Low-risk thyroid cancer: Time to rethink radioactive iodine?

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 15 September 2026 · Edited by Mara Voss

Differentiated thyroid cancer (DTC) is the most common endocrine malignancy, with an increasing incidence globally. While generally associated with an excellent prognosis, particularly for low-risk disease, the optimal management strategy for these patients has long been debated, specifically regarding the role of adjuvant radioactive iodine (RAI) therapy. The question of which low-risk patients can safely omit RAI without compromising outcomes has been a persistent clinical dilemma, balancing the potential benefits of reducing recurrence against the known risks and burdens of treatment.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Current evidence supports selective use of radioactive iodine, allowing many low-risk DTC patients to avoid the therapy.
- The Data: Omitting RAI in carefully selected low-risk patients does not increase recurrence rates.
- The Action: Clinicians should rigorously apply risk stratification guidelines to identify patients who can safely skip adjuvant radioactive iodine.

Differentiated thyroid cancer, encompassing papillary and follicular thyroid carcinomas, typically carries a favourable prognosis. Standard management often involves total or near-total thyroidectomy, followed by adjuvant radioactive iodine therapy to ablate residual thyroid tissue and treat potential microscopic metastatic disease. This approach has been a cornerstone of treatment for decades, rooted in the belief that it improves survival and reduces recurrence, particularly in patients deemed to be at intermediate or high risk.

But the market of DTC management has evolved. Improved diagnostic techniques, including high-resolution ultrasonography and fine-needle aspiration biopsy, now detect smaller, earlier-stage cancers. This shift has led to a growing proportion of patients presenting with low-risk disease, prompting a re-evaluation of aggressive adjuvant therapies. The rationale for routine RAI in these low-risk cases has come under scrutiny, given the potential for adverse effects and the lack of clear survival benefits in this specific subgroup.

Re-evaluating the role of radioactive iodine

The primary goal of adjuvant RAI is to destroy any remaining thyroid tissue after surgery, facilitating more sensitive monitoring with serum thyroglobulin levels and potentially treating occult metastatic disease. For patients with high-risk features, such as large primary tumours, extensive extrathyroidal extension, distant metastases, or aggressive histological subtypes, the benefit of RAI in reducing recurrence and improving disease-specific survival is generally accepted. But for low-risk patients, the evidence supporting this benefit is less robust.

Low-risk DTC is typically defined by the absence of aggressive features. This includes patients with unifocal papillary microcarcinomas (≤1 cm) without extrathyroidal extension or lymph node metastases, or small intrathyroidal papillary carcinomas (1-4 cm) without aggressive histology, extrathyroidal extension, or nodal involvement. These patients have an excellent prognosis with surgery alone, with 10-year survival rates exceeding 95%.

The burden of treatment

Radioactive iodine therapy is not without its drawbacks. Patients undergo a period of thyroid hormone withdrawal or recombinant human TSH administration, followed by a low-iodine diet, all of which can be burdensome. The therapy itself requires isolation and carries risks of acute and long-term adverse effects. Acute side effects can include sialadenitis, xerostomia, nausea, and fatigue. Long-term concerns include an increased risk of secondary malignancies, particularly salivary gland tumours and leukaemia, although this risk is generally small. There is also a potential for gonadal dysfunction and subsequent infertility, particularly with higher cumulative doses, and an increased risk of nasolacrimal duct obstruction.

Given these considerations, the medical community has increasingly questioned the routine administration of RAI to patients who may not derive a significant clinical benefit. The aim is to de-escalate treatment for those who will do just as well with less, thereby reducing treatment-related morbidity and improving quality of life without compromising oncological outcomes. This aligns with a broader trend in oncology towards personalized, risk-adapted therapy.

Risk stratification and guideline evolution

Major professional societies, including the American Thyroid Association (ATA) and European Thyroid Association (ETA), have progressively refined their guidelines for DTC management. These guidelines emphasize careful risk stratification to identify patients who are truly at low risk of recurrence and mortality. Initial risk assessment is performed post-surgery, considering factors such as tumour size, extrathyroidal extension, lymph node involvement, distant metastases, and histological subtype.

Dynamic risk stratification, which re-evaluates risk based on response to initial therapy and subsequent follow-up, has also gained prominence. Patients who achieve an excellent response to surgery alone, characterized by undetectable thyroglobulin levels and no structural evidence of disease, are often reclassified to a very low-risk category, further supporting the omission of RAI. This iterative process allows for a more precise tailoring of treatment intensity over time.

The current consensus, reflected in recent guideline updates, supports a selective approach to RAI. For very low-risk patients, defined as those with unifocal papillary microcarcinoma without aggressive features, RAI is generally not recommended. For low-risk patients with slightly larger tumours or minimal extrathyroidal extension, the decision to administer RAI is often individualized, considering patient preferences, surgeon experience, and specific pathological features. The trend towards de-escalation is evident across various cancer types.

Outcomes without radioactive iodine

Clinical observations and retrospective studies have consistently shown that a significant proportion of low-risk DTC patients who forgo RAI achieve excellent long-term outcomes, comparable to those who receive it. These studies typically track recurrence rates, disease-specific survival, and overall survival. The data generally indicate that for carefully selected low-risk patients, the absence of RAI does not translate into a higher risk of structural recurrence

or distant metastases.

One of the key challenges in definitively proving non-inferiority for omitting RAI in low-risk patients is the inherently excellent prognosis of this group. Detecting statistically significant differences in rare events, such as disease-specific mortality, requires extremely large cohorts and long follow-up periods. But the cumulative evidence from multiple observational studies and meta-analyses supports the safety of a selective approach. This is similar to the discussions around watchful waiting in acute otitis media for certain paediatric populations.

The argument for omitting RAI is further strengthened by the understanding that a significant portion of the benefit attributed to RAI in historical studies may have been confounded by the inclusion of higher-risk patients and less precise initial risk stratification. As diagnostic and surgical techniques have improved, and our ability to accurately identify truly low-risk disease has advanced, the incremental benefit of RAI in this specific subgroup has diminished.

The role of surveillance

For patients who forgo RAI, rigorous surveillance remains critical. This typically involves regular clinical examinations, serum thyroglobulin measurements, and neck ultrasonography. The sensitivity of these surveillance tools, particularly high-resolution ultrasound, is often sufficient to detect early recurrence in the thyroid bed or regional lymph nodes, allowing for timely intervention if needed. The absence of RAI does not mean the absence of monitoring; it simply shifts the focus to non-invasive methods.

The decision to omit RAI should be a shared one, involving a thorough discussion between the clinician and the patient. This discussion must cover the patient's individual risk profile, the potential benefits and risks of RAI, and the implications for long-term surveillance. Patient preferences, comorbidities, and quality of life considerations are all important factors in this shared decision-making process. For a comprehensive overview of endocrine management, the Oxford Handbook of Endocrinology and Diabetes (4th ed) can be a valuable resource.

Where the evidence falls short

While the evidence for omitting RAI in very low-risk DTC is compelling, some caveats remain. The definition of 'low-risk' itself can vary slightly between guidelines and institutions, leading to heterogeneity in patient selection. The long-term follow-up data, while extensive, is predominantly from observational studies, which are inherently susceptible to confounding. Randomised controlled trials comparing RAI to no RAI in truly low-risk patients are challenging to conduct due to the large sample sizes and extended follow-up required to detect differences in rare events.

But the practical implications of these limitations are diminishing. The consistency of findings across numerous studies, coupled with the evolving understanding of DTC biology, provides a strong basis for current guideline recommendations. The focus has shifted from proving non-inferiority in every conceivable subgroup to identifying the vast majority of low-risk patients who clearly do not need this additional therapy.

The ongoing challenge lies in ensuring consistent application of these risk stratification guidelines in clinical practice. Over-treatment remains a concern, driven by historical practice patterns and a natural inclination to err on the side of caution. Education and clear clinical pathways are essential to ensure that eligible patients are identified and offered de-escalated therapy.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The shift towards selective use of radioactive iodine in low-risk differentiated thyroid cancer represents a mature evolution in oncology, moving away from a one-size-fits-all approach. Clinicians must internalize the updated risk stratification criteria, understanding that for many patients, less intervention is genuinely more beneficial.

This change has direct implications for patient counselling. GPs and specialists alike need to be prepared to discuss the rationale for omitting RAI, addressing patient anxieties that may stem from historical treatment paradigms. Emphasizing the excellent prognosis and the robust surveillance strategies in place will be key to building confidence in a de-escalated approach.

From an economic and healthcare system perspective, reducing unnecessary RAI treatments frees up resources and minimizes patient burden. The costs associated with RAI administration, isolation, and managing adverse effects are not insignificant. This selective approach offers a clear pathway to optimizing resource allocation without compromising patient outcomes.

The ongoing need for precise risk assessment means that pathology reporting and multidisciplinary team discussions remain paramount. The decision to forgo RAI is not a casual one; it is the result of careful, evidence-based evaluation, ensuring that only truly low-risk patients are spared the therapy's burdens.

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. Boucai L, Zafereo M, Cabanillas ME. Thyroid Cancer: A Review. JAMA. 2024;331(5):425-435. doi:10.1001/jama.2023.26348
2. 2. Forma A, KBodnicka K, Paj k W, et al. Thyroid Cancer: Epidemiology, Classification, Risk Factors, Diagnostic and Prognostic Markers, and Current Treatment Strategies. Int J Mol Sci. 2025;26(11). doi:10.3390/ijms26115173
3. 3. Reverter JL. Thyroid cancer. Med Clin (Barc). 2025;164(8):421-428. doi:10.1016/j.medcli.2024.12.005
4. 4. Cabanillas ME, McFadden DG, Durante C. Thyroid cancer. Lancet. 2016;388(10061):2783-2795. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(16)30172-6
5. 5. Tang L, Angell TE. Thyroid cancer. Semin Perinatol. 2025;49(2):152042. doi:10.1016/j.semperi.2025.152042
6. 6. Hegedüs L, Wirth LJ, Tuttle RM. Management of Differentiated Thyroid Cancer. N Engl J Med. 2026;394(23):2340-2355. doi:10.1056/NEJMra2416814

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

thelifesciencefeed.com

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