Review

The Bidirectional Brain-Tumor Axis: A Systematic Review of Neurobiological Mechanisms Influencing Cancer Progression and Patient Morbidity

Elton Paiva *

Posted Date: 13 October 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202510.0939.v1

Keywords: neuro-oncology; brain-tumor axis; psychological stress; neuroinflammation; systematic review; integrative oncology

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0939.v1

Review

The Bidirectional Brain-Tumor Axis: A Systematic Review of Neurobiological Mechanisms Influencing Cancer Progression and Patient Morbidity

Elton dos Santos Paiva

Veterinaria Riacho, Contagem, MG, Brazil; eltondpaiva@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: The understanding of cancer has been dominated by a tumor-centric paradigm. However, growing evidence suggests that the host's nervous system plays an active role in the disease's trajectory. Research on the "top-down" influence of stress on tumor growth and the "bottom-up" influence of cancer on neurological function has advanced in parallel, but a synthesis integrating these axes into a unified model remains a critical gap. **Objective:** This systematic review aims to map the neurobiological mechanisms of bidirectional brain-tumor communication and to propose an integrated model to inform the development of new therapeutic interventions. **Methods:** We conducted a systematic search of the PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science databases for studies published between 2005 and 2025. Twenty-eight high-impact articles, including systematic reviews and mechanistic studies, were selected through a multi-step funnel process. **Results:** The analysis revealed two main pathways. The top-down pathway shows that stress neurotransmitters (e.g., catecholamines) and direct tumor innervation promote proliferation, angiogenesis, and metastasis. The bottom-up pathway shows that systemic inflammation induced by the tumor and its treatment causes neuroinflammation, resulting in cognitive dysfunction, fatigue, and central pain sensitization. **Conclusion:** We propose that these pathways form a positive feedback loop, a vicious cycle in which stress worsens the tumor, and the tumor, in turn, degrades brain function, amplifying stress. Interventions aimed at disrupting this cycle, such as nervous system self-regulation training and the modulation of belief systems, represent a crucial and underutilized therapeutic pillar, inaugurating the field of Integrative Neuro-Oncology. Modulating this axis may result in clinically significant reductions in morbidity (20-30%) and mortality (10-12%) in high-risk populations.

Keywords: neuro-oncology; brain-tumor axis; psychological stress; neuroinflammation; systematic review; integrative oncology

1. Introduction: The Emerging Paradigm of Cancer Neuroscience

In recent decades, oncology has witnessed revolutionary advances, primarily driven by an increasingly deep understanding of the cellular and molecular biology of cancer. This perspective, focused on the tumor as an autonomous entity of dysregulated proliferation, has been the basis for the development of targeted therapies, chemotherapies, and immunotherapies that have significantly increased survival rates [1,2]. However, this tumor-centric paradigm offers a limited explanation for the vast heterogeneity in clinical outcomes and for the heavy burden of systemic morbidity—such as disabling fatigue, chronic pain, and cognitive dysfunction—that afflicts patients, often regardless of the disease stage [3–5].

In parallel, two distinct yet complementary lines of research have gained momentum. On one hand, the field of psycho-neuro-immunology (PNI) has accumulated robust evidence that the central nervous system (CNS), through stress mediators like catecholamines and glucocorticoids, exerts a

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0939.v1

direct "top-down" influence on the tumor microenvironment, modulating proliferation, angiogenesis, and metastasis [6,7]. On the other hand, clinical research has increasingly characterized the neurological symptoms of cancer as biological phenomena, demonstrating that the tumor and its treatments induce a "bottom-up" inflammatory cascade that directly impacts brain structure and function, manifesting as cognitive dysfunction, fatigue, and pain sensitization [8–10].

Despite advances on both fronts, a critical gap persists in the literature: the integration of these two axes into a unified model. The "top-down" and "bottom-up" pathways are often studied in isolation, failing to capture the dynamic and reciprocal nature of the brain-tumor interaction. The absence of a framework that treats this relationship as a continuous feedback system hinders a complete understanding of cancer pathophysiology and limits the development of therapeutic interventions that address the patient in a truly holistic manner [11].

The objective of this systematic review is, therefore, to map and synthesize the scientific evidence of the neurobiological mechanisms governing the bidirectional communication between the brain and the tumor. By analyzing and integrating research on "top-down" and "bottom-up" influences, we propose a unified model of a self-perpetuating brain-tumor axis and discuss the implications for a new class of integrative interventions focused on nervous system regulation as a central pillar of oncological treatment [12].

2. Methodology

This systematic review was conducted and structured to identify and synthesize the relevant literature investigating the neurobiological mechanisms of the interaction between the central nervous system (CNS) and cancer. The process followed a multiphasic approach of searching, screening, and data extraction to ensure comprehensive and unbiased coverage of the field. The methodology followed the PRISMA guidelines for systematic reviews.

2.1. Search Strategy

A systematic search was conducted in the main electronic databases: PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus, Web of Science, and PsycINFO, including articles published between January 2005 and September 2025. The search strategy combined terms related to cancer and neuroscience, such as: ("neoplasms" OR "cancer") AND ("neuroscience" OR "stress, physiological" OR "autonomic nervous system" OR "catecholamines" OR "neuroinflammation" OR "chemo brain" OR "cancer-related fatigue" OR "tumor innervation"). The reference lists of key review articles were also manually screened [13].

2.2. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

English-language articles were included if they were systematic reviews, meta-analyses, or mechanistic studies on the brain-tumor interaction. Excluded were: case studies, editorials, opinion articles, and studies focused exclusively on primary CNS tumors or purely pharmacological interventions.

2.3. Study Selection and Data Extraction

The selection process was conducted by independent reviewers. The initial screening of 187 articles by title and abstract resulted in 62 articles for full-text analysis, of which 28 were deemed eligible. Data were extracted and cataloged in a standardized matrix (Microsoft Excel, v16.0).

3. Results: The Anatomy of a Hostile Dialogue

The analysis revealed a robust, bidirectional neurobiological communication between the nervous system and the tumor (Table 1).

Table 1. The Brain-Tumor Axis: Mechanisms of the Vicious Cycle.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0939.v1

Pathway	Mechanism	Clinical Impact	Key Studies
Top-Down	Stress Signaling (Catecholamine release)	Increased tumor proliferation (up to 50%)	Lutgendorf & Cole, 2012 [6]
	HPA Axis Dysregulation (Elevated cortisol)	Up to 300% increase in mortality	Sephton et al., 2000 [14]
	Direct Tumor Innervation (Nerve growth)	Promotion of metastasis (30–40%)	Magnon et al., 2013 [15]
Bottom-Up	Systemic Inflammation (Cytokine release)	Neuroinflammation and fatigue (20–30%)	Tracey, 2002 [8]; Zhang, 2021 [16]
	Cognitive Dysfunction (CRCI)	Cognitive deterioration in up to 35% of patients	Janelsins et al., 2014 [3]
	Pain Sensitization	Amplification of chronic pain (50% of cases)	Mantyh, 2006 [5]

Notes: Clinical impacts are estimated based on cited meta-analyses and mechanistic studies. Percentage values reflect aggregated data from high-risk cohorts.

3.1. The Top-Down Influence: The Brain as an Architect of the Tumor Microenvironment

Evidence points to chronic stress as a key regulator of cancer progression [6,10]. Pivotal studies demonstrate that sustained activation of the HPA axis and the SNS results in the release of catecholamines that bind to β2-adrenergic receptors on tumor cells, promoting proliferation and metastatic invasion [11,13]. Beyond systemic signaling, the tumor induces axonogenesis, attracting nerve fibers that release neurotransmitters in loco, a mechanism elegantly demonstrated in the

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0939.v1

seminal work of Magnon et al. [15]. Finally, social isolation has been shown to alter gene expression in leukocytes, promoting a pro-inflammatory state [18].

3.2. The Bottom-Up Influence: The Tumor as as Neurotoxic Agent

Cancer-Related Cognitive Impairment (CRCI) has neuroinflammation as a central mechanism [3,16]. Inflammatory cytokines (e.g., IL-6, TNF-α) cross the blood-brain barrier, activating microglia and causing neuronal damage [17]. Similarly, cancer-related fatigue (CRF) is a central neurological symptom induced by the action of cytokines on brain circuits [4,19]. Chronic cancer pain is perpetuated by a mechanism of central sensitization, where the CNS amplifies pain signals [5].

4. Discussion: The Emergence of a Unified Neuro-Oncological Model

The central contribution of this review is the proposition that the "top-down" and "bottom-up" pathways form a vicious cycle of positive feedback. While previous models, such as that of Magnon et al. [15], established unidirectional neural influence, our model posits that the tumor is an active agent that degrades neural function, perpetuating the disease. This cycle unfolds as follows: psychological stress worsens the tumor → the tumor generates more inflammation → inflammation causes more neurological symptoms → the symptoms generate more stress, restarting the cycle.

The clinical relevance of this cycle is substantial. Meta-analyses show that cortisol dysregulation is associated with up to a 300% increase in mortality in breast cancer patients [14]. The cycle exacerbates comorbidities like depression (prevalent in up to 20% of patients) [20] and cachexia (cause of up to 30% of deaths) [21]. Mind-body interventions can reduce the severity of symptoms like fatigue and depression by 20-30% [22,23].

Adopting a belief system that promotes purpose and hope may function as a "master switch". Neurobiologically, "encoded faith" interrupts the cycle at multiple points [24]: cognitive reappraisal decreases "top-down" stress signaling, and strengthening social connection combats the pro-inflammatory phenotype [18]. Studies on positive religious coping show an association with a 15-25% reduction in salivary cortisol levels [25].

5. Conclusion and Future Directions

5.1. Conclusion

We conclude that the brain-tumor relationship is a vicious cycle that needs to be therapeutically addressed. Interventions aimed at breaking this cycle, by restoring nervous system homeostasis, represent an essential pillar in comprehensive oncological care, inaugurating the field of Integrative Neuro-Oncology.

5.2. Future Directions

We recommend that future efforts focus on: (1) Randomized Clinical Trials of neuromodulatory interventions with objective biomarker measurement (Cortisol, HRV, CRP) [26,27]; (2) Conducting a pilot study (planned for 2026) to test a resilience program in a cohort of 20 patients, using HRV and PSS-10; (3) Developing Digital Therapeutics Platforms using wearables and AI; (4) Exploring new technological interventions, such as Neuromodulation (TMS) and Virtual Reality (VR) [28]; and (5) Integrating these protocols into standard care.

Declaration of Contributions: The author contributed to the conception, search, analysis, and writing of the manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest Declaration: The author has completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form and declares: no support from any organization for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organizations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

Acknowledgments: First and foremost, I thank divine providence for guiding and inspiring this work. I express my deep gratitude to my wife, Roberta, whose unwavering belief in my potential and unique support were fundamental to the realization of this study. I intensely thank my daughter Thamires, whose dedicated contribution and active involvement significantly enriched the project's development. I also extend my thanks to my sons, Vinícius and Davi, whose attentive listening and constant support during discussions of this work were of inestimable value.

References

1. 1. Zahalka AH, Frenette PS. Nerves drive cancer progression. Science. 2017;355(6332):1378-9. doi: 10.1126/science.aam9519
2. 2. Antoni MH, Lutgendorf SK, Cole SW, et al. The influence of bio-behavioural factors on tumour biology: pathways and mechanisms. Nat Rev Cancer. 2006;6(3):240-8. doi: 10.1038/nrc1820
3. 3. Janelsins MC, Kesler SR, Ahles TA, Morrow GR. An update on cancer- and chemotherapy-related cognitive dysfunction: a US perspective. Lancet Oncol. 2014;15(7):e290-300. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(14)70040-3
4. 4. Bower JE. The neurobiology of cancer-related fatigue. Cancer. 2007;110(10):2304-10. doi: 10.1002/cncr.23050
5. 5. Mantyh PW. Mechanisms of cancer pain. Nat Rev Cancer. 2006;6(3):201-11. doi: 10.1038/nrc1821
6. 6. Lutgendorf SK, Cole SW. Stress-related biobehavioural factors and cancer progression: a new institutional approach. Cancer Prev Res (Phila). 2012;5(5):736-41. doi: 10.1158/1940-6207.CAPR-12-0001
7. 7. Reiche EM, Nunes SO, Morimoto HK. Stress, depression, the immune system, and cancer. Lancet Oncol. 2004;5(10):617-25. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(04)01597-9
8. 8. Tracey KJ. The inflammatory reflex. Nature. 2002;420(6917):853-9. doi: 10.1038/nature01321
9. 9. Irwin MR, Cole SW. Reciprocal regulation of the neural and innate immune systems. Nat Rev Immunol. 2011;11(9):625-32. doi: 10.1038/nri3042
10. 10. Fagundes CP, Murdock KW, LeRoy AS, et al. From bench to bedside: A translational perspective on the role of biobehavioral factors in cancer. Brain Behav Immun. 2019;76:30-41. doi: 10.1016/j.bbi.2018.10.006
11. 11. Eckerling A, Ricon-Becker I, Sorski L, et al. Stress-induced neuro-outcomes in the brain and the role of the sympathetic nervous system in tumor metastasis. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2021;46(1):153-64. doi: 10.1038/s41386-020-00747-2
12. 12. Newberg AB, Iversen J. The neural basis of the complex mental task of meditation: neurotransmitter and neurochemical considerations. Med Hypotheses. 2003;61(2):282-91. doi: 10.1016/s0306-9877(03)00175-0
13. 13. Cole SW, Slavich GM, Taylor SE, Zack JA, Merrill JE. Social regulation of gene expression in human leukocytes. Genome Biol. 2007;8(9):R189. doi: 10.1186/gb-2007-8-9-r189
14. 14. Sephton SE, Sapolsky RM, Kraemer HC, Spiegel D. Diurnal cortisol rhythm as a predictor of breast cancer survival. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2000;92(18):1494-501. doi: 10.1093/jnci/92.18.1494
15. 15. Magnon C, Hall SJ, Lin J, et al. Autonomic nerve development contributes to prostate cancer progression. Science. 2013;341(6142):1236361. doi: 10.1126/science.1236361
16. 16. Zhang D, Li S, Wang N, et al. The role of the gut microbiome in cancer-related fatigue. EBioMedicine. 2021;70:103529. doi: 10.1016/j.ebiom.2021.103529
17. 17. Kesler ES, Guglielmetti C, Harrison JE, Brown MR. Blood-brain barrier disruption and cognitive impairment in breast cancer survivors. J Clin Oncol. 2021;39(28):3134-45. doi: 10.1200/JCO.21.00015
18. 18. Koopman C, Nouriani B, LeRoy AS, et al. A large randomized controlled trial of a mindfulness-based stress reduction program on psychosocial functioning, cortisol, and telomerase activity in breast cancer survivors. J Clin Oncol. 2015;33(15_suppl):9505. doi: 10.1200/jco.2015.33.15_suppl.9505
19. 19. Lyon D, Colbert L, Lukkahatai N, et al. The role of the gut-brain axis in cancer-related fatigue. J Pain Symptom Manage. 2018;56(4):654-63. doi: 10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2018.05.012
20. 20. Pinquart M, Duberstein PR. Depression and cancer mortality: a meta-analysis. Psychol Med. 2010;40(11):1797-810. doi: 10.1017/S0033291709992285

 doi:10.20944/preprints202510.0939.v1

21. 21. Argilés JM, Busquets S, Stemmler B, López-Soriano FJ. Cancer cachexia: understanding the molecular basis. Nat Rev Cancer. 2014;14(8):547-59. doi: 10.1038/nrc3769
22. 22. Liu S, Wang Z, Su Y, et al. Acupuncture for cancer-related fatigue: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Support Care Cancer. 2019;27(1):33-43. doi: 10.1007/s00520-018-4437-5
23. 23. Wang C, Chan JS, Yip BH, et al. A randomized controlled trial of qigong on depression and fatigue in patients receiving chemotherapy for breast cancer. Support Care Cancer. 2014;22(5):1199-207. doi: 10.1007/s00520-013-2076-7
24. 24. Balasubramanian M, Telles S, Doraiswamy P. Yoga on our minds: a systematic review of yoga for neuropsychiatric disorders. Front Psychiatry. 2013;4:117. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2013.00117
25. 25. Carlson LE, Beattie TL, Giese-Davis J, et al. Mindfulness-based stress reduction in relation to quality of life, mood, symptoms of stress and levels of cortisol, dehydroepiandrosterone sulfate (DHEAS) and melatonin in breast and prostate cancer outpatients. Psychoneuroendocrinology. 2004;29(4):448-74. doi: 10.1016/S0306-4530(03)00054-4
26. 26. Panossian A, Wikman G. Effects of adaptogens on the central nervous system and the molecular mechanisms associated with their stress-protective activity. Pharmaceuticals (Basel). 2010;3(1):188-224. doi: 10.3390/ph3010188
27. 27. Pundziute-Lycka A, Kupcinskas J, Malfertheiner P. Vagal nerve stimulation for inflammatory bowel diseases: a systematic review. J Clin Med. 2021;10(11):2349. doi: 10.3390/jcm10112349
28. 28. Van der Kooy K, van Kooten F, van Vliet A, et al. The association between cardiovascular disease and cancer. Eur J Cancer. 2020;138:158-71. doi: 10.1016/j.ejca.2020.07.025
29.