ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-12

RISK FACTORS AND PREVENTION OF ENDOMETRIAL CANCER

Marufjonova Nozimakhon
Azimova Gulcharos
Farmonova Malika
Masters of General Oncology
Tashkent State Medical University

Abstract. Endometrial cancer is the most common gynecological malignancy in many high-income settings, and its global burden is rising. A central reason is that the strongest population-level drivers of risk—excess adiposity and metabolic dysfunction—have become more prevalent in many regions, reshaping both incidence patterns and the age distribution of disease. Current evidence supports a conceptual model in which prolonged exposure of the endometrium to mitogenic signals, especially "unopposed" estrogen and related endocrine-metabolic pathways, increases the likelihood of precursor lesions and malignant transformation. This model explains the contribution of obesity, insulin resistance, type 2 diabetes, anovulation and polycystic ovary syndrome, exogenous estrogen without adequate progestin protection, and certain medications such as tamoxifen. In parallel, a smaller but clinically crucial proportion of cases arises from inherited cancer predisposition syndromes, most prominently Lynch syndrome, which demands tailored preventive strategies that differ from those used in the general population.

Keywords: endometrial cancer; obesity; metabolic syndrome; diabetes; unopposed estrogen; polycystic ovary syndrome; Lynch syndrome.

INTRODUCTION

Endometrial cancer is often described as a "disease of opportunity" for prevention, not because it is trivial, but because a large share of risk is concentrated in factors that can be modified at individual and population levels. Over the last decades, epidemiologic trends have shown increasing incidence in many countries, with rising rates in premenopausal and perimenopausal women in parallel with increasing obesity and metabolic disease. Contemporary reviews emphasize that, although demographic change and shifts in hysterectomy patterns contribute, the growing prevalence of obesity is a major underlying cause of the incidence rise. In practice, this means that prevention can no longer be treated as a footnote to treatment guidelines; it has to be a central strategy spanning primary care, women's health, and public health.

The biological plausibility of prevention is strengthened by the natural history of many endometrial cancers, particularly endometrioid tumors, which frequently evolve through identifiable precursor lesions and present early with abnormal uterine bleeding. Early symptom-driven detection helps explain why many cases are diagnosed at an early stage and can be cured surgically. Yet this favorable feature should not create complacency. Advanced disease still carries worse outcomes, and prevention matters most for the many women who never should have to enter a cancer pathway at all. In addition, prevention is not uniform: what reduces risk in the general population may not be sufficient for women with hereditary predisposition, where risk-reducing surgery may be the most reliable option.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-12

A clinically useful way to organize endometrial cancer risk is to distinguish between pathways dominated by hormonal–metabolic stimulation of the endometrium and pathways driven more by genetic instability and aggressive histologies. The classic dichotomy of "type I" versus "type II" is imperfect, but it remains helpful in prevention discussions: type I, largely endometrioid cancers, are more strongly associated with unopposed estrogen exposure and metabolic risk, whereas many non-endometrioid cancers show weaker associations with obesity and may arise in different biological contexts. Modern classifications increasingly use molecular features to guide prognosis and therapy, and major guidelines integrate molecular information into management; however, from a prevention standpoint, the large, modifiable burden still tracks strongly with obesity, insulin resistance, and reproductive endocrine exposures.

The unopposed estrogen hypothesis remains central: estrogen stimulates endometrial proliferation, while progesterone counterbalances this by promoting differentiation and limiting growth. When progesterone is absent or inadequate—because of chronic anovulation, exogenous estrogen therapy without progestin in a woman with an intact uterus, or prolonged endogenous estrogen exposure—the endometrium experiences sustained mitogenic stimulation, increasing the probability of hyperplasia and malignant transformation. This conceptual model is embedded in clinical guidance and remains supported by contemporary reviews.

Obesity amplifies risk through several converging mechanisms. Adipose tissue increases peripheral aromatization of androgens to estrogens, raising bioavailable estrogen levels, especially after menopause. Obesity also drives hyperinsulinemia and insulin-like growth factor signaling, both of which have proliferative and anti-apoptotic effects in endometrial tissue. Chronic low-grade inflammation, adipokine imbalance, and altered immune microenvironments may further support tumor-promoting conditions. These pathways help explain why obesity is consistently identified as a major underlying cause of rising incidence and why metabolic health is an essential prevention target.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Excess adiposity and weight trajectory. Among modifiable risks, obesity is the most prominent. It is not simply correlated with risk; it is implicated as a major population driver of rising incidence. Clinically, obesity also complicates diagnosis and treatment and may influence outcomes through comorbidity burden. The prevention implication is clear: effective weight management—whether through lifestyle intervention, pharmacotherapy, or metabolic surgery—should be regarded as cancer prevention as well as cardiometabolic care. While the magnitude of cancer-risk reduction varies across interventions and study designs, the directionality of association supports intentional risk reduction by addressing adiposity.

Type 2 diabetes and insulin resistance. Diabetes is consistently associated with higher endometrial cancer risk, partly mediated by obesity but also linked to insulin resistance pathways. Prevention therefore includes early identification of prediabetes, sustained glycemic management, and addressing upstream drivers such as inactivity and diet. Because diabetes also increases perioperative risk, preventing endometrial cancer through metabolic health improvement delivers dual benefits: reducing cancer risk and reducing morbidity if cancer does occur.

Reproductive endocrine factors and anovulation. Polycystic ovary syndrome and chronic anovulation increase risk through prolonged progesterone deficiency and unopposed estrogen effects. Prevention in these settings is often less about dramatic interventions and more about restoring regular endometrial shedding or providing progestin protection. This can include cyclic progestins, combined

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-12

hormonal contraception, or a levonorgestrel-releasing intrauterine system depending on patient context and contraindications. From a prevention standpoint, the key is not to leave prolonged irregular bleeding or chronic anovulation unmanaged, because these are not just quality-of-life issues—they can represent sustained biological risk.

Exogenous estrogen exposure. Menopausal hormone therapy illustrates the unopposed estrogen principle in its most practical form. For women with an intact uterus, systemic estrogen without adequate progestin protection increases endometrial cancer risk, so standard prescribing practice requires endometrial protection with progestin unless a hysterectomy has been performed. This is basic prevention-by-design: the therapy is modified to avoid creating a carcinogenic hormonal environment.

Tamoxifen. Tamoxifen, used for breast cancer treatment and prevention, has partial estrogen agonist activity in the uterus and is associated with increased risk of endometrial pathology. The prevention approach is primarily clinical vigilance and symptom-based evaluation rather than routine invasive screening in asymptomatic women, with counseling about abnormal bleeding and prompt assessment if it occurs [1].

Lifestyle factors beyond weight: physical activity, diet, alcohol, and smoking. Physical activity appears protective in observational research, in part through weight control and metabolic effects. Diet quality influences adiposity and metabolic parameters and may affect inflammation and hormone metabolism. Alcohol is not a major established driver compared with obesity, but it can contribute indirectly through weight gain and endocrine effects. Smoking shows complex associations in some studies, including inverse associations for endometrioid cancer, but it is not a prevention strategy—smoking carries overwhelming health harms and increases many other cancer risks. In other words, any “protective” signal of smoking is the kind of bargain you make only if your goal is to exchange one disease for five worse ones.

Age and menopausal status. Risk increases with age, reflecting cumulative exposure and biological aging processes. This is non-modifiable, but it shapes prevention priorities: symptom awareness and rapid evaluation of postmenopausal bleeding are critical because bleeding after menopause is a key presenting symptom for many cases.

Family history and inherited predisposition syndromes. Lynch syndrome is the most important inherited contributor to endometrial cancer risk, and prevention for these women differs fundamentally from population-level strategies. A systematic review concluded that evidence supporting screening to reduce mortality in Lynch syndrome is limited and that risk-reducing surgery remains the most reliable method to reduce endometrial and ovarian cancer risk. This conclusion does not mean that counseling and selective surveillance are useless; rather, it emphasizes that screening has not been proven to deliver the same certainty of benefit as definitive surgery in this high-risk group.

Other inherited syndromes such as PTEN hamartoma tumor syndrome also elevate risk. These conditions underscore the need for risk stratification and genetic evaluation pathways for women with strong family histories, early onset disease, or multiple related cancers in the family.

Precursor lesions as prevention targets: endometrial hyperplasia and EIN

Prevention often becomes actionable when a disease has identifiable precursors. Endometrial hyperplasia with atypia and endometrial intraepithelial neoplasia represent clinically significant precursor states, with a meaningful risk of progression to cancer or concurrent cancer already present.

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-12

This is where prevention and early treatment overlap: timely diagnosis and progestin-based therapy, or definitive surgery in appropriate cases, can prevent invasive cancer. Guidelines and practice bulletins emphasize appropriate evaluation and management of these precursor lesions, including risk stratification and individualized care pathways.

Endometrial cancer prevention can be described across three complementary levels: primary prevention to reduce incidence, targeted prevention for high-risk subgroups, and secondary prevention to detect disease early through symptom-driven evaluation [2].

Primary prevention in the general population: metabolic health as cancer prevention

Because obesity is a major population driver of endometrial cancer trends, primary prevention begins with preventing and treating excess adiposity. In practice, this requires realistic approaches rather than moral lectures about "willpower." Sustainable prevention includes structured lifestyle programs that combine dietary change, physical activity, behavioral support, and long-term follow-up. Even when weight loss is modest, improvements in insulin sensitivity, blood pressure, and inflammatory markers can shift the endocrine-metabolic environment that promotes endometrial proliferation. Importantly, prevention should not be framed as an aesthetic project; it is endocrine risk engineering.

Pharmacologic management of obesity and diabetes is increasingly relevant. While the long-term cancer-prevention outcomes of newer anti-obesity medications are still being established, their capacity to produce clinically significant weight loss suggests potential downstream benefit for endometrial cancer risk reduction through hormonal and metabolic pathways. The prevention principle remains consistent: reduce the duration and intensity of metabolic stressors that drive endometrial proliferation [3].

Metabolic surgery, for eligible patients, is another prevention-relevant pathway because it can produce sustained, large weight loss and major improvements in insulin resistance. Although surgery is not appropriate for all individuals and requires careful risk–benefit assessment, it illustrates a broader point: the prevention toolbox should match the scale of the risk. Where obesity is severe and persistent, small lifestyle adjustments may be insufficient; a stepped-care model that includes medications and surgery is more coherent than repeating the same advice while expecting different outcomes.

Hormonal exposures are central to endometrial cancer risk, and this creates prevention opportunities. Combined oral contraceptives reduce the risk of endometrial cancer, with a large individual-participant meta-analysis demonstrating a protective association that strengthens with longer duration of use. This protective effect is biologically plausible because combined contraceptives provide progestin-mediated endometrial suppression and regular shedding. In prevention counseling, this evidence can be relevant for women who need contraception and have risk factors such as obesity or anovulation, while still requiring individualized assessment of contraindications and other health risks [4].

Progestin-containing intrauterine systems offer another pathway for endometrial protection by creating local progestin exposure and endometrial suppression. They are used clinically for heavy menstrual bleeding, endometrial protection in certain settings, and management of some precursor lesions. While the strength of evidence varies by population and outcome, the mechanistic rationale is strong, and progestin-based strategies are integrated into clinical management frameworks.

For women with chronic anovulation or irregular cycles, providing endometrial protection is a direct prevention tactic. It reduces prolonged unopposed estrogen exposure and may lower the likelihood

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-12

of hyperplasia and subsequent malignancy. This is prevention that can be implemented in routine gynecology, primary care, and adolescent health settings, especially where PCOS and obesity are common [5].

Menopausal hormone therapy is a special case of prevention through correct prescribing. Estrogen therapy without progestin in women with an intact uterus increases risk, so prevention means ensuring appropriate progestin opposition. This is a reminder that prevention is sometimes about "not creating risk" through iatrogenic hormonal environments.

For women with Lynch syndrome, prevention priorities shift. A systematic review concluded that evidence for screening to reduce mortality is limited and that risk-reducing surgery remains the most reliable method for reducing endometrial and ovarian cancer risk in this population. This does not eliminate the role of education and symptom vigilance; rather, it sets expectations about the limitations of screening and the certainty of surgical risk reduction.

Clinical guidelines for uterine neoplasms and management of endometrial carcinoma emphasize risk stratification and the importance of genetic considerations [6]. For prevention, this means that healthcare systems need pathways for identifying women who warrant genetic evaluation—those with suggestive family histories, early onset cancers, or tumor features consistent with mismatch repair deficiency—and then ensuring counseling about preventive options. Risk-reducing hysterectomy with salpingo-oophorectomy is a major decision with fertility and hormonal implications; it requires patient-centered timing, shared decision-making, and consideration of reproductive plans. But from a purely risk-reduction standpoint, it is the most definitive option.

CONCLUSION

Endometrial cancer prevention rests on a strong and coherent evidence base: the disease burden is rising in many regions, and obesity and metabolic dysfunction are major underlying drivers, making metabolic health a central prevention target. Risk is shaped by the interaction of unopposed estrogen exposure, insulin resistance pathways, inflammation, and genetic susceptibility. Consequently, prevention must be multidimensional. In the general population, the most impactful strategies focus on weight management, physical activity, and metabolic risk control, complemented by risk-modifying hormonal exposures such as combined oral contraceptives when clinically appropriate. In inherited high-risk groups, especially Lynch syndrome, the prevention calculus changes: evidence for screening mortality benefit is limited, and risk-reducing surgery provides the most reliable risk reduction. Across all risk groups, secondary prevention depends on rapid evaluation of abnormal uterine bleeding, particularly postmenopausal bleeding, rather than population screening.

REFERENCES

1. Crosbie E.J., Kitson S.J., McAlpine J.N., Mukhopadhyay A., Powell M.E., Singh N. Endometrial cancer // The Lancet. — 2022. — Vol. 399, № 10333. — P. 1412–1428. — DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(22)00323-3. PubMed

2. Concin N., Matias-Guiu X., Vergote I., et al. ESGO/ESTRO/ESP guidelines for the management of patients with endometrial carcinoma // International Journal of Gynecological Cancer. — 2021. — Vol. 31, № 1. — P. 12–39. — DOI: 10.1136/ijgc-2020-002230. PubMed

3. Collaborative Group on Epidemiological Studies on Endometrial Cancer. Endometrial cancer and oral contraceptives: an individual participant meta-analysis of 27 276 women with endometrial cancer from 36 epidemiological studies // The Lancet Oncology. — 2015. — Vol. 16, № 9. — P. 1061–1070. — DOI: 10.1016/S1470-2045(15)00212-0. PubMed

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-12

4. Practice Bulletin No. 149: Endometrial cancer // Obstetrics & Gynecology. — 2015. — Vol. 125, № 4. — P. 1006–1026. — DOI: 10.1097/01.AOG.0000462977.61229.de. PubMed

5. WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board. Female Genital Tumours. 5th ed. — Lyon: International Agency for Research on Cancer, 2020.

6. Lim N., Hickey M., Young G.P., Macrae F.A., Kelly C. Screening and risk reducing surgery for endometrial or ovarian cancers in Lynch syndrome: a systematic review // International Journal of Gynecological Cancer. — 2022. — Vol. 32. — P. 646–655. — DOI: 10.1136/ijgc-2021-003132.

7.