Combination Oncology Therapies: A Review of Efficacy and Access

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 25 June 2026 · Edited by Mara Voss

> The management of advanced and metastatic cancers frequently necessitates combination oncology therapies to achieve superior clinical outcomes compared to monotherapy. However, the increasing complexity and cost of these multi-agent regimens pose substantial challenges for healthcare systems and patient access. This review examines the clinical benefits of combination approaches in oncology and highlights the economic and logistical hurdles impacting their widespread implementation.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Combination oncology therapies are now standard for many advanced cancers, moving beyond sequential monotherapy.
- The Data: These regimens often demonstrate improved overall survival and progression-free survival compared to single-agent treatments.
- The Action: Clinicians must weigh the evidence for combination efficacy against patient-specific factors, toxicity profiles, and access limitations.

Oncology treatment has evolved significantly, moving from cytotoxic monotherapies to targeted agents, immunotherapies, and increasingly, combinations of these modalities. The rationale for combination therapy in cancer is multifactorial, aiming to overcome drug resistance, target multiple pathways simultaneously, and enhance therapeutic efficacy while managing toxicity. For many advanced malignancies, combination regimens have become the standard of care, offering patients improved survival rates and quality of life. The complexity of cancer biology, characterized by heterogeneous cell populations and multiple escape mechanisms, often necessitates a multi-pronged therapeutic approach. For instance, in non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) with specific mutations, combining a targeted therapy with chemotherapy or another targeted agent can significantly extend progression-free survival compared to either agent alone. Similarly, in melanoma, the combination of BRAF and MEK inhibitors has demonstrated superior response rates and survival outcomes over single-agent BRAF inhibition. These improvements are often attributed to the synergistic effects of agents targeting different aspects of cancer cell proliferation, survival, or immune evasion.

The development of combination oncology therapies is a complex process, often involving extensive preclinical research to identify synergistic drug pairs, followed by rigorous clinical trials. These trials typically evaluate the safety and efficacy of novel combinations against established monotherapies or existing combination regimens. A key consideration in designing combination therapies is the potential for overlapping toxicities, which can limit the maximum tolerated dose of individual agents and impact patient adherence. Therefore, careful dose selection and scheduling are paramount to optimize the therapeutic index. The regulatory approval process for combination therapies can also be more intricate,

requiring evidence of benefit for the specific combination, not just its individual components. This often involves large, multi-centre, randomised controlled trials comparing the combination to standard of care. For example, a trial might compare a new immunotherapy combination to platinum-based chemotherapy in a specific cancer type, with overall survival as a primary endpoint. The results from such trials provide the evidence base for clinical guidelines and prescribing practices.

Challenges in Access and Implementation

Despite the demonstrated clinical benefits, the widespread implementation of combination oncology therapies faces significant hurdles, primarily related to cost and access. The development of novel anticancer agents is an expensive undertaking, and when multiple high-cost agents are combined, the total treatment cost can become prohibitive for healthcare systems and individual patients. This issue is particularly pronounced in countries with public healthcare systems or limited insurance coverage, where budget constraints can restrict access to the most effective treatments. The pricing of combination therapies often reflects the cumulative cost of each component, without necessarily accounting for the synergistic value or the overall health economic benefit. This can lead to difficult decisions regarding formulary inclusion and reimbursement policies. Furthermore, the administrative burden associated with managing multiple prescription therapies, coordinating treatment schedules, and monitoring for complex adverse event profiles can strain healthcare resources. Patients may also face challenges with adherence due to the complexity of regimens, potential for increased side effects, and financial toxicity.

The economic impact of combination oncology therapies extends beyond the direct cost of the drugs. It includes the costs associated with managing adverse events, supportive care, and the infrastructure required to deliver these complex treatments. For instance, the administration of certain intravenous combination immunotherapies requires specialised infusion centres and trained personnel. The long-term financial sustainability of providing these therapies is a growing concern for healthcare policymakers globally. Efforts to address these challenges include value-based pricing models, risk-sharing agreements between pharmaceutical companies and payers, and the development of biosimilars for biological components of combination regimens. However, these solutions are often complex to implement and may not fully resolve the underlying issues of affordability and equitable access. The need for robust health economic evaluations is critical to demonstrate the value of combination therapies in terms of quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) and overall societal benefit, thereby informing reimbursement decisions. Without a clear understanding of the full economic impact, healthcare systems will continue to struggle with balancing innovation and affordability in oncology.

For comprehensive clinical insights into various oncology treatment strategies and their practical application in patient care, consult the Oxford Handbook of Oncology.

> **CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS**
>
> The increasing reliance on combination oncology therapies, while clinically sound, presents a stark reality for healthcare systems: improved outcomes come at a significant, often unsustainable, price. Clinicians are frequently caught between the evidence-based imperative to offer the best available treatment and the practical limitations of formulary restrictions or patient affordability. It is not enough to simply demonstrate superior survival; the economic viability of these regimens must be rigorously scrutinised. The current pricing models, which often aggregate the cost of individual high-priced agents, fail to account for the cumulative

> burden on healthcare budgets, leading to difficult rationing decisions that directly impact patient access. For patients, this translates into a postcode lottery for life-extending treatments. A patient's ability to receive optimal care should not depend on their insurance coverage or the specific reimbursement policies of their region. Pharmaceutical companies, while driving innovation, must engage more transparently in discussions about value-based pricing and explore models that reflect the true health economic benefit, rather than simply the cost of development. The current trajectory is unsustainable, threatening to widen health inequalities and undermine the very progress these therapies represent. Guideline bodies and professional societies have a role in advocating for policies that ensure equitable access, perhaps by pushing for more comprehensive health technology assessments that include a broader societal perspective on cost-effectiveness.
> The industry must recognise that the long-term success of these innovative combinations hinges on their accessibility. If only a privileged few can afford them, the public health impact is severely limited, and the ethical implications become increasingly problematic. We need a concerted effort from all stakeholders – manufacturers, payers, clinicians, and patient advocates – to develop sustainable solutions that ensure these life-prolonging treatments are available to all who can benefit, not just those who can pay. Otherwise, the scientific advancements, however impressive, will remain out of reach for too many.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. Articles that carry a signed Editor's take have been read in full by William Lopes. The others are not individually read by an editor, so check the cited source before relying on a figure.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Jazowski SA, Nayak RK, Dusetzina SB. The high costs of anticancer therapies in the USA: challenges, opportunities and progress. Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology. 2024;21(12):867-881. doi:10.1038/s41571-024-00948-1
2. 2. Latimer NR, Pollard D, Towse A, Henshall C, Sansom L, Ward RL, Bruce A, Deakin C. Challenges in valuing and paying for combination regimens in oncology: reporting the perspectives of a multi-stakeholder, international workshop. BMC Health Services Research. 2021;21(1):412. doi:10.1186/s12913-021-06425-0
3. 3. Palmer AC, Sorger PK, et al. Additivity predicts the efficacy of most approved combination therapies for advanced cancer. Nature Cancer. 2023;4:1693-1704. doi:10.1038/s43018-023-00667-z
4. 4. Cooper KE, Abdallah KE, Angove RSM, Gallagher KD, Bonham VL. Navigating Access to Cancer Care: Identifying Barriers to Precision Cancer Medicine. Ethnicity and Disease. 2022;32(1):39-48. doi:10.18865/ed.32.1.39
5. 5. Tannock IF, Hickman JA. Limits to Personalized Cancer Medicine. New England Journal of Medicine. 2016;375(13):1289-1294. doi:10.1056/NEJMsb1607705

LICENCE & RIGHTS

© 2026 The Life Science Feed. All rights reserved. This content is produced for medical education purposes. It may not be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted without prior written permission from The Life Science Feed.

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com