PERGAMON

Oral Oncology 34 (1998) 454–465

ORAL ONCOLOGY

Oral cancer in the UK: to screen or not to screen

V.C. Rodrigues [a], S.M. Moss [a,*], H. Tuomainen [b]

[a] *Cancer Screening Evaluation Unit, Block D, Institute of Cancer Research, 15 Cotswold Road, Sutton, Surrey SM2 5NG, UK*

[b] *Centre for Cancer and Palliative Care Studies, Block D, Institute of Cancer Research, 15 Cotswold Road, Sutton, Surrey SM2 5NG, UK*

Received 12 January 1998; accepted 2 February 1998

Abstract

Although oral squamous cell carcinoma accounts for only a small proportion of malignant neoplasms in the UK, oral cancer incidence and mortality rates have been rising in recent years. The natural history of oral cancer is not adequately understood at present and there is very little information about the epidemiology of precancerous lesions in the UK. There are also insufficient data to provide firm evidence that the percentage of cases arising de novo is greater in the UK and the Western world as compared to the Indian subcontinent. Screening for oral cancer by visual examination is simple, inexpensive and causes little discomfort; however, there is no evidence for the effectiveness of screening for oral cancer either in reducing mortality from the disease or in reducing the incidence of invasive disease by detection and treatment of precancerous lesions. There is currently insufficient evidence to recommend population screening for oral cancer in the UK. Measures aimed at primary prevention of the disease may be a more feasible method of disease control at present.

Keywords: Mouth neoplasms; UK epidemiology; Precancerous conditions; Oral leukoplakia; Erythroplasia; Referral and consultation; Patient compliance; Mass screening; Sensitivity and specificity

1. Introduction

Oral cancer is one of the 10 most frequent cancers worldwide, with about three-quarters of all cases occurring in the developing countries [1]. In Central and Southeast Asia it accounts for up to 40% of all cancers, whereas in most industrialised countries it is relatively uncommon, accounting for less than 4% [2–4].

Oral cancers constitute only 1–4% of all malignant neoplasms in the UK [5], but the incidence and mortality are reported to have been rising in recent years. Although major advances in reconstructive surgery have improved the quality of life of patients, there have been no significant improvements in cure rates in the past few decades [6]. Other measures are, therefore, necessary to tackle the rising trends. Primary prevention using health education is one possibility; screening for oral cancer has also been suggested [7,8].

The potential benefits of screening are reduced mortality from oral cancer, reduced incidence of invasive oral cancer, reassurance for those screened negative and decreased costs of treatment as smaller lesions are easier to treat with less morbidity [7,9]. Any screening programme would also have disadvantages such as psychological trauma for false-positive cases, unnecessary treatment of precursor lesions which may never have progressed, false reassurance for false-negatives, and, not least, the financial costs of setting up the programme [7].

In 1993, a UK Working Group on Screening for Oral Cancer and Precancer concluded that there was insufficient evidence to recommend population-based screening. Opportunistic screening among high-risk groups attending primary care services was recommended [10]. In 1995, the European School of Oncology's Advisory Group on Oral Carcinogenesis to the European Commission for the Europe against Cancer Programme reported that there was no evidence to support population screening [11]. The Group also found it inadvisable to carry out randomised trials of oral cancer screening because of deficiencies in the knowledge of the natural history of oral cancer and the sensitivity and specificity of current screening tests. Other authors [12] have suggested a systematic reconsideration of data on the natural history of oral cancer from previous screening programmes and follow-up studies so as to design a trial evaluating the effectiveness of screening.

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +44-181-643-8901 ext. 4192; fax: +44-181-770-0802; e-mail: s.moss@icr.ac.uk

1368-8375/98/$—see front matter
PII: S1368-8375(98)00052-9

Prior to considering the implementation of a screening programme for oral cancer as public health policy in the UK, it is necessary to examine whether the principles of screening are fulfilled [13–15] and whether sufficient research evidence exists for the beneficial effect of screening and for its cost-effectiveness when compared with other health interventions [16].

This paper discusses the present situation in the UK, with particular emphasis on the evidence for and against population-based screening for oral squamous cell carcinoma (ICD9 140, 141, 143–5).

2. Oral cancer in the UK

In England and Wales, the incidence of oral cancer is 4.0 per 100,000 per year at all ages, but over 30.0 per 100,000 among those aged 65 years or more [4]. Incidence and mortality rates have increased in young males during the last 30 years, a birth cohort effect being seen in those born after 1911–1912. Females show a similar trend though of a smaller magnitude; however, no cohort effect is apparent [17]. New registrations of oral cancer in 1991 (1815 in all) were 15.6% higher than the figure reported for 1971 [18]. In 1994, there were a total of 893 registered deaths due to oral cancer (ICD9 140, 141, 143–5) in England and Wales, of which 61% occurred in those aged 65 years or more [19].

In Scotland, among men aged 35–64, mouth cancer (ICD9 143–5) mortality rose from 0.5 per 100,000 in 1971–75 to 1.9 per 100,000 in 1985–1989, while in women the rate increased from 0.3 per 100,000 to 0.7 per 100,000. Incidence rates showed a similar trend. A cohort effect was seen for incidence and mortality due to tongue cancer among males born subsequent to 1910 [20,21].

A rising trend in oral cancer incidence has also been reported from Northern Ireland among both sexes though the magnitude is smaller among females [22,23].

A study conducted to determine the accuracy of oral cancer reporting found 27% under-ascertainment of cases at the Thames Cancer Registry and a similar figure at the South Western Cancer Registry. Warnakulasuriya et al. suggest that under ascertainment might be a national problem, the figures for oral cancer in the UK being actually much higher than reported [24].

The incidence of lip cancers has decreased over the last three decades among males. However, intra-oral cancer incidence, particularly that of the tongue and floor of the mouth, is rising in both sexes though the changes are less pronounced among females [18,21,25,26]. In 1991, tongue cancers (ICD9 141) accounted for about 40% of oral cancer registrations, mouth cancer (ICD9 143–5) for about 50%, and lip cancers (ICD9 140) the remaining 10% (Table 1).

Table 1
Oral cancer registrations in England and Wales (1991)

Site (ICD9)	Males		Females	
	Number	Rate[a]	Number	Rate[a]
Lip (140)	125	0.5	49	0.1
Tongue (141)	464	1.8	273	0.8
Alveolus (143)	71	0.3	52	0.1
Floor of the mouth (144)	246	1.0	81	0.3
Other and unspecified sites (145)	274	1.1	180	0.5

Source: Office for National Statistics (provisional data).

[a] Directly age standardised rates per 100,000 population using the European standard population.

Studies of oral cancer mortality according to ethnicity suggest substantially raised risks (RR = 2.2, 95% CI = 1.5–3.1 for males and RR = 5.5, 95% CI = 3.7–8.2 for females) among 'ethnic immigrants' from the Indian subcontinent as compared to the England and Wales 'native' population [27]. The incidence of oral cancer among 'Asians' in Bradford and Leicestershire has been reported to be higher than in 'non-Asians' [28,29].

To conclude, although the absolute number of oral cancer cases in the UK is small compared to cancers such as breast cancer and colorectal cancer, the incidence and mortality rates are rising and the number is, therefore, likely to increase in future. The total number of oral cancer deaths occurring each year is almost comparable to the number of deaths due to cervical cancer. However, oral cancer deaths occur among comparatively older age groups [30] and a national screening programme is operational for cervical cancer which will already be having an impact on mortality [31].

3. Natural history of oral squamous cell carcinoma

3.1. Risk factors

Both smoked [32–34] and smokeless tobacco [35,36] are aetiologically linked to oral cancer. Tobacco is also an important risk factor for pre-cancerous lesions of the mouth [37–40].

There is evidence that chewing betel quid with tobacco is carcinogenic to humans [35]. The habit of betel quid chewing is widespread in Southeast Asia, Eastern Melanesia, and the East African coast [41] and remains prevalent in South Asians who migrate to the UK [27,42], hence increasing the importance of betel quid as a risk factor in this country.

Elevated levels of alcohol consumption confer sizeable risks of developing oral cancer even after controlling for tobacco use [43–45].

Other aetiological factors such as diet [46,47], oral hygiene and dentition [48,49], mouthwashes [50,51] and

viral infections [52,53] have also been identified but their role is inconsistent.

Although tobacco and alcohol are known to be the major risk factors for oral cancer worldwide, data on risk factors for oral cancer in the UK are limited. La Vecchia et al. [54] suggest that alcohol and tobacco account for about 75% of oral cancers in Europe while dietary deficiencies or imbalances may account for about 10–15%.

A comprehensive discussion of the role of primary prevention in tackling the rising trends of oral cancer incidence and mortality is beyond the scope of this paper. However, it is fairly obvious that such activities should focus on health education to promote the cessation of tobacco use and moderation in alcohol consumption.

3.2. Precancerous lesions/conditions and malignant transformation

Both precursor lesions (leukoplakia, erythroplakia) and a number of pre-cancerous conditions (oral submucous fibrosis, lichen planus, syphilitic glossitis and sideropenic dysphagia) are known to exist.

Leukoplakia is the most common precancerous lesion [55]. The incidence and prevalence of oral leukoplakia in the UK are not known. However, outside the UK, the prevalence has been estimated to range from 0.2 to 11.7% [56]. The variation in prevalence between studies is likely to be due to varying methodology as well as population differences in risk factor prevalence. The minimum degree of whiteness required to define leukoplakia is arbitrary, and the lesions included in this group have differed between studies and over time [56–59]. The prevalence of leukoplakia was shown to vary between 0.7 and 24.8% in the same population just by altering the clinical criteria used [58]. In the only population-based prospective study (in Kerala, India), the age-adjusted annual incidence of oral leukoplakia among 20,358 villagers was reported to be 3.3/1000 among males and 1.9/1000 among females [60]. Leukoplakia is more common in males than in females and usually affects persons older than 40, the average age being 60 years [61–63].

The risk of malignant transformation is reported to vary with gender (higher among women), type of leukoplakia (higher among those that are idiopathic, non-homogenous, of a long duration, or situated on the tongue/floor of the mouth), presence of *Candida albicans*, and presence of epithelial dysplasia [55]. Hospital-based series from Europe and USA have reported malignant transformation rates of 4.4–17.5% for leukoplakia, whereas in India, population-based studies report rates of 0.13–2.2% (Table 2). Estimates of the percentage of leukoplakias which regress to normal vary between 4.6% per year in India to 28.6% in the USA. It is difficult to determine to what extent these differences are due to case selection, as opposed to variation in natural history.

The prevalence of erythroplakia is not known but it is less common than leukoplakia [64]. In a study of 64,354 cases of potential pre-malignant lesions in the USA, erythroplakias constituted only 0.09% of the total [65]. Erythroplakia has no apparent sex predilection and

Table 2
Malignant transformation and regression of leukoplakia

Reference	Setting		Number of cases	Follow-up	Transformation (%)	Regression (%)
[134]	California, USA	hospital	105	1–11 years	6.7	–
[135]	San Fancisco, USA	hospital leukoplakia patients	257	mean 7.2 years	17.5	28.6
[136]	Amsterdam	hospital leukoplakia patients	84 46 with available follow-up	1–8 years (mean 2.5)	3.6 (3/84) 6.5 (3/46)	–
[137]	Stockholm, Sweden	hospital	782	1–20 years	4.0	–
[138]	Copenhagen, Denmark	hospital	248	1–10 years (mean 3.7)	4.4	20.1
[139]	Budapest, Hungary	hospital	670	1–30 years (mean 9.8)	6	31
[140]	Oslo, Norway	hospital	157	6–16 years (mean 9.1)	8.9	–
[141]	Gujarat, India	industrial workers	4,762	2 years	0.13	31.6
[72]	Kerala, India Andhra Pradesh, India	field survey 1966–77	410 360	1–10 years (mean 7) 1–10 years (mean 7)	2.2 (4.4/1000 p.a.) 0.3	4.6 p.a.
[142]	Kerala, India	cohort of tobacco users baseline 1977–78	489 homogenous 13 nodular 105 ulcerated	median 4.8 years median 2.8 years median 4.4 years	1.3/1000 p.a. 162.2/1000 p.a. 2.2/1000 p.a.	

p.a., per annum.

is more common in the sixth and seventh decades of life [65,66]. There are no studies reporting follow-up of series of cases of erythroplakia, perhaps due to its relatively low prevalence or due to more active management. Most studies of biopsied cases of erythroplakia have found that the majority show areas of epithelial dysplasia, carcinoma in situ or invasive cancer [65,67], leading most authors to conclude that erythroplakia has a high potential for malignant transformation. However, the role of erythroplakia as a precursor lesion as opposed to an early sign of carcinoma in situ or invasive cancer is not clear.

Oral submucous fibrosis (OSMF) is a chronic disease of the oral mucosa which occurs predominantly among people of Indian origin and occasionally among other Asians. Sporadic cases have been reported among non-Asians (Europeans) [68,69]. The prevalence of OSMF in India ranges from 0.2 to 1.2% [70]. Evidence for the pre-cancerous nature of OSMF includes the observation of a higher prevalence of leukoplakia in cases of OSMF, the occurrence of epithelial dysplasia, the occurrence of OSMF in oral cancer patients and the higher incidence of oral cancer in patients with OSMF [70]. Data from India show increasing rates of malignant transformation with increasing duration of follow-up for OSMF (2–3% at 10 years of follow-up, 4.5% over 15 years, and 7.6% over a 17-year period).

Oral lichen planus (OLP) is a mucocutaneous disorder affecting 1–2% of the population in the UK [71]; similar figures have been reported in one study from India [72]. The malignant potential of OLP has been the subject of controversy for some time [73], the primary reasons being a debate over the diagnostic criteria and definition of OLP, the selection of patients included in follow-up studies and lack of information on the prevalence of OLP in the general population. Its role as a true precursor lesion remains unclear.

Other pre-cancerous conditions such as sideropenic dysphagia and tertiary syphilis are now rare in developed countries [74,75].

3.3. Cancers arising 'de novo'

The percentage of oral cancers which arise from precursor lesions is not accurately known, but has been estimated as more than 75% in India [76]. Although there are suggestions that the percentage of oral cancer cases arising de novo is greater in the Western world as compared to India [77], there are insufficient data to provide firm evidence particularly in countries such as the UK. Speight and Morgan [64] have calculated that, based on estimates of prevalence of leukoplakia and malignant transformation rates from the literature, progression of leukoplakias could account for the observed incidence of oral cancer in the UK.

4. Management

4.1. Potentially malignant oral lesions

To date, there are no widely accepted guidelines for the management of potentially malignant oral lesions in the UK [40,78,79] and available evidence confirms variability in the management of these lesions. Marley et al. [79] reports that only 6% of oral and maxillofacial surgeons had seen more than 100 patients with such lesions during the year of study (1993). This may reflect the referral of these patients to other specialties such as oral medicine clinics, ENT (ear, nose and throat) surgeons, plastic surgeons and radiotherapists or simply the low number of patients with pre-malignant oral lesions in the UK. Although the definitive diagnosis of potentially malignant lesions is based on histopathology [80,81], only 67% of the consultants biopsied the lesion routinely at initial presentation, the remaining 33% presumably relying on clinical appearance as a guide.

The malignant potential of leukoplakia appears to be associated with the presence of epithelial dysplasia which is graded by convention as mild, moderate or severe [82]. The clinical significance of mild and moderate epithelial dysplasia is not known but current evidence suggests that severe epithelial dysplasia has a high potential for future development of malignancy [83].

A management protocol for potentially malignant oral lesions proposed by Lamey [78] suggests the elimination of risk factors where possible, followed by a biopsy and surgical excision of lesions with severe dysplasia. For mild–moderately dysplastic lesions, a follow-up and re-biopsy is suggested after a 3-month period, with bleomycin or retinoid therapy if dysplasia is unchanged. A 6-monthly review is suggested for all patients for their entire life-time.

Most authors seem to agree on the initial approach suggested by Lamey but differ in their opinions on which lesions require surgical excision. Tradati et al. [84] suggest surgical excision of all persistent leukoplakias because of poor patient compliance with follow-up. Other authors [55] recommend active treatment for lesions showing moderate or severe dysplasia, with oral sub-site being the deciding factor in whether or not to treat mild dysplasia. In the UK, treatment of mild to moderate dysplasia varies, with 16% of oral and maxillofacial surgeons preferring no active treatment. For severe dysplasia and carcinoma in situ, the majority (96%) favoured excision; however, three (2%) of the clinicians reported not undertaking any active treatment for these lesions [79].

4.2. Chemoprevention

Retinoids [85–87], β-carotene [88], vitamin E [89] and *Spirulina fusiformis* [90] have been shown to produce regression of oral leukoplakia, but the lesions recur

soon after stopping the administration of the chemopreventive agents.

As no trial has evaluated primary outcome in terms of reduction in oral cancer incidence and mortality rates in apparently healthy subjects, it is at present premature to suggest chemoprevention as a routine strategy to prevent oral cancers.

4.3. Oral cancer

Treatment in the early stages of oral cancer is a choice between elective surgery and radical radiotherapy and depends on factors like the site of the tumour, stage, previous irradiation, histology and age of the patient. Preferences vary considerably between treatment centres, and partly reflect differences in resources, expertise, referral patterns and individual clinicians' opinions [11]. There is no evidence that survival of oral cancer patients can be improved by chemotherapy.

Formulation of national guidelines for the management of potentially malignant oral lesions and oral cancer, based on current knowledge, is essential to make the diagnosis and treatment of these lesions consistent across the UK.

5. Oral cancer prognosis

5.1. Predictors

Tumour stage is a significant predictor of survival, with prognosis worsening as stage increases [91–94]. Stage has also been found to be related to recurrence [94].

Several studies have reported an independent prognostic role for tumour diameter with treatment of lesions less than 2 cm in diameter resulting in a better prognosis than that of larger lesions [95–98].

Clinical involvement of neck nodes is also a good marker of prognosis: lymph node negative cases have a significantly better prognosis than cases with lymph node involvement [91,96,99,100]. Prognosis has also been reported to worsen as lymph node involvement progresses [95,98].

Duration of symptoms and clinical appearance of the tumour do not seem to have any prognostic significance when adjusted for other clinical factors [92,95]. Tumour site has been found to be an independent prognostic factor in some studies [93,96]. Lip cancers are reported to have the best prognosis with 5-year survival rates of 85–95% [101,102] whereas for tumours in the oral cavity 5-year survival rates vary from 25 to 60% [95].

Research into the role of histological factors, DNA ploidy, oncogene expression and other biological markers has shown that these may complement tumour stage as prognostic factors, but the results remain inconclusive at present. These investigations are also time consuming and require expensive equipment, thus limiting their clinical use as markers of prognosis. More prospective research is needed in order to establish the predictive value of such markers.

5.2. Diagnostic delay

Although the oral cavity permits easy access to visual examination, most carcinomas of the oral cavity are not diagnosed until they are symptomatic. By this time they are larger than 2 cm, regional spread to lymph nodes already having occurred in 50% of cases [103,104]. Several authors have reported a median total delay of approximately 4 months [104–108]. A study in the UK reported that patient delay in seeking professional advice was the most important factor delaying diagnosis [109]. Professional delay can result from failure on the part of the clinician to conduct a thorough examination, a low index of suspicion, and lack of experience with these tumours [104]. In the UK, a mean delay of 6.4 days from referral to histological diagnosis and 25.8 days from diagnosis to treatment has been reported [110]. One study [111] reported that general practitioners (GPs) diagnosed and referred oral cancer cases earlier than dental practitioners although the patient populations examined were similar. Another [109] found that dental practitioners were less likely than GPs to suggest a diagnosis of malignancy or to emphasise the urgency of the consultation in their referral letters to the specialist. These findings suggest an important role in the early diagnosis of oral cancer for GPs in the National Health Service as well as the need for continuing education among both groups of practitioners.

6. Screening for oral cancer

Screening for oral cancer and pre-cancer can be carried out by a systematic visual examination of the surface of the oral mucosa. The screening test is, therefore, relatively simple and inexpensive to perform, and causes little discomfort to the patient. A detailed examination protocol, including palpation for lymph nodes has been described [112] and palpation of the posterior third of the tongue has also been recommended [10]. The necessity for adequate lighting (standard dental lights) and the use of dental and laryngeal mirrors have been recognised [103].

6.1. Compliance

Pilot studies conducted within the UK have shown that the acceptance of an invitation to oral screening varies according to the setting.

A study carried out at a commercial organisation in London reported a 53% compliance among employees aged 40 and over, who were invited to attend for oral screening by a dentist on-site [113]. However, in a study of the feasibility of conducting oral screening as part of a routine dental check-up in a comparable setting to a NHS practice, almost all (1947/1949) subjects of any age registered with an industrial dental clinic who were invited to attend for an oral screen as part of their dental examination agreed to participate [114]. An invitational screening programme [115] targeting 4348 subjects (aged 40 and over) registered with an inner city medical practice in North London reported that 25.7% of those invited accepted; a further 8.5% responded after a second mailing. Of those screened, 12 patients (1.2%) tested positive, but only eight of these attended the referral appointment [115].

These results highlight the problem that, whilst the simplest way to organise screening in the UK may be to link examinations to dental check-ups, this may not reach the majority of the population at risk.

In the USA, a survey conducted in 1992 showed that 14.3% of respondents reported ever having an examination for oral cancer; of these more than half reported that their most recent examination was as part of a dental check-up, and more than a third said it was part of a routine physical examination [112].

Elsewhere, different strategies have been used to recruit subjects for oral cancer screening. A study in northeast Italy attempted to identify high-risk subjects (smokers and/or heavy drinkers) attending GP surgeries and offer them an examination for the early detection of head and neck cancer. Of 627 subjects identified over a 2-year period only 212 (34%) attended for examination [116].

In Tokoname, Japan, annual screening of 60-year-old residents for oral cancer and pre-cancer by postal invitation was begun in 1986 [117]. Of the 5187 individuals invited betweeen 1986 and 1983, only 802 (15.5%) attended. Among the variables studied, participation in screening for other diseases was most strongly associated with attendance.

6.2. Validity of the test

The sensitivity and specificity of screening depend on factors such as the training of the individual performing the examination, and on the criteria used to determine which lesions are counted as 'positive' and warrant referral for further investigation. The yield and positive predictive value depend on the population screened.

In the UK, examination of the oral cavity has been reported to have a sensitivity ranging from 71 to 81% and a specificity of 99% or more when screening was carried out by general dental practitioners, with dental specialists' diagnosis as the gold standard [113, 114,118]. In two studies [113,114], detection of a white or red patch or ulcer of more than 2 weeks duration constituted a positive test. The relatively low yield in one study [114] has been suggested to be due to the confidence of the screeners in diagnosing frictional keratosis (counted as a negative test). The fact that over half the subjects were below age 50 could also be a factor.

An attempt has been made to use computer-aided diagnosis, 'neural networking', to identify people at high risk of oral cancer [119]. Using data obtained on 10 risk factors, the 'network' correctly identified 80% of subjects diagnosed by specialists as having positive lesions, and had a specificity of 77%.

A number of authors have reported on the use of toluidine blue dye as an adjunct for screening for oral cancer in order to increase sensitivity by providing better demarcation of SCC and dysplastic changes [120]. A recent study in a clinical series found a sensitivity of 100% for oral cancer and 79.5% for oral epithelial dysplasia, but a specificity of only 62.5% [121]. A meta-analysis [122] of a number of clinical studies estimated the sensitivity of the test to range from 93.5 to 97.8%, and the specificity from 73.3 to 92.9%, but there are no studies of its use in a screening situation.

Table 3 summarises the results of the UK studies: specificity is high, sensitivity (where measurable) satisfactory, and values for the yield of positive lesions are generally high.

Table 3
Sensitivity and specificity of the screening test (UK studies)

Reference	Area/country	Settting	Subjects screened	Age	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Yield (%)	PPV (%)
[113]	London	company dental practice	309	40+	71	99	5.5	86
[114]	Wirral	industrial dental clinic	1947	20–69	–	100	0.2	100
[118]	London	dental hospital (out-patients department)	1042	40+	81	99	3.1	68
		inner-city medical practice	985		64	99	2.2	47

PPV, positive predictive value.

6.3. Large-scale population screening studies

These have mostly been carried out outside the UK, in areas where oral cancer is a significant public health problem. In a number of studies in developing countries, a major problem with compliance has been with attendance for referral in those with a suspicious lesion.

The feasibility of using primary health care workers for oral cancer screening has been investigated in Sri Lanka [123]. Of 29,295 individuals (age > 20 years) screened, 1220 (4.2%) had oral lesions warranting referral [124]. However, only 660 (54.1%) of these subsequently attended re-evaluation by the project dentist and 384 (58%) had the diagnosis confirmed. Of a sample of 1212 subjects screened negative and re-examined, 21 (1.7%) were classified as positive. In another study in Sri Lanka [125], the use of a simultaneous health education programme improved compliance with referral to 62% (2193/3559). The detection rates were 35 per 100,000 for new oral cancers, and 30 per 1000 for a true positive referral. Of 1350 negative cases re-examined 3.8% had 'referable' lesions.

In Kerala, India, a sensitivity of 59% and a specificity of 98% have been reported for screening by Basic Health Workers and re-examination by dentists [126] . Of those referred, 72% had attended further examination, and 45% of these were deemed correctly referred. In another study in Kerala [127], despite organised training, only a small percentage of primary health workers were motivated to carry out screening. They examined 17,812 subjects (6.5% of those eligible) over a period of 36 months, but of the 408 referred with suspected lesions only 258 (63.2%) attended for re-examination. A population-based oral cancer screening trial aiming to randomise 90,000 individuals to intervention and control groups was begun in 1995 in Trivandrum, India. About 32,000 subjects have already been recruited, and a recent report indicates almost perfect agreement (kappa = 0.85) between health workers performing the oral screen and the reference findings provided by physicians, in the identification of various oral precancerous lesions [128].

In Cuba, an oral cancer screening programme has been in existence since 1984, with the aim of all subjects $\geqslant$15 years of age having an annual oral examination by a dentist [129]. Between 1984 and 1990, 12–26% of the population were covered annually, and of 30,244 (0.23%) individuals referred only 28.8% complied. The detection rate for cancers and pre-cancerous lesions was 0.3 per 1000 screens. A recent paper claims that a fall in the percentage of stage II–IV cancers between 1982 and 1988 reflects the effect of this program [130]. It is unlikely that treatment of pre-cancerous lesions would have a marked effect within such a time period. As no rates are presented, the percentages may simply reflect an increase in the diagnosis of early stage disease.

6.4. Mouth self-examination (MSE)

The majority of work on early detection of oral cancer has been on screening by health professionals. There is little information about the feasibility of self-screening, or on health education to promote this. One study which examined the feasibility of MSE in India reported that 36% of 22,000 eligible subjects approached had practised MSE [131]. Among 247 subjects visiting the clinic within 2 weeks of the promotion (distribution of brochures regarding MSE), seven new oral cancers and 82 pre-cancerous lesions/conditions were detected. However, there is no information on longer term uptake or detection rates.

6.5. Costs of screening

There are no estimates available of the full cost of a screening programme for oral cancer. Clearly the costs will vary according to the setting and method of organisation. The initial examination has been quoted as taking less than 5 min (e.g. of a dentist's time). However, it has been pointed out that the abolition of free dental check-ups in the UK means that the cost of screening in such a setting would, therefore, be borne by the population, and would have a detrimental effect on uptake [132].

Although facilities for the diagnosis and treatment of potentially malignant and malignant oral lesions exist, implementation of a population-based screening programme on a nationwide scale would be a strain on the available resources because of the resulting increase in work-load.

Preliminary results from a simulation model of population screening for oral cancer and precancer indicate that approximately 18,000 individuals would need to be screened in order to save one life [133]. With an assumed compliance rate of 50%, the net benefit of screening was the equivalent of 2.8 lives saved. However, any health gain achieved by screening would be severely compromised in the presence of low compliance rates, variable performance (detection rates) by practitioners, and high drop-out rates that might occur in a programme providing periodic rescreening.

7. Conclusions

Oral cancer incidence and mortality are currently rising; a cohort effect is seen for males born after 1911–12. Each year about 2000 new oral cancers (ICD9 140–145) and 1000 oral cancer deaths are registered in England and Wales. Although the major risk factors for oral

cancer are known to be tobacco and alcohol consumption, more information is needed on the risk factors for oral cancer in the UK, including those in ethnic groups, and on the reasons for the increasing incidence.

Visual examination appears to be a valid screening test for oral cancer and pre-cancer, the acceptability of screening varying according to the setting. There is a likelihood of selection bias, particularly if screening is performed in dental practices, with those attending likely to be a more health-conscious and low-risk population. In developing countries, whilst acceptance of initial examination has been good, compliance with referral by subjects detected positive has often been poor, and adequate resources may not be available for follow-up.

Incomplete understanding of the natural history of precursor lesions makes the classification of positive cases at screening difficult. Identification of all leukoplakias as 'positive' is likely to result in considerable over-diagnosis, but determination of which lesions are likely to progress involves invasive techniques. In addition, treatment of leukoplakia does not necessarily prevent progression to invasive cancer.

Further research into the natural history of the disease would be worthwhile in order to provide better estimates of the prevalence of pre-cancerous and early invasive lesions in Western countries. Whilst dentists may be the most appropriate professionals to conduct such studies, care needs to be taken to avoid a highly selected population.

As there are no widely accepted guidelines for the management of potentially malignant oral lesions in the UK and available evidence confirms variability in the management of these lesions by consultant oral and maxillofacial surgeons, formulation of national guidelines based on current knowledge is essential to make the diagnosis and treatment of these lesions consistent across the UK.

Although treatment of early invasive cancer will cause less morbidity than that of late-stage cancer, and early stage disease has a better prognosis, there is no evidence on the effectiveness of population screening for oral cancer, either in reducing mortality from the disease or in reducing the incidence of invasive disease by the detection and treatment of precursor lesions. On the same basis, there is no justification for opportunistic screening in general practitioner/dental practitioner clinics. In addition, this method might not reach individuals at high risk of disease, as clinic attendees are often more health conscious, low-risk individuals.

Further research on the effectiveness of screening for oral cancer, ideally in the form of a randomised trial is, therefore, necessary before population screening is considered. The applicability of the results of the on-going Indian trial [28] to the UK are likely to be limited, both due to methods of intervention and possible differences in natural history. A randomised trial in the general population in the UK would be prohibitively large with an estimated sample size in excess of 1.4 million subjects based on current oral cancer mortality rates among the general population ($\alpha = 0.05$, 80% power to detect a mortality reduction of 20%). Calculation of sample size using expected mortality rates among a population initially free of disease (as in a screening trial setting) would yield an even higher figure. Although this problem could be overcome by targeting a sub-group at sufficiently increased risk of oral cancer, identification of such a group (smokers and drinkers aged 40+ years) would be a difficult task as lifestyle factors are often difficult to ascertain and people are reluctant to admit to them [7].

There is currently insufficient evidence to recommend population screening for oral cancer in the UK. Other measures, particularly efforts aimed at primary prevention of the disease may be a more feasible method of disease control at present.

Acknowledgements

This paper is based on a review of the early natural history of oral cancer prepared by the Cancer Screening Evaluation Unit for the NHS National Cancer Research and Development Division in July 1997, a project funded by the NHS R&D Division (Project NCP/ ICV/ 042/ K). We are grateful to Dr J. Melia, Cancer Screening Evaluation Unit, Institute of Cancer Research, for her valuable comments and suggestions.

References

[1] Macfarlane GJ, Boyle P, Evstifeeva TV, Robertson C, Scully C. Rising trends of oral cancer mortality among males worldwide: the return of an old public health problem. Cancer Causes Control 1994;5:259–65.

[2] Johnson NW. Orofacial neoplasms: global epidemiology, risk factors and recommendations for research. International Dentistry Journal 1991;41:365–75.

[3] Smith CJ. Epidemiology and aetiology. In: Langdon JD, Henk JM, editors. Malignant Tumours of the Mouth, Jaws and Salivary Glands. London: Edward Arnold, 1995, pp. 1–13.

[4] Downer MC. Patterns of disease and treatment and their implications for dental health services research. Community Dental Health 1993;10(Suppl. 2):39–46.

[5] Johnson NW, Warnakulasuriya KA. Epidemiology and aetiology of oral cancer in the United Kingdom. Community Dental Health 1993;10:13–29.

[6] Cancer Research Campaign: Oral Cancer Factsheet 14.1, 1993.

[7] Speight PM, Zakrzewska J, Downer MC. Screening for oral cancer and precancer. European Journal of Cancer: Oral Oncology 1992;28:45–8.

[8] Nally F. Screening for oral cancer. Practitioner 1992;236:915–6, 919–20.

[9] Warnakulasuriya KAASW. Strengths and weaknesses of screening programmes for oral malignancies and potentially malignant lesions. European Journal of Cancer Prevention 1996;5:93–8.

[10] Zakrzewska JM, Hindle I, Speight PM. Practical considerations for the establishment of an oral cancer screening programme. Community Dental Health 1993;10:79–85.
[11] Boyle P, Macfarlane GJ, Blot WJ, et al. European School of Oncology Advisory Report to the European Commission for the Europe Against Cancer Programme: oral carcinogenesis in Europe. European Journal of Cancer: Oral Oncology 1995; 31:75–85.
[12] Franceschi S, Barzan L, Talamini R. Screening for cancer of the head and neck: if not now, when? Oral Oncology 1997;33:313–6.
[13] Wilson JMG, Jungner, G. Principles and Practice of Screening for Disease. Geneva: World Health Organization, 1968.
[14] Wald N, Cuckle H. Reporting the assessment of screening and diagnostic tests. British Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology 1989;96:389–96.
[15] National Screening Committee. First Report of the National Screening Committee. London: Department of Health, 1998.
[16] Calman K. Developing screening in the NHS. Journal of Medical Screening 1994;1:101–5.
[17] Hindle I, Downer MC, Speight PM. The epidemiology of oral cancer. British Journal of Oral Maxillofacial Surgery 1996;34:471–6.
[18] Worrall SF. Oral cancer incidence between 1971 and 1989. British Journal of Oral Maxillofacial Surgery 1995;33:195–6.
[19] Office for National Statistics. Mortality Statistics: Cause, England and Wales, 1993 (revised) and 1994. London: HMSO, 1996.
[20] Macfarlane GJ, Boyle P, Scully C. Oral cancer in Scotland: changing incidence and mortality. British Medical Journal 1992;305:1121–3.
[21] Coleman M, Esteve J, Damiecke P, Arsland A, Renard H. Trends in Cancer Incidence and Mortality. Lyon: IARC, 1993.
[22] Gregg TA, Cowan CG, Kee F. Trends in the relative frequency of histologically diagnosed epithelial dysplasia and intra-oral carcinoma in Northern Ireland, 1975–1989. British Dentistry Journal 1992;173:234–6.
[23] Cowan CG, Gregg TA, Kee F. Trends in the incidence of histologically diagnosed intra-oral squamous cell carcinoma in Northern Ireland, 1975–89. British Dentistry Journal 1992;173:231–3.
[24] Warnakulasuriya KA, Acworth P, Bell J, Johnson NW. Incompleteness of oral cancer registration in south-east England, 1971–87. British Journal of Cancer 1994;70:736–8.
[25] Hindle I, Nally F. Incidence of oral cancer. British Dentistry Journal 1991;170:432.
[26] Hindle I, Nally F. Oral cancer: a comparative study between 1962–67 and 1980–84 in England and Wales. British Dentistry Journal 1991;170:15–20.
[27] Swerdlow AJ, Marmot MG, Grulich AE, Head J. Cancer mortality in Indian and British ethnic immigrants from the Indian subcontinent to England and Wales. British Journal of Cancer 1995;72:1312–9.
[28] Barker RM, Baker MR. Incidence of cancer in Bradford Asians. Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health 1990;44:125–9.
[29] Donaldson LJ, Clayton DG. Occurrence of cancer in Asians and non-Asians. Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health 1984;38:203–7.
[30] Eversole LR. Diseases should not be considered entities unto themselves (editorial). Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine and Oral Pathology 1992;73:707.
[31] Sasieni P, Cuzick J, Farmery E. Accelerated decline in cervical cancer mortality in England and Wales. Lancet 1995;346:1566–7.
[32] Franceschi S, Talamini R, Barra S, et al. Smoking and drinking in relation to cancers of the oral cavity, pharynx, larynx, and esophagus in northern Italy. Cancer Research 1990;50:6502–7.
[33] Franceschi S, Barra S, La Vecchia C, Bidoli E, Negri E, Talamini R. Risk factors for cancer of the tongue and the mouth. A case-control study from northern Italy. Cancer 1992;70:2227–33.
[34] Macfarlane GJ, Zheng T, Marshall JR, et al. . Alcohol, tobacco, diet and the risk of oral cancer: a pooled analysis of three case-control studies. European Journal of Cancer: Oral Oncology 1995;31B:181–7.
[35] International Agency for Research on Cancer. Tobacco Habits other than Smoking: Betel-quid and Areca-nut Chewing; and some Related Nitrosamines. Lyon: IARC, 1985.
[36] US Department of Health and Human Services. The Health Consequences of using Smokeless Tobacco. Report of the Advisory Committee to the Surgeon General. Bethesda: NIH, 1986; 86-2874.
[37] Grady D, Greene J, Daniels TE, et al. Oral mucosal lesions found in smokeless tobacco users. Journal of the American Dental Association 1990;121:117–23.
[38] Ikeda N, Handa Y, Khim SP, et al. Prevalence study of oral mucosal lesions in a selected Cambodian population. Community. Dental and Oral Epidemiology 1995;23:49–54.
[39] Gupta PC, Mehta FS, Pindborg JJ, et al. Primary prevention trial of oral cancer in India: a 10-year follow-up study. Journal of Oral Pathology and Medicine 1992;21:433–9.
[40] Scully C. Oral precancer: preventive and medical approaches to management. European Journal of Cancer: Oral Oncology 1995;31B:16–26.
[41] Thomas S, Kearsley J. Betel quid and oral cancer: a review. European Journal of Cancer: Oral Oncology 1993;29:251–5.
[42] Bedi R. Betel-quid and tobacco chewing among the United Kingdom's Bangladeshi community. British Journal of Cancer 1996;74:S73.
[43] Franco EL, Kowalski LP, Oliveira BV, et al. Risk factors for oral cancer in Brazil: a case-control study. International Journal of Cancer 1989;43:992–1000.
[44] Oreggia F, De Stefani E, Correa P, Fierro L. Risk factors for cancer of the tongue in Uruguay. Cancer 1991;67:180–3.
[45] La Vecchia C, Negri E, D'Avanzo B, Boyle P, Franceschi S. Dietary indicators of oral and pharyngeal cancer. International Journal Epidemiology 1991;20:39–44.
[46] Winn DM. Diet and nutrition in the etiology of oral cancer. American Journal of Clinical Nutrition 1995;61:437S–45S.
[47] TougerDecker R, Mobley C, Etzel KR, et al. Position of The American Dietetic Association: oral health and nutrition. Journal of the American Dietetic Association 1996;96:184–9.
[48] Graham S, Dayal H, Rohrer T, et al. Dentition, diet, tobacco, and alcohol in the epidemiology of oral cancer. Journal of the National Cancer Institute 1977;59:1611–8.
[49] Elwood JM, Pearson JC, Skippen DH, Jackson SM. Alcohol, smoking, social and occupational factors in the aetiology of cancer of the oral cavity, pharynx and larynx. International Journal of Cancer 1984;34:603–12.
[50] Winn DM, Blot WJ, McLaughlin JK, et al. Mouthwash use and oral conditions in the risk of oral and pharyngeal cancer. Cancer Research 1991;51:3044–7.
[51] Day GL, Blot WJ, Austin DF, et al. Racial differences in risk of oral and pharyngeal cancer: alcohol, tobacco, and other determinants. Journal of the National Cancer Institute 1993;85:465–73.
[52] Steinberg BM, DiLorenzo TP. A possible role for human papillomaviruses in head and neck cancer. Cancer Metastasis Review 1996;15:91–112.
[53] Scully C. Viruses and oral squamous carcinoma. European Journal of Cancer: Oral Oncology 1992;28B:57–9.
[54] La Vecchia C, Tavani A, Franceschi S, Levi F, Corrao G, Negri E. Epidemiology and prevention of oral cancer. Oral Oncology 1997;33:302–12.
[55] van der Waal I, Schepman KP, van der Meij EH, Smeele LE. Oral leukoplakia: a clinicopathological review. Oral Oncology 1997;33:291–301.
[56] Kleinman DV, Swango PA, Niessen LC. Epidemiologic studies of oral mucosal conditions—methodologic issues. Community Dental and Oral Epidemiology 1991;19:129–40.

[57] Gluckman JL, Stambrook PJ, Pavelic ZP. Prognostic significance of p53 protein accumulation in early stage T1 oral cavity cancer [letter]. European Journal of Cancer: Oral Oncology 1994;30B:281.
[58] Axell T, Holmstrup P, Kramer IRH, Pindborg JJ, Shear M. International seminar on oral leukoplakia and associated lesions related to tobacco habits. Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology 1984;12:145–54.
[59] Axell T, Pindborg JJ, Smith CJ, van der Waal I. Oral white lesions with special reference to precancerous and tobacco-related lesions: conclusions of an international symposium held in Uppsala, Sweden, May 18–21 1994. International Collaborative Group on Oral White Lesions. Journal of Oral Pathology and Medicine 1996;25:49–54.
[60] Mehta FS, Pindborg JJ, Bhonsle RB, Sinor PN. Incidence of oral leucoplakias among 20,358 Indian villagers in a 7-year period. British Journal of Cancer 1976;33:549–54.
[61] Bouquot JE, Gorlin RJ. Leukoplakia, lichen planus, and other oral keratoses in 23,616 white Americans over the age of 35 years. Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine and Oral Pathology 1986;61:373–81.
[62] Bouquot JE. Reviewing oral leukoplakia: clinical concepts for the 1990s. Journal of the American Dentistry Association 1991;122:80–2.
[63] Axell T. Occurrence of leukoplakia and some other oral white lesions among 20,333 adult Swedish people. Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology 1987;15:46–51.
[64] Speight PM, Morgan PR. The natural history and pathology of oral cancer and precancer. Community Dental Health 1993; 10:31–41.
[65] Shafer WG, Waldron CA. Erythroplakia of the oral cavity. Cancer 1975;36:1021–8.
[66] Shear M. Erythroplakia of the mouth. International Dental Journal 1972;22:460–73.
[67] Katz HC, Shear M, Altini M. A critical evaluation of epithelial dysplasia in oral mucosal lesions using the Smith-Pindborg method of standardization. Journal of Oral Pathology 1985; 14:476–82.
[68] Pillai R, Balaram P, Reddiar KS. Pathogenesis of oral submucous fibrosis: relationship to risk factors associated with oral cancer. Cancer 1992;69:2011–20.
[69] Rajendran R. Oral submucous fibrosis: etiology, pathogenesis, and future research. Bulletin of the WHO 1994;72:985–96.
[70] Pindborg JJ. Is submucous fibrosis a precancerous condition in the oral cavity? International Dentistry Journal 1972;22:474–80.
[71] Lamey PJ, Lewis MA. Oral medicine in practice: white patches. British Dentistry Journal 1990;168:147–52.
[72] Gupta PC, Mehta FS, Daftary DK, et al. Incidence rates of oral cancer and natural history of oral precancerous lesions in a 10-year follow-up study of Indian villagers. Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology 1980;8:283–333.
[73] Eisenberg E, Krutchkoff DJ. Lichenoid lesions of oral mucosa. Diagnostic criteria and their importance in the alleged relationship to oral cancer. Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine amd Oral Pathology 1992;73:699–704.
[74] Larsson LG, Sandstrom A, Westling P. Relationship of Plummer-Vinson disease to cancer of the upper alimentary tract in Sweden. Cancer Research 1975;35:3308–16.
[75] Chief Medical Officer of the Department of Health. On the State of the Public Health. London: HMSO, 1995, pp.168–169.
[76] Sankaranarayanan R. Oral cancer in India: an epidemiologic and clinical review. Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine and Oral Pathology 1990;69:325–30.
[77] Johnson NW, Ranasinghe AW, Warnakulasuriya KA. Potentially malignant lesions and conditions of the mouth and oropharynx: natural history—cellular and molecular markers of risk. European Journal of Cancer Prevention 1993;2:31–51.
[78] Lamey P-J. Management options in potentially malignant, malignant oral epithelial lesions. Community Dental Health 1993;10:53–62.
[79] Marley JJ, Cowan CG, Lamey PJ, Linden GJ, Johnson NW, Warnakulasuriya KAAS. Management of potentially malignant oral mucosal lesions by consultant UK oral and maxillofacial surgeons. British Journal of Oral Maxillofacial Surgery 1996;34:28–36.
[80] Daftary DK, Murti PR, Bhonsle RB, Gupta PC, Mehta FS, Pindborg JJ. Risk factors and risk markers for oral cancer in high incidence areas of the world. In: Johnson NW, editor. Risk Markers for Oral Diseases, Vol. 2, Oral Cancer: Detection of Patients and Lesions at Risk. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, pp. 29–63.
[81] Langdon JD. Classification and staging. Mouth cancer and jaw tumours. In: Henk JM, Langdon JD, editors. Malignant Tumours of the Mouth, Jaws and Salivary Glands. London: Edward Arnold, 1995, pp. 36–44.
[82] Lumerman H, Freedman P, Kerpel S. Oral epithelial dysplasia and the development of invasive squamous cell carcinoma. Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology, Oral Radiology and Endodontics 1995;79:321–9.
[83] Waldron CA, Shafer WG. Leukoplakia revisited. A clinicopathologic study 3256 oral leukoplakias. Cancer 1975; 36:1386–92.
[84] Tradati N, Grigolat R, Calabrese L, et al. Oral leukoplakias: to treat or not? Oral Oncology 1997;33:317–21.
[85] Sankaranarayanan R, Mathew B. Retinoids as cancer-preventive agents. In: Stewart BW, McGregor D, Kleihues P, editors. Principles of Chemoprevention. Lyon: International Agency for Research on Cancer, 1996, pp. 47–59.
[86] Sankaranarayanan R, Mathew B, Nair PP, et al. Chemoprevention of cancers of the oral cavity and the head and neck. In: Hakama M, Beral V, Buiatti E, Faivre J, Parkin DM, editors. Chemoprevention in Cancer Control. Lyon: International Agency for Research on Cancer, 1996, pp. 13–25.
[87] Stich HF, Hornby AP, Mathew B, Sankaranarayanan R, Krishnan Nair M. Response of oral leukoplakias to the administration of vitamin A. Cancer Letters 1988;40:93–101.
[88] Stich HF, Rosin MP, Hornby AP, Mathew B, Sankaranarayanan R, Nair MK. Remission of oral leukoplakia and micronuclei in tobacco/betel quid chewers treated with beta-carotene and with beta-carotene plus vitamin A. International Journal of Cancer 1988;42:195–9.
[89] Benner SE, Winn RJ, Lippman SM, et al. Regression of oral leukoplakia with alpha-tocopherol: a community clinical oncology program chemoprevention study. Journal of the National Cancer Institute 1993;85:44–7.
[90] Mathew B, Sankaranarayanan R, Nair PP, et al. Evaluation of chemoprevention of oral cancer with Spirulina fusiformis. Nutrition and Cancer 1995;24:197–202.
[91] Bundgaard T, Bentzen SM, Wildt J, Serensen FB, Sogaard H, Nielsen JE. Histopathologic, stereologic, epidemiologic, and clinical parameters in the prognostic evaluation of squamous cell carcinoma of the oral cavity. Head and Neck 1996;18:142–52.
[92] Bryne M, Eide GE, Lilleng R, Langmark F, Thrane PS, Dabelsteen E. A multivariate study of the prognosis of oral squamous cell carcinomas. Are blood group and hemoglobin new prognostic factors? Cancer 1991;68:1994–8.
[93] Faye Lund H, Abdelnoor M. Prognostic factors of survival in a cohort of head and neck cancer patients in Oslo. European Journal of Cancer: Oral Oncology 1996;32B:83–90.
[94] Bundgaard T, Sorensen FB, Gaihede M, Sogaard H, Overgaard J. Stereologic, histopathologic, flow cytometric, and clinical parameters in the prognostic evaluation of 74 patients with intraoral squamous cell carcinomas. Cancer 1992;70:1–13.

[95] Boffetta P, Merletti F, Magnani C, Terracini B. A population-based study of prognostic factors in oral and oropharyngeal cancer. European Journal of Cancer: Oral Oncology 1994; 30B:369–73.
[96] Platz H, Fries R, Hudec M. Prognoses of Oral Cavity Carcinomas: Results of a Multicentric Retrospective Observational Study. Munchen: Carl Hanser Verlag, 1986.
[97] Beltrami CA, Desinan L, Rubini C. Prognostic factors in squamous cell carcinoma of the oral cavity. A retrospective study of 80 cases. Pathol. Res. Pract. 1992;188:510–6.
[98] Jones AS. Prognosis in mouth cancer: tumour factors. European Journal of Cancer: Oral Oncology 1994;30:8–15.
[99] Woolgar JA, Scott J, Vaughan ED, Brown JS, West CR, Rogers S. Survival, metastasis and recurrence of oral cancer in relation to pathological features. Ann. R. Coll. Surg. Engl. 1995; 77:325–31.
[100] Melchiorri C, Cattini L, Lalli E, Campobassi A, Marchetti C, Facchini A. DNA ploidy analysis of squamous cell carcinoma of the oral and maxillofacial region.Clinical and pathological correlations. Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine and Oral Pathology 1996;82:308–14.
[101] Antoniades DZ, Styanidis K, Papanayotou P, Trigonidis G. Squamous cell carcinoma of the lips in a northern Greek population. Evaluation of prognostic factors on 5-year survival rate—I. European Journal of Cancer: Oral Oncology 1995;31:333–9.
[102] Hosal IN, Onerci M, Kaya S, Turan E. Squamous cll carcinoma of the lower lip. American Journal of Otolaryngology 1992; 13:363–5.
[103] Mashberg A, Samit AM. Early detection, diagnosis, and management of oral and oropharyngeal cancer. CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicains 1989;39:67–88.
[104] Guggenheimer J, Verbin RS, Johnson JT, Horkowitz CA, Myers EN. Factors delaying the diagnosis of oral and oropharyngeal carcinomas. Cancer 1989;64:932–5.
[105] Wildt J, Bundgaard T, Bentzen SM. Delay in the diagnosis of oral squamous cell carcinoma. Clinical Otolaryngology 1995;20:21–5.
[106] Kowalski LP, Franco EL, Torloni H, et al. Lateness of diagnosis of oral and oropharyngeal carcinoma: factors related to the tumour, the patient and health professionals. European Journal of Cancer: Oral Oncology 1994;30:167–73.
[107] Jovanovic A, Kostense PJ, Schulten EAJM B, van der Waal I. Delay in diagnosis of oral squamous cell carcinoma; a report from The Netherlands. European Journal of Cancer: Oral Oncology 37;28B;1992.
[108] Pogrel MA. The dentist and oral cancer in the north east of Scotland. British Dentistry Journal 1974;137:15–20.
[109] Scully C, Malamos D, Levers BGH, Porter SR, Prime SS. Sources and patterns of referrals of oral cancer: role of general practitioners. British Medical Journal 1986;293:599–601.
[110] Worrall SF, Corrigan M. An audit of one surgeon's experience of oral squamous cell carcinoma using computerised malignancy database. Annals of the Royal College of Surgeons of England (London) 1995;77:332–6.
[111] Schnetler JF. Oral cancer diagnosis and delays in referral. British Journal of Oral Maxillofacial Surgery 1992;30:210–3.
[112] Goodman HS, Yellowitz JA, Horowitz AM. Oral cancer prevention. The role of family practitioners. Archives of Family Medicine 1995;4:628–36.
[113] Downer MC, Evans AW, Hughes Hallet CM, Jullien JA, Speight PM, Zakrzewska JM. Evaluation of screening for oral cancer and precancer in a company headquarters. Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology 1995;23:84–8.
[114] Field EA, Morrison T, Darling AE, Parr TA, Zakrzewska JM. Oral mucosal screening as an integral part of routine dental care. British Dentistry Journal 1995;179:262–6.
[115] Jullien JA, Zakrzewska JM, Downer MC, Speight PM. Attendance and compliance at an oral cancer screening programme in a general medical practice. European Journal of Cancer: Oral Oncology 1995;31B:202–6.
[116] Talamini R, Barzan L, Franceschi S, Caruso G, Gasparin A, Comoretto R. Determinants of compliance with an early detection programme for cancer of the head and neck in north-eastern Italy. European Journal of Cancer: Oral Oncology 1994;30B:415–8.
[117] Ikeda N, Downer MC, Ishii T, Fukano H, Nagao T, Inoue K. Annual screening for oral cancer and precancer by invitation to 60-year-old residents of a city in Japan. Community Dental Health 1995;12:133–7.
[118] Jullien JA, Downer MC, Zakrzewska JM, Speight PM. Evaluation of a screening test for the early detection of oral cancer and precancer. Community Dental Health 1995;12:3–7.
[119] Speight PM, Elliott AE, Jullien JA, Downer MC, Zakzrewska JM. The use of artificial intelligence to identify people at risk of oral cancer and precancer. British Dentistry Journal 1995; 179:382–7.
[120] Epstein JB, Scully C, Spinelli J. Toluidine blue and Lugol's iodine application in the assessment of oral malignant disease and lesions at risk of malignancy. Journal of Oral Pathology and Medicine 1992;21:160–3.
[121] Warnakulasuriya KAASW. Sensitivity and specificity of OraScan toluidine blue mouthrinse in the detection of oral cancer and precancer. Journal of Oral Pathology and Medicine 1996; 25:97–103.
[122] Rosenberg D, Cretin S. Use of meta-analysis to evaluate tolonium chloride in oral cancer screening. Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine and Oral Pathology 1989;67:621–7.
[123] Warnakulasuriya S, Pindborg JJ. Reliability of oral precancer screening by primary health care workers in Sri Lanka. Community Dental Health 1990;7:73–9.
[124] Warnakulasuriya KA, Ekanayake AN, Sivayoham S, et al. Utilization of primary health care workers for early detection of oral cancer and precancer cases in Sri Lanka. Bull. WHO 1984; 62:243–50.
[125] Warnakulasuriya KA, Nanayakkara BG. Reproducibility of an oral cancer and precancer detection program using a primary health care model in Sri Lanka. Cancer Detection and Prevention 1991;15:331–4.
[126] Mehta FS, Gupta PC, Bhonsle RB, Murti PR, Daftary DK, Pindborg JJ. Detection of oral cancer using basic health workers in an area of high oral cancer incidence in India. Cancer Detecttio and Prevention 1986;9:219–25.
[127] Mathew B, Sankaranarayanan R, Wesley R, Joseph A, Krishnan Nair M. Evaluation of utilisation of health workers for secondary prevention of oral cancer in Kerala, India. European Journal of Cancer: Oral Oncology 1995;31:193–6.
[128] Mathew B, Sankaranarayanan R, Sunilkumar KB, Kuruvila B, Pisani P, Nair MK. Reproducibility and validity of oral visual inspection by trained health workers in the detection of oral precancer and cancer. British Journal of Cancer 1997; 76:390–4.
[129] Garrote LF, Sankaranarayanan R, Anta JJL, Salva AR, Parkin DM. An evaluation of the oral cancer control program in Cuba. Epidemiology 1995;6:428–31.
[130] Santana JC, Delgado L, Miranda J, Sanchez M. Oral Cancer Case Finding Program (OCCFP). Oral Oncology 1997;33:10–2.
[131] Mathew B, Sankaranarayanan R, Wesley R, Nair MK. Evaluation of mouth self-examination in the control of oral cancer. British Journal of Cancer 1995;71:397–9.
[132] Ogden GR, Cowpe JG, Chisholm DM. Cost of oral screening. Lancet 1991;337:920–1.
[133] Downer MC, Jullien JA, Speight PM. An interim determination of health gain from oral cancer and precancer screening: 2. developing a model of population screening. Community Dental Health 1997;14:227–32.

[134] Silverman Jr S. Observations on the clinical characteristics and natural history of oral leukoplakia. Journal of the American Dental Association 1968;76:772–7.
[135] Silverman Jr S, Gorsky M, Lozada F. Oral leukoplakia and malignant transformation. A follow-up study of 257 patients. Cancer 1984;53:563–8.
[136] Hogewind WF, van der Kwast WA, van der Waal I. Oral leukoplakia, with emphasis on malignant transformation. A follow-up study of 46 patients. Journal or Cranio–Maxillo Facial Surgery 1989;17:128–33.
[137] Einhorn J, Wersall J. Incidence of oral carcinoma in patients with leukoplakia of the oral mucosa. Cancer 1967; 20:2189–93.
[138] Pindborg JJ, Jolst O, Renstrup G, Roed Petersen B. Studies in oral leukoplakia: a preliminary report on the period prevalence of malignant transformation in leukoplakia based on a follow-up study of 248 patients. Journal of the American Dental Association 1968;76:767–71.
[139] Banoczy J. Follow-up studies in oral leukoplakia. Journal of Maxillofacial Surgery 1977;5:69–75.
[140] Lind PO. Malignant transformation in oral leukoplakia. Scandinavian Journal of Dental Research 1987;95:449–55.
[141] Silverman S, Bhargava K, Smith LW, Malaowalla AM. Malignant transformation and natural history of oral leukoplakia in 57,518 industrial workers of Gujarat, India. Cancer 1976;38:1790–5.
[142] Gupta PC, Bhonsle RB, Murti PR, Daftary DK, Mehta FS, Pindborg JJ. An epidemiologic assessment of cancer risk in oral precancerous lesions in India with special reference to nodular leukoplakia. Cancer 1989;63:2247–52.