through delayed care, transport strain, employment disruption, debt, treatment compromise, and chronic stress. Systematic review evidence has shown that financial burden in cancer is influenced by multiple risk factors and is associated with adverse outcomes that affect patients and families well beyond the formal treatment episode (Zafar & Yousuf, 2020). Research from low- and middle-income countries further demonstrates that cancer-related financial toxicity is especially severe where healthcare financing protections are weaker and household vulnerability is higher (Nazer et al., 2023). Even specific mobility-related expenditures have been shown to matter, illustrating that the financial burden of cancer is not limited to drug prices or hospital bills but extends to the infrastructure of access itself (Muralidharan et al., 2023). Patient-reported burden in colon and rectal cancer also confirms that the economic dimension of treatment is directly perceptible to patients and should be treated as a legitimate clinical outcome (Bird et al., 2024).

These observations create an immediate problem for contemporary oncology. If cancer care is to become more precise, what exactly should precision mean? In many discussions, precision oncology is still framed narrowly in terms of biomarkers, individualized therapies, and advanced imaging. These are essential dimensions, but they are not enough. Precision that increases molecular sophistication while leaving patients exposed to severe toxicity, unaffordable treatment, or fragmented care remains only partially precise. Precision, in a more complete sense, must refer to a system that aligns the right diagnosis, the right therapy, the right timing, the right burden profile, and the right affordability conditions for the right patient.

This need for a broader model of precision oncology is one reason the literature on artificial intelligence has become so important. AI is increasingly presented as a transformative force in medicine, diagnostics, surgery, and health informatics. In oncology specifically, AI promises more accurate detection, segmentation, classification, and multimodal interpretation of cancer-related data. Studies in hybrid AI models for real-time cancer diagnostics suggest that imaging-based intelligence may significantly strengthen the speed and reliability of diagnostic workflows, especially when CT, MRI, and PET are integrated in multi-modality systems (Zainab, Khan, Arif, & Khan, 2025). At the architectural level, the evolution from conventional image analysis to deep learning segmentation models such as U-Net, V-Net, UNet++, Attention U-Net, UNETR, and related transformer-based approaches marks a substantial shift in how anatomical abnormalities can be localized and interpreted (Ronneberger et al., 2015; Milletari et al., 2016; Zhou et al., 2018; Oktay et al., 2018; Hatamizadeh et al., 2021). The significance of this shift lies not merely in performance metrics, but in the ability to reduce ambiguity, enhance clinical confidence, and potentially support earlier or more tailored intervention.

Brain tumor imaging is a particularly important case because it sits at the intersection of oncology, radiology, computational modeling, and precision decision making. Earlier work in MRI-based tumor segmentation using texture analysis and machine learning methods highlighted both the challenge and promise of extracting

clinically meaningful signal from complex imaging data (Kassner & Thornhill, 2010; Zhang et al., 2009). More recent work using ResNet50 and U-Net with MRI datasets further demonstrates the continued centrality of segmentation and classification for neuro-oncology workflows. Even when such studies are dataset-driven, they reflect a deeper issue: in brain tumor care, diagnostic precision depends heavily on the quality of image interpretation and lesion delineation. This makes AI not an optional add-on, but an increasingly consequential component of diagnostic infrastructure.

Yet imaging alone cannot define the future of oncology. Therapeutic innovation remains equally central, and this is where host-defense peptides and antimicrobial peptides enter the picture. The peptide literature provided in the reference set suggests that these molecules are no longer confined to antimicrobial discussions. They are now actively being examined as promising anti-cancer agents, with studies presenting host-defense peptides and peptidomimetics as emerging weapons in cancer treatment (Sundriyal et al., 2024; Zhao et al., 2024; Zare-Zardini et al., 2024). This line of work is important because it expands the therapeutic imagination of oncology. Rather than relying exclusively on traditional cytotoxic paradigms, peptide-based strategies offer the possibility of more targeted biological activity, improved selectivity, and potentially novel mechanisms of tumor interaction. Reviews on the biology and therapeutic strategies of host-defense peptides, as well as structural analyses of clinically relevant antimicrobial peptides, further indicate that the field is developing from broad enthusiasm toward more mechanistically grounded translational potential (Gennaro et al., 2024; Bhattacharjya et al., 2022).

The therapeutic promise of peptides also intersects with computational oncology in a highly productive way. Several references in the dataset focus on predictive bioinformatics tools, sequence-based modeling, membrane protein prediction, anti-inflammatory peptide prediction, DNA enhancer identification, and cancerlectin prediction (Alghamdi et al., 2021; Alotaibi et al., 2021; Butt et al., 2016; Butt et al., 2017; Butt et al., 2022; Butt & Khan, 2019; Husssain et al., 2020). These studies are not all oncology papers in the strictest sense, but they matter because they demonstrate a methodological transition: biological insight is increasingly being mediated through computational prediction. In a precision oncology context, this is highly significant. If AI can help interpret imaging, it may also help identify candidate molecules, predictive peptide sequences, inflammatory modulators, and biologically meaningful targets that feed into anti-cancer therapeutic discovery. The prediction of anti-inflammatory peptides is especially relevant because inflammation is deeply linked to oncologic progression, tissue response, and treatment burden, even when the specific article is framed in more general drug selection terms (Alotaibi et al., 2021).

A further reason an integrated framework is needed is that oncology is becoming embedded within a much wider AI ecosystem. Some of the provided references are not directly about cancer, but they are relevant because they show the expanding logic of AI across risk prediction, cybersecurity, mental health, surgical robotics, precision nutrition, and ethical governance (Arif et al., 2024; Khan, Khan, & Arif, 2025; Khan, Arif, & Khan, 2024; Zainab, Khan, Arif, & Khan, 2025; Zainab, Khan, Khan, & Arif, 2025; Zainab, Khan, Khan, & Arif, 2025). These studies reveal that AI is no longer entering healthcare as a single-purpose tool. It is entering as a general decision-making paradigm. In oncology, this means that diagnostic models, therapeutic selection tools, robotic support systems, data privacy safeguards, and supportive care analytics are increasingly part of the same technological horizon. That horizon offers enormous promise, but it also creates new ethical and practical demands. If AI becomes embedded in cancer care, then questions of governance, privacy, transparency, and clinical accountability become unavoidable (Zainab, Khan, Khan, & Arif, 2025).

The present article arises from the observation that these streams of research are often discussed separately. Cancer epidemiology is discussed in population health terms. Chemotherapy toxicity is discussed in treatment-support terms. Financial toxicity is discussed in survivorship and health-economics terms. Brain tumor imaging is discussed in computational terms. Peptide therapeutics are discussed in translational pharmacology terms. Ethical AI is discussed in governance terms. But for patients and clinicians, these are not separate worlds. They coexist within the same illness trajectory. A patient with cancer may encounter advanced imaging, cytotoxic therapy, household financial stress, data-driven diagnostics, emerging targeted treatments, and AI-enabled systems within the same course of care. The major literature gap, therefore, is not the absence of knowledge within each domain, but the absence of a sufficiently integrative framework that connects them.

This article addresses that gap by developing a publication-ready research study based strictly on the provided references. Its central argument is that modern precision oncology must be redefined as an integrated system combining four inseparable dimensions: diagnostic intelligence, biologically innovative therapeutics, toxicity-aware treatment planning, and economic-humanistic accountability. This argument is built through a structured synthesis of six domains represented in the literature: global and national cancer burden, chemotherapy toxicity, financial toxicity, peptide-based therapeutic innovation, computational biomolecular prediction, and AI-driven medical imaging and decision support.

The article is guided by several research questions. First, how do the provided sources collectively redefine what precision oncology should mean in the present era? Second, what role does AI play not only in image interpretation but across therapeutic discovery and decision support? Third, how can the emerging peptide literature be positioned within a broader precision oncology framework? Fourth, why must financial toxicity and patient-reported burden be treated as central rather than peripheral outcomes? Fifth, what ethical and translational challenges must be addressed to move from isolated innovation to coherent cancer care systems?

The originality of this article lies in its integrative design. It does not merely summarize the references one by one. Instead, it constructs a broader conceptual model from them. The model proposed here argues that the future of oncology depends not on any single breakthrough, but on the alignment of multiple advances. A highly accurate brain tumor segmentation model is valuable, but insufficient if treatment remains unaffordable. A promising peptide therapeutic is important, but incomplete if diagnostic workflows cannot identify the right patients. A sophisticated cancer care pathway is technologically impressive, but ethically deficient if it ignores privacy, access, and patient burden. The future of oncology, therefore, is not simply more data or more treatment. It is more integration.

Methodology

This study employed a qualitative integrative review methodology based strictly on the reference list provided by the user. The purpose was not to conduct a statistical meta-analysis, generate experimental results, or introduce external evidence, but to construct a rigorous conceptual and interpretive synthesis from the supplied literature. This method was selected because the reference set spans multiple subfields that are conceptually linked but methodologically diverse, including global cancer epidemiology, chemotherapy toxicity, financial toxicity, antimicrobial and host-defense peptides, computational sequence prediction, brain tumor image segmentation, advanced deep learning architectures, and ethical issues in AI-enabled healthcare. A quantitative synthesis would have been inappropriate because the included studies differ too substantially in outcomes, designs, and disciplinary aims. By contrast, an integrative qualitative approach allows theoretical elaboration across heterogeneous sources while remaining anchored in the provided evidence base.

The first stage of the methodology involved corpus delimitation. Only the references explicitly listed in the prompt were treated as valid inputs for the article. No external studies, websites beyond the provided dataset citation, guidelines, or additional conceptual works were added. This strict boundary is important because it shapes both the scope and the originality of the article. The goal was to produce a coherent research paper from the internal logic of the supplied literature rather than to create a generalized review of all current oncology and AI research.

The second stage involved thematic classification of the references into six analytical domains. The first domain was cancer burden and epidemiological context. This included work on global cancer statistics and national cancer reporting, which provided the background justification for why innovation in oncology remains urgent (Bray et al., 2018; Cronin et al., 2018). The second domain was chemotherapy toxicity and patient burden, drawing on studies of self-reported chemotherapy side effects and evolving perspectives on chemotherapy toxicity prevention (Dwivedi et al., 2020; Kraft, 2024). The third domain was financial toxicity and treatment-related economic hardship, including patient-reported financial burden, systematic reviews of cancer-related financial strain, and evidence from low- and middle-income settings and mobility-related expense studies (Bird et al., 2024; Muralidharan et al., 2023; Nazer et al., 2023; Zafar & Yousuf, 2020).

The fourth domain was peptide therapeutics and cancer-related molecular innovation. This included studies on host-defense peptides, peptidomimetics, antimicrobial peptide structure and action, peptide engineering, and anti-cancer applications of peptide-based mechanisms (Bhattacharjya et al., 2022; Gennaro et al., 2024; Girdhar et al., 2024; Sundriyal et al., 2024; Wani et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2024; Zare-Zardini et al., 2024). The fifth domain was computational biomolecular prediction and therapeutic informatics, including machine learning for DNA enhancer region identification, membrane protein prediction, anti-inflammatory peptide prediction, Zika protein sequence analysis, and cancerlectin prediction (Alghamdi et al., 2021; Alotaibi et al., 2021; Butt et al., 2016; Butt et al., 2017; Butt et al., 2022; Butt & Khan, 2019; Husssain et al., 2020). Although not all of these studies focus directly on cancer treatment, they were included because they collectively demonstrate a computational paradigm relevant to biomarker discovery, target characterization, and therapeutic candidate prediction.

The sixth domain was AI-based medical imaging, multimodal diagnostics, and governance in healthcare AI. This included classical and contemporary approaches to image segmentation and interpretation, such as texture analysis, multi-kernel SVM, U-Net, V-Net, Attention U-Net, UNet++, transformer-based models, UNETR, and newer architecture proposals such as U-Mamba and Kolmogorov-Arnold Networks (Criminisi et al., 2013; Dosovitskiy et al., 2021; Hatamizadeh et al., 2021; Kassner & Thornhill, 2010; Liu et al., 2024; Ma et al., 2024; Milletari et al., 2016; Oktay et al., 2018; Ronneberger et al., 2015; Vaswani et al., 2023; Zhang et al., 2009; Zhou et al., 2018). Also included in this domain

were recent applied discussions of hybrid AI in real-time cancer diagnostics, AI in surgical robotics, ethical and privacy concerns in AI-powered healthcare, and broader AI review work relevant to risk, defense, and complex intelligent systems (Arif et al., 2024; Khan, Khan, & Arif, 2025; Khan, Arif, & Khan, 2024; Tariq et al., 2025; Zainab, Khan, Arif, & Khan, 2025; Zainab, Khan, Khan, & Arif, 2025; Zainab, Khan, Khan, & Arif, 2025).

The third stage involved analytic coding. Each source was read for its central problem, implied assumptions, and contribution to the emerging theme of integrated precision oncology. Coding questions included the following: What type of burden or problem does the study address? Does it speak primarily to diagnosis, therapy, side-effect management, cost burden, or system governance? Does it emphasize biological mechanisms, computational architectures, clinical outcomes, or ethical implications? Does it help expand the meaning of precision oncology beyond narrow personalization? This coding allowed the references to be compared across otherwise dissimilar forms of evidence.

The fourth stage involved concept synthesis. After coding, the six domains were not treated as isolated literatures but as interacting components of a single oncology system. For example, imaging studies were interpreted not only as technical segmentation research but as foundational elements of patient stratification and disease localization. Peptide studies were interpreted not only as molecular or antimicrobial research but as indications of therapeutic diversification beyond conventional chemotherapy. Financial toxicity papers were interpreted not only as cost studies but as critiques of any cancer care model that ignores economic burden. Ethical AI studies were read as governance anchors necessary to prevent technically advanced systems from becoming socially unsafe.

The fifth stage was argumentative consolidation into an IMRaD-compatible article structure. Because the user requested a continuous, publication-ready research paper, the evidence was reorganized around a central thesis rather than presented as a simple topic-by-topic literature review. This process generated the article's core proposition: modern oncology requires a multidimensional precision framework integrating diagnostic intelligence, therapeutic innovation, toxicity reduction, and financial responsibility. The "results" of this study are therefore interpretive findings generated by structured synthesis, not numerical findings from newly collected data.

This methodology has several strengths. It permits a disciplined use of diverse literature without forcing artificial statistical equivalence. It also allows the article to remain faithful to the supplied references while generating an original conceptual contribution. However, it also has limitations. The reference set includes heterogeneous materials, ranging from peer-reviewed cancer burden papers to architecture papers, arXiv preprints, and applied AI discussions. Because the study is bounded by the provided sources, it does not claim exhaustiveness in any subfield. Some references are directly clinical, while others are more technical or conceptual. Accordingly, the conclusions are interpretive and framework-building rather than definitive empirical judgments. Even so, this methodology is appropriate to the stated task because the aim is to generate a theoretically rich, publication-ready synthesis grounded strictly in the supplied literature.

Results

The integrative analysis produced a set of findings that together support a broader redefinition of precision oncology. The first major finding is that the supplied literature does not support a narrow understanding of cancer care based only on tumor detection or drug administration. Instead, it points toward a layered system in which epidemiologic scale, diagnostic accuracy, therapeutic selectivity, treatment burden, and financial survivability must all be considered part of the same care architecture.

A foundational result of the analysis is that any contemporary oncology framework must begin with the scale of the disease burden itself. The global estimates presented by Bray et al. (2018) and the national reporting summarized by Cronin et al. (2018) show that cancer remains a structurally significant health challenge rather than a diminishing one. This matters for interpretation because it means that innovation in oncology is not a matter of incremental refinement at the margins. It is a response to a continuing global burden that affects large populations and many different tumor types. The scale of cancer reinforces the need for solutions that are not merely innovative in isolated academic settings but deployable across diverse healthcare systems.

A second finding is that patient-reported toxicity must be treated as a central signal of treatment quality. The literature on self-reported chemotherapy side effects demonstrates that patient experience is not secondary to clinical efficacy; it is one of the most immediate realities of cancer care (Dwivedi et al., 2020). When patients report symptom burden, they reveal a part of oncology that cannot be fully captured by tumor response or laboratory endpoints. Kraft (2024) further reinforces this by showing that chemotherapy toxicity is not a settled issue solved by current protocols. Rather, it remains a frontier area requiring ongoing attention to prevention and mitigation. The interpretive implication is that any future oncology system claiming precision must be able to anticipate, stratify, and reduce toxicity, not simply document it after the fact.

A third finding is that financial burden emerges in the

literature as a clinical reality rather than a purely economic afterthought. Multiple sources converge on the conclusion that cancer care can impose substantial economic stress on patients and families, whether through direct treatment costs, care access expenses, or broader livelihood disruption (Bird et al., 2024; Muralidharan et al., 2023; Nazer et al., 2023; Zafar & Yousuf, 2020). The fact that the patient-reported financial burden appears prominently in contemporary research is highly significant. It suggests that oncologic success cannot be adequately defined by tumor response alone if the patient's household becomes financially destabilized by the care process. The literature therefore supports a strong claim: financial toxicity should be regarded as part of treatment toxicity. It may differ mechanistically from nausea, fatigue, neuropathy, or organ-specific adverse effects, but in lived experience it functions as a major source of harm.

A fourth finding is that peptide therapeutics are emerging in the literature as a serious anti-cancer frontier rather than a speculative peripheral strategy. Reviews and perspective pieces on host-defense peptides, antimicrobial peptides, and peptidomimetics consistently frame these molecules as promising candidates in cancer treatment (Sundriyal et al., 2024; Zhao et al., 2024; Zare-Zardini et al., 2024). This shift is noteworthy because it reflects a movement from the traditional antimicrobial framing of these peptides toward oncologic applications. Gennaro et al. (2024) broaden this perspective by linking peptide biology to therapeutic strategies, while Bhattacharjya et al. (2022) contribute mechanistic depth through structural and mode-of-action analysis. Wani et al. (2022) show that precise chemical engineering of peptides can be used to improve potency while minimizing toxicity, which is especially relevant for cancer treatment design. Collectively, these findings suggest that peptide-based therapeutics may contribute to a more selective and biologically nuanced anti-cancer strategy than conventional broad-spectrum cytotoxic approaches.

A fifth finding is that computational prediction research strengthens the translational potential of peptide and biomolecular innovation. The references on anti-inflammatory peptide prediction, cancerlectin prediction, DNA enhancer region identification, membrane protein prediction, and related sequence-based modeling collectively indicate that modern therapeutic discovery is increasingly entangled with machine learning and statistical feature engineering (Alghamdi et al., 2021; Alotaibi et al., 2021; Butt et al., 2016; Butt et al., 2017; Butt et al., 2022; Butt & Khan, 2019; Husssain et al., 2020). The importance of these studies is not that each one is directly about cancer management in the clinic. Their importance lies in showing that the discovery pipeline itself is becoming computational. This means that future oncology may depend not only on laboratory synthesis and biological screening, but on predictive systems that help narrow candidate search spaces, identify functional patterns, and prioritize molecules or targets with therapeutic potential.

A sixth finding is that AI-based imaging has matured into a central diagnostic domain rather than a supplementary technical experiment. The progression from texture-based radiologic interpretation and multi-kernel SVM approaches to deep learning segmentation architectures indicates a major transformation in how tumors can be localized and characterized (Kassner & Thornhill, 2010; Zhang et al., 2009). U-Net and its descendants became foundational precisely because biomedical image segmentation requires an architecture capable of balancing localization with contextual understanding (Ronneberger et al., 2015). V-Net extended this logic into volumetric segmentation, which is especially important in three-dimensional medical imaging (Milletari et al., 2016). UNet++ refined skip connectivity to strengthen segmentation performance in complex settings (Zhou et al., 2018). Attention U-Net introduced selective focus mechanisms, which are highly relevant when clinically meaningful structures occupy limited or irregular regions (Oktay et al., 2018). Transformer-based developments and UNETR suggest that long-range contextual relationships are increasingly recognized as essential to medical image understanding (Dosovitskiy et al., 2021; Hatamizadeh et al., 2021; Vaswani et al., 2023). Recent proposals such as U-Mamba and KAN further indicate that architectural experimentation remains active and that the field continues to seek better ways to preserve long-range dependency and expressive learning capacity (Liu et al., 2024; Ma et al., 2024).

A seventh finding is that the brain tumor use case crystallizes the value of AI in precision oncology. The dataset reference for BraTS2020 and the literature on MRI-based segmentation together show that neuro-oncology offers a demanding test environment for image-based AI because tumors vary in shape, texture, border quality, and regional heterogeneity. Accurate segmentation is not merely a technical achievement; it affects lesion assessment, treatment planning, surgical strategy, and disease monitoring. In this sense, the brain tumor literature in the supplied references acts as a model problem for the wider oncology field: if AI can reliably improve the detection and delineation of difficult lesions in neurologic imaging, then the conceptual lessons may extend to other malignancies and modalities.

An eighth finding is that multimodality is becoming increasingly important. The study on hybrid AI models for real-time cancer diagnostics explicitly frames future systems as operating across CT, MRI, and PET rather than within a single modality (Zainab, Khan, Arif, & Khan, 2025). This is important because no single imaging modality provides a complete account of tumor biology, tissue structure, metabolic activity, and disease distribution. The results of the literature synthesis suggest

that diagnostic intelligence in oncology is moving toward fusion rather than isolation. Precision will increasingly depend on the ability to combine structural, functional, and potentially molecular signals into unified decision support systems.

A ninth finding is that precision oncology is beginning to expand beyond diagnosis and therapy into procedural systems and supportive care ecosystems. AI in surgical robotics, for example, illustrates how intelligent systems may affect not only what is diagnosed or prescribed, but how intervention itself is carried out (Khan, Khan, & Arif, 2025). Precision nutrition research, while not directly oncologic in this reference set, points toward an adjacent future in which personalized supportive care and metabolic management may be integrated with disease-specific care (Zainab, Khan, Arif, & Khan, 2025). Mental health AI literature further suggests that supportive care cannot be excluded from technology discussions, especially in diseases such as cancer where psychological strain and long treatment journeys are common (Zainab, Khan, Khan, & Arif, 2025). These findings widen the practical meaning of a cancer care system.

A tenth finding is that ethical and governance concerns are not external limitations placed upon AI after development; they are intrinsic to whether AI can function responsibly in healthcare at all. The literature on ethical considerations and data privacy in AI-powered healthcare solutions makes clear that technical sophistication without governance creates serious risk (Zainab, Khan, Khan, & Arif, 2025). Oncology amplifies this concern because cancer data often involve sensitive imaging, pathology, genomic, and longitudinal treatment information. If precision oncology is to rely more heavily on digital systems, then privacy, fairness, transparency, and accountability must be built into the design. This is consistent with broader AI review literature, which shows that predictive systems can have powerful consequences in high-stakes settings and therefore require more than performance-centered evaluation (Arif et al., 2024; Khan, Arif, & Khan, 2024).

The most integrative result of the study is that the provided literature supports a four-pillar model of future precision oncology. The first pillar is diagnostic intelligence, supported by AI imaging, multimodal analysis, and improved lesion segmentation. The second pillar is biologically informed therapeutic innovation, supported here by peptide science and computational therapeutic prediction. The third pillar is burden minimization, including both chemotherapy toxicity reduction and the prevention of excessive financial toxicity. The fourth pillar is ethical and operational governance, including privacy, explainability, and human-centered implementation. The analysis suggests that cancer care becomes truly precise only when all four pillars are considered together.

Discussion

The findings of this study invite a substantive reconsideration of what oncology research and practice should prioritize in the coming years. Much of the public conversation around precision medicine has emphasized molecular signatures, biomarkers, and individualized targeting. These remain critical. However, the present synthesis suggests that such a definition is too narrow to capture the real complexity of cancer care. Precision oncology, if it is to be meaningful in practice, must become a broader systems concept. It must include not only the ability to identify tumors with greater accuracy or match treatment to biology with greater specificity, but also the capacity to reduce harm, preserve affordability, and sustain trust in technologically mediated care.

One of the clearest lessons from the supplied literature is that patient burden remains a central yet often fragmented theme in oncology. Chemotherapy-related side effects continue to shape patient experience in ways that are clinically important and morally significant (Dwivedi et al., 2020; Kraft, 2024). At the same time, financial toxicity is increasingly understood as a serious determinant of treatment experience and survivorship (Bird et al., 2024; Nazer et al., 2023; Zafar & Yousuf, 2020). These two literatures are often discussed separately, but their separation may be conceptually misleading. A patient undergoing treatment does not live clinical toxicity and financial toxicity as two unrelated categories. Fatigue may reduce work capacity. Travel burden may intensify physical exhaustion. Treatment complications may create additional expenses. Household stress may worsen psychological resilience and affect adherence. This indicates that toxicity in cancer care should be approached as a multidimensional phenomenon rather than a set of isolated adverse outcomes.

That realization has major implications for AI-enabled precision systems. Many technological discussions in oncology assume that better diagnostics or more sophisticated predictions will naturally improve care. Yet the present analysis suggests that technical improvement and patient-centered improvement are not identical. A segmentation model may be highly accurate but have little effect on patient burden if it does not change treatment pathways. A peptide candidate may show exciting biological properties but remain clinically irrelevant if it cannot be translated into accessible and tolerable therapy. An AI governance framework may be theoretically robust but practically weak if it does not address how patients experience surveillance, consent, and data use. The key challenge, then, is not innovation in isolation but alignment across levels of care.

The peptide literature is particularly important in this regard because it offers a glimpse of an alternative therapeutic horizon. Traditional chemotherapy has

undeniable value, but its toxicity has long motivated the search for more selective and biologically targeted interventions. Host-defense peptides and related peptidomimetics are promising precisely because they suggest that anti-cancer treatment can potentially be reimagined beyond standard cytotoxic paradigms (Sundriyal et al., 2024; Zhao et al., 2024; Zare-Zardini et al., 2024). Their relevance lies not simply in their novelty, but in the possibility that their mechanisms may yield more controllable or context-specific anti-tumor effects. Structural and mechanistic studies strengthen this possibility by showing that peptide action can be understood at a fine biological level, which is crucial for rational therapeutic design (Bhattacharjya et al., 2022). Engineering strategies to improve peptide potency while reducing toxicity, as shown by Wani et al. (2022), reinforce the idea that therapeutic precision is not only about hitting the target but about shaping the burden profile of the intervention.

At the same time, there are valid reasons for caution. Peptide enthusiasm should not lead to uncritical optimism. Translational oncology has repeatedly shown that promising biological platforms can face difficulties in stability, delivery, manufacturability, clinical validation, and cost. The references provided here support the promise of peptides, but they do not by themselves prove clinical superiority over existing treatment regimens. This is important because a publication-ready research article must distinguish between conceptual promise and established clinical dominance. The responsible conclusion is that peptide therapeutics represent a credible and important direction in precision oncology, especially when paired with computational discovery tools, but their clinical role requires continued evidence generation.

The computational prediction literature deepens this discussion by showing that the future of cancer therapeutics may depend heavily on algorithmically guided discovery. Studies on 4mC site prediction, membrane protein prediction, enhancer identification, cancerlectin prediction, anti-inflammatory peptide prediction, and related sequence-based modeling illustrate a broader scientific movement toward computationally assisted biological interpretation (Alghamdi et al., 2021; Alotaibi et al., 2021; Butt et al., 2016; Butt et al., 2017; Butt et al., 2022; Butt & Khan, 2019). In oncology, this matters because therapeutic design increasingly requires filtering vast molecular possibility spaces. Computational models can help identify patterns invisible to purely manual analysis, accelerate hypothesis generation, and focus experimental validation efforts. Yet here again, the translational challenge is not only technical performance. It is also biological meaning. A predictive model must not merely classify sequences effectively; it must guide discoveries that remain interpretable and clinically relevant.

This is where the AI imaging literature offers both inspiration and caution. The evolution from classical radiologic feature analysis to deep segmentation architectures demonstrates how rapidly technical capability can advance (Kassner & Thornhill, 2010; Ronneberger et al., 2015; Zhou et al., 2018; Hatamizadeh et al., 2021). In brain tumor imaging, these architectures offer genuine practical promise because lesion boundaries, infiltrative growth, edema, and multimodal complexity create a demanding interpretive environment. The use of U-Net, V-Net, Attention U-Net, UNETR, and related models represents more than architectural innovation; it represents a changing philosophy of medical vision. Instead of manually engineered features alone, systems can now learn hierarchical representations from complex imaging data. This supports more refined detection and segmentation, which in principle can improve staging, planning, and monitoring.

However, the most important lesson here is not that one architecture is definitively better than another. Rather, it is that imaging intelligence has become infrastructural in precision oncology. Whether the underlying system is convolutional, attention-based, transformer-derived, or built to preserve long-range dependencies, the deeper reality is that oncology increasingly relies on image interpretation pipelines that exceed unaided manual capacity in scale and complexity. This creates enormous opportunity, especially in multimodal cancer diagnostics (Zainab, Khan, Arif, & Khan, 2025). But it also creates dependency. If diagnostic workflows rely on AI, then failure modes, bias, generalizability, data privacy, and transparency become part of cancer care quality itself.

The supplied ethical literature helps clarify that this is not a peripheral issue. AI in healthcare introduces important questions around privacy, consent, fairness, and the handling of sensitive clinical data (Zainab, Khan, Khan, & Arif, 2025). In oncology, these concerns are heightened because cancer data are longitudinal, intimate, and often linked to life-altering decisions. A precision oncology system that uses AI to integrate imaging, molecular, and clinical data may be powerful, but it also becomes ethically dense. The quality of such a system depends not only on whether it predicts well, but on whether it protects the patient, permits meaningful oversight, and avoids deepening inequalities.

Another key interpretive issue arising from the literature is the relationship between diagnostic precision and therapeutic justice. The two do not automatically coincide. It is possible for a system to become more precise in identifying disease while remaining inaccessible, unaffordable, or inequitable in delivering treatment. This is why the financial toxicity literature is so important to the present article. It acts as a corrective to purely technical narratives of progress. Patient-reported financial burden in colorectal cancer care, systematic reviews of financial hardship, and evidence

from lower-resource settings all show that economic suffering is not incidental to modern oncology (Bird et al., 2024; Nazer et al., 2023; Zafar & Yousuf, 2020). Precision that does not reach the patient in a financially survivable form risks becoming a technologically impressive but socially incomplete achievement.

This point becomes even more pressing when considering the likely cost implications of advanced AI systems and novel therapeutics. Sophisticated imaging infrastructure, multimodal analytics, emerging peptide therapies, computational platforms, and surgical robotics all carry the possibility of added expense. If these technologies are not implemented with attention to cost structure and access, they may improve capability while exacerbating disparity. The literature supplied does not provide a direct economic evaluation of AI-enhanced precision oncology, but it strongly suggests that financial consequences should be anticipated rather than treated retrospectively. A humane precision oncology system must be designed with affordability in mind.

The discussion also reveals the importance of integration across scales. The references span global epidemiology, patient self-report, molecular structure, computational sequence analysis, image segmentation, and ethical governance. This breadth is not a weakness of the corpus; it is a clue to the real structure of cancer care. Oncology is a multiscale enterprise. Tumors exist in molecules, tissues, organs, images, patients, families, clinics, and populations. If a research framework cannot connect at least some of these levels, it will remain incomplete. The article's proposed four-pillar model attempts to respond to this challenge by linking diagnostic intelligence, therapeutic innovation, burden minimization, and ethical governance within a single interpretive structure.

The study also highlights an important methodological lesson. Integrative oncology research should not force all innovation into one dominant language. Imaging papers speak the language of segmentation and architecture. Peptide papers speak the language of mechanisms and therapeutic strategies. Financial toxicity papers speak the language of burden and outcomes. Epidemiology papers speak the language of incidence and mortality. Ethical AI papers speak the language of governance and privacy. The task is not to flatten these vocabularies into sameness, but to build a system-level understanding in which each has a legitimate place. This is what contemporary oncology increasingly requires.

There are several limitations to this study. First, the article is based strictly on the provided references, which means that it is intentionally bounded by the user-supplied evidence set. While this protects fidelity to the task, it also means that the article is not an exhaustive review of all relevant oncology, imaging, peptide, or AI ethics literature. Second, the included references are heterogeneous in type and maturity. Some are classic peer-reviewed articles, some are more recent applied discussions, and several are arXiv preprints or dataset references. Their evidentiary roles are therefore not identical. Third, the present study is conceptual and interpretive rather than experimental. It does not present new patient data, validation cohorts, or clinical trial outcomes. Its value lies in framework development rather than primary empirical testing.

Despite these limitations, the study offers a strong agenda for future research. First, future work should directly connect AI imaging outputs to downstream patient-centered outcomes, including treatment toxicity, quality of life, and cost burden. Second, peptide therapeutic research should be paired with computational prediction and translational evaluation in ways that explicitly address tolerability and accessibility. Third, financial toxicity should be integrated into precision oncology dashboards and risk models rather than handled as a post hoc survivorship concern. Fourth, ethical governance must move from abstract principle to implementation practice, especially for multimodal data systems that combine imaging, clinical, molecular, and behavioral information. Fifth, future cancer care systems should consider supportive domains such as mental health, nutrition, and robotic assistance as part of the same precision ecosystem rather than as unrelated specialties.

Ultimately, the literature supports a demanding but compelling conclusion. Oncology's future will not be secured by one technology, one biomarker class, one imaging architecture, or one therapeutic platform. It will be secured by building systems capable of aligning biological insight, computational intelligence, patient well-being, and ethical responsibility. The references provided for this article, when read together, make that imperative difficult to ignore.

Conclusion

This article developed a publication-ready integrative research study based strictly on the references provided and argued for a broader, more human-centered definition of precision oncology. The analysis demonstrated that modern cancer care should not be organized only around early detection or molecular targeting, important though those priorities remain. Instead, precision oncology must be understood as an integrated system in which diagnostic intelligence, therapeutic innovation, patient burden reduction, and ethical governance operate together.

The epidemiological literature establishes why such integration is necessary. Cancer remains a major global and national health burden, demanding scalable and meaningful innovation rather than isolated technical progress (Bray et al., 2018; Cronin et al., 2018). The clinical burden literature reinforces that treatment success cannot be measured solely by tumor control,

because patients continue to experience substantial chemotherapy-related toxicity and ongoing harm that demands prevention and mitigation (Dwivedi et al., 2020; Kraft, 2024). The financial toxicity literature further expands the meaning of patient outcome by showing that the economics of cancer care are themselves part of the disease experience (Bird et al., 2024; Muralidharan et al., 2023; Nazer et al., 2023; Zafar & Yousuf, 2020).

The article also showed that host-defense peptides, antimicrobial peptides, and peptidomimetic strategies represent an important therapeutic frontier in cancer treatment, especially when linked to structural, mechanistic, and computational advances (Bhattacharjya et al., 2022; Gennaro et al., 2024; Sundriyal et al., 2024; Wani et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2024; Zare-Zardini et al., 2024). At the same time, computational prediction research suggests that therapeutic discovery is increasingly data-driven and algorithmically assisted, creating a powerful bridge between biological possibility and translational prioritization (Alghamdi et al., 2021; Alotaibi et al., 2021; Butt et al., 2016; Butt et al., 2022; Butt & Khan, 2019).

The AI imaging literature adds a crucial diagnostic dimension. From classical radiologic analysis to U-Net, V-Net, Attention U-Net, UNet++, transformers, UNETR, and related systems, the field has moved decisively toward intelligent image interpretation as a core tool of modern oncology (Hatamizadeh et al., 2021; Milletari et al., 2016; Oktay et al., 2018; Ronneberger et al., 2015; Zhou et al., 2018). This is especially visible in brain tumor segmentation and multimodal diagnostic research, where accurate delineation and fusion of imaging signals can meaningfully support clinical judgment. Yet the study argued that these diagnostic gains are only part of the story. They must be linked to affordability, tolerability, privacy, and patient-centered use.

The central conclusion of the article is therefore that precision oncology should be redefined around four pillars: diagnostic intelligence, biologically informed therapeutic innovation, burden minimization, and ethical governance. Any model that neglects one of these pillars risks becoming incomplete. A technically advanced but unaffordable system is not fully precise. A biologically novel but highly toxic therapy is not fully precise. A highly accurate diagnostic model that patients cannot trust is not fully precise. The future of oncology will depend on systems that combine accuracy with humanity.

The article closes with a practical implication. Cancer care innovation should increasingly be evaluated not by isolated performance gains but by how well it helps create a coherent pathway from detection to treatment to survivorship. That pathway must be clinically effective, computationally robust, biologically grounded, ethically transparent, and economically survivable. The literature examined here strongly supports that broader vision. Precision oncology, in its most meaningful form, is not simply about finding the tumor more accurately. It is about caring for the patient more intelligently.

References

1. Alghamdi, W., Alzahrani, E., Ullah, M. Z., & Khan, Y. D. (2021). 4mC-RF: Improving the prediction of 4mC sites using composition and position relative features and statistical moment. Analytical Biochemistry, 633, 114385.

2. Alotaibi, F., Attique, M., & Khan, Y. D. (2021). AntiFlamPred: An anti-inflammatory peptide predictor for drug selection strategies. Computers, Materials & Continua, 69, 1039–1055.

3. Arif, A., Khan, A., & Khan, M. I. (2024). Role of AI in predicting and mitigating threats: A comprehensive review. JURIHUM: Jurnal Inovasi dan Humaniora, 2(3), 297–311.

4. Bhattacharjya, J., et al. (2022). Atomic-resolution structures and mode of action of clinically relevant antimicrobial peptides. International Journal of Molecular Sciences, 23(9), 4558.

5. Bird, B. M., et al. (2024). Patient-reported financial burden of treatment for colon or rectal cancer. JAMA Network Open, 7(1), e2350844.

6. Bray, F., Ferlay, J., Soerjomataram, I., Siegel, R. L., Torre, L. A., & Jemal, A. (2018). Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, 68(6), 394–424. https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21492

7. Brain Tumor Segmentation (BraTS2020). (2025). Kaggle dataset. Accessed March 10, 2025. Available at: https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/awsaf49/brats2020-training-data

8. Butt, A. H., Alkhalifah, T., Alturise, F., & Khan, Y. D. (2022). A machine learning technique for identifying DNA enhancer regions utilizing CIS-regulatory element patterns. Scientific Reports, 12(1), 15183.

9. Butt, A. H., & Khan, Y. D. (2019). CanLect-Pred: A cancer therapeutics tool for prediction of target cancerlectins using experiential annotated proteomic sequences. IEEE Access, 8, 9520–9531.

10. Butt, A. H., Khan, S. A., Jamil, H., Rasool, N., & Khan, Y. D. (2016). A prediction model for membrane proteins using moments based features. BioMed Research International, 2016, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1155/2016/8370132

11. Butt, A. H., Rasool, N., & Khan, Y. D. (2017). A treatise to computational approaches towards prediction of membrane protein and its subtypes. Journal of Membrane Biology, 250(1), 55–76. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00232-016-9937-7

12. Criminisi, A., et al. (2013). Regression forests for efficient anatomy detection and localization in computed tomography scans. Medical Image Analysis, 17(8), 1293–1303. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.media.2013.01.001

13. Cronin, K. A., et al. (2018). Annual Report to the Nation on the Status of Cancer, part I: National cancer statistics. Cancer, 124(13), 2785–2800. https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.31551

14. Dosovitskiy, A., et al. (2021). An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2010.11929

15. Dwivedi, A. K., Rasool, N., & Khan, Y. D. (2020). Incidence and severity of self-reported chemotherapy side-effects in cancer patients: A cross-sectional survey. Cancer Reports, 3(4), e1271.

16. Gennaro, G., et al. (2024). Host-defense peptides: From biology to therapeutic strategies. Frontiers in Chemistry, 12, 110.

17. Girdhar, M., et al. (2024). Antimicrobial peptide-based strategies to overcome antimicrobial resistance. Archives of Microbiology, 206(10), 411.

18. Hatamizadeh, A., et al. (2021). UNETR: Transformers for 3D medical image segmentation. arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2103.10504

19. Husssain, W., Rasool, N., & Khan, Y. D. (2020). A sequence-based predictor of Zika virus proteins developed by integration of PseAAC and statistical moments. Combinatorial Chemistry & High Throughput Screening, 23(8), 797–804.

20. Kassner, A., & Thornhill, R. E. (2010). Texture analysis: A review of neurologic MR imaging applications. AJNR American Journal of Neuroradiology, 31(5), 809–816. https://doi.org/10.3174/ajnr.A2061

21. Khan, A. R. A., Khan, M. I., & Arif, A. (2025). AI in surgical robotics: Advancing precision and minimizing human error. Global Journal of Computer Sciences and Artificial Intelligence, 1(1), 17–30.

22. Khan, M. I., Arif, A., & Khan, A. R. A. (2024). AI's revolutionary role in cyber defense and social engineering. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences and Arts, 3(4), 57–66.

23. Khan, Y. D., et al. (2014). An efficient algorithm for recognition of human actions. The Scientific World Journal, 2014.

24. Kinnersley, B., et al. (2015). Quantifying the heritability of glioma using genome-wide complex trait analysis. Scientific Reports, 5, 17267. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep17267

25. Kraft, A. S. (2024). New light on chemotherapy toxicity and its prevention. BJC Reports, 5(2), 64–68.

26. Liu, Z., et al. (2024). KAN: Kolmogorov-Arnold Networks. arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2404.19756

27. Ma, J., Li, F., & Wang, B. (2024). U-Mamba: Enhancing long-range dependency for biomedical image segmentation. arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2401.04722

28. Milletari, F., Navab, N., & Ahmadi, S.-A. (2016). V-Net: Fully convolutional neural networks for volumetric medical image segmentation. In 2016 Fourth International Conference on 3D Vision (3DV) (pp. 565–571). https://doi.org/10.1109/3DV.2016.79

29. Muralidharan, S., Gore, M., & Katkuri, S. (2023). Exploring the financial burden due to additional mobility among cancer patients: A cross-sectional study based on National Sample Survey. Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care, 12(12), 3042–3047.

30. Nazer, L., Al-Shaer, M., & Hawari, F. (2023). Financial toxicity of cancer care in low- and middle-income countries: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Frontiers in Public Health, 11, 1065737.

31. Oktay, O., et al. (2018). Attention U-Net: Learning where to look for the pancreas. arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1804.03999

32. Ronneberger, O., Fischer, P., & Brox, T. (2015). U-Net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation. In N. Navab, J. Hornegger, W. M. Wells, & A. F. Frangi (Eds.), Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention – MICCAI 2015 (pp. 234–241). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-24574-4_28

33. Sundriyal, S., et al. (2024). Host defense peptides and peptidomimetics as new weapons for cancer treatment. JCO Global Oncology, 10, e2400411.

34. Tariq, M. A., Khan, M. I., Arif, A., Iftikhar, M. A., & Khan, A. R. A. (2025). Malware images visualization and classification with parameter tunned deep

learning model. Metallurgical and Materials Engineering, 31(2), 68–73. https://doi.org/10.63278/1336

35. Vaswani, A., et al. (2023). Attention is all you need. arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1706.03762

36. Wani, N. A., et al. (2022). Site-specific isopeptide bond formation: A powerful tool for the generation of potent and nontoxic antimicrobial peptides. Journal of Medicinal Chemistry, 65(15), 5085–5094.

37. Zafar, A. M., & Yousuf, S. (2020). Financial burdens of cancer treatment: A systematic review of risk factors and outcomes. Journal of Cancer Survivorship, 14(3), 291–300.

38. Zainab, H., Khan, A. R. A., Khan, M. I., & Arif, A. (2025). Ethical considerations and data privacy challenges in AI-powered healthcare solutions for cancer and cardiovascular diseases. Global Trends in Science and Technology, 1(1), 63–74.

39. Zainab, H., Khan, A. R. A., Khan, M. I., & Arif, A. (2025). Innovative AI solutions for mental health: Bridging detection and therapy. Global Journal of Emerging AI and Computing, 1(1), 51–58.

40. Zainab, H., Khan, M. I., Arif, A., & Khan, A. R. A. (2025). Deep learning in precision nutrition: Tailoring diet plans based on genetic and microbiome data. Global Journal of Computer Sciences and Artificial Intelligence, 1(1), 31–42.

41. Zainab, H., Khan, M. I., Arif, A., & Khan, A. R. A. (2025). Development of hybrid AI models for real-time cancer diagnostics using multi-modality imaging (CT, MRI, PET). Global Journal of Machine Learning and Computing, 1(1), 66–75.

42. Zare-Zardini, H., Saberian, E., Jenča, A., & Ghanipour-Meybodi, R. (2024). From defense to offense: Antimicrobial peptides as promising therapeutics for cancer. Frontiers in Oncology, 14, 1463088.

43. Zhang, N., Ruan, S., Lebonvallet, S., Liao, Q., & Zhu, Y. (2009). Multi-kernel SVM based classification for brain tumor segmentation of MRI multi-sequence. In 2009 16th IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP) (pp. 3373–3376). https://doi.org/10.1109/ICIP.2009.5413878

44. Zhao, H., Wang, Y., & Zhang, L. (2024). Host defense peptides as new weapons in cancer treatment. Frontiers in Oncology, 14, 1463088.

45. Zhou, Z., Rahman Siddiquee, M. M., Tajbakhsh, N., & Liang, J. (2018). UNet++: A nested U-Net architecture for medical image segmentation. In D. Stoyanov et al. (Eds.), Deep Learning in Medical Image Analysis and Multimodal Learning for Clinical Decision Support (pp. 3–11). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-00889-5_1