



ALMA MATER STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA

ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE
DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Lymphovascular space invasion in endometrial carcinoma: A prognostic factor independent from molecular signature

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Raffone A., Travaglino A., Raimondo D., Neola D., Maletta M., Santoro A., et al. (2022). Lymphovascular space invasion in endometrial carcinoma: A prognostic factor independent from molecular signature. *GYNECOLOGIC ONCOLOGY*, 165(1), 192-197 [10.1016/j.ygyno.2022.01.013].

Availability:

This version is available at: <https://hdl.handle.net/11585/906532> since: 2023-02-28

Published:

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ygyno.2022.01.013>

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<https://cris.unibo.it/>).
When citing, please refer to the published version.

(Article begins on next page)

1 **Lymphovascular space invasion in endometrial carcinoma: a prognostic factor independent**
2 **from molecular signature**

3 Antonio RAFFONE, MD^{1,2}; Antonio TRAVAGLINO, MD^{3,4}; Diego RAIMONDO, MD, PhD²; Daniele
4 NEOLA, MD¹; Manuela MALETTA, MD²; Angela SANTORO, MD, PhD⁴; Luigi INSABATO, MD,
5 PhD³; Paolo CASADIO, MD²; Francesco FANFANI, MD, PhD^{5,6}; Gian Franco ZANNONI, MD, PhD⁴;
6 Fulvio ZULLO, MD, PhD¹; Renato SERACCHIOLI, MD, PhD^{2*} and Antonio MOLLO, MD, PhD^{7*}

7 ¹Gynecology and Obstetrics Unit, Department of Neuroscience, Reproductive Sciences and
8 Dentistry, School of Medicine, University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy

9 ²Division of Gynaecology and Human Reproduction Physiopathology, Department of Medical and
10 Surgical Sciences (DIMEC). IRCCS Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria di Bologna. S. Orsola
11 Hospital. University of Bologna, Via Massarenti 13, Bologna 40138, Italy

12 ³ Anatomic Pathology Unit, Department of Advanced Biomedical Sciences, School of Medicine,
13 University of Naples Federico II, Naples, Italy

14 ⁴ Gynecopathology and Breast Pathology Unit, Department of Woman's Health Science, Agostino
15 Gemelli University Polyclinic, Rome, Italy

16 ⁵ Department of Woman and Child Health and Public Health, Division of Gynecologic Oncology,
17 Fondazione Policlinico Universitario A. Gemelli, Istituto di Ricovero e Cura a Carattere Scientifico
18 (IRCCS), Rome, Italy

19 ⁶ Department of Women and Child Health and Public Health, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore,
20 Rome, Italy.

21 ⁷ Gynecology and Obstetrics Unit, Department of Medicine, Surgery and Dentistry "Schola Medica
22 Salernitana", University of Salerno, 84081 Baronissi, Italy

23 *: The authors equally contributed to the study and shared the last authorship.

24

25 **CORRESPONDING AUTHORS:** Antonio TRAVAGLINO, Anatomic Pathology Unit, Department of
26 Advanced Biomedical Sciences, School of Medicine, University of Naples Federico II, Via Sergio
27 Pansini, 5, Naples, 80131, Italy, Email: antonio.travaglino@unina.it;
28 antonio.travaglino.ap@gmail.com

29 Paolo CASADIO, Division of Gynaecology and Human Reproduction Physiopathology, Department
30 of Medical and Surgical Sciences (DIMEC). IRCCS Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria di Bologna.
31 S. Orsola Hospital. University of Bologna, Via Massarenti 13, Bologna 40138, Italy, Email:
32 p.paolocasadio@gmail.com

33 **ABSTRACT**

34 **Background:** The 2020 ESGO/ESTRO/ESP guidelines stratify the prognosis of endometrial
35 carcinoma (EC) patients combining The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) molecular signature and
36 pathological factors, including lymphovascular space invasion (LVSI). However, little is known about
37 the prognostic independence of LVSI from molecular signature.

38 **Aim:** To assess whether the prognostic value of LVSI is independent from the TCGA signature.

39 **Material and methods:** A systematic review and meta-analysis was performed by searching 5
40 electronic databases from their inception to March 2021. All peer-reviewed studies reporting
41 assessing LVSI as a prognostic factor independent from the TCGA groups in EC were included.
42 Multivariate HRs with 95% confidence interval (CI) were pooled separately for overall survival (OS),
43 disease-specific survival (DSS) and disease-free survival (DFS). The absence of LVSI was
44 considered as a reference. In DFS analyses, locoregional and distant recurrence were separately
45 considered for one study.

46 **Results:** Six studies with 3,331 patients were included in the systematic review and three studies
47 with 2,276 patients in the meta-analysis. LVSI showed a pooled multivariate HR of 1.818 (CI 95%,
48 1.378-2.399) for OS, 1.849 (CI 95%, 1.194-2.863) for DSS, 1.377 (CI 95%, 1.008-1.880) for DFS
49 excluding one study, 1.651 (CI 95%, 1.044-2.611) for DFS additionally considering locoregional
50 recurrence from one study, and 1.684 (CI 95%, 1.05-2.701) for DFS additionally considering distant
51 recurrence from the same study.

52 **Conclusion:** LVSI has a prognostic value independent of TCGA signature, as well as age and
53 adjuvant treatment, increasing the risk of death of any cause, death due to EC and recurrent or
54 progressive disease by 1.5-2 times.

55

56 **KEYWORDS:** cancer; tumor; endometrium; prognosis; treatment; risk assessment; PROMISE.

57

58 **INTRODUCTION**

59 In 2020, endometrial carcinoma (EC) was the most common gynecological cancer in Europe, with
60 an incidence of 31.2% and a 5-year prevalence of 34.1% [1]. In the last decades, EC has showed a
61 300% increase in the number of deaths despite a lower increase in incidence (80%) [1-10]. Such
62 data seems due to an inaccurate risk stratification underlying patient management [2,3,10-16].

63 In the attempt of improving the risk stratification system, in 2020, the European Society of
64 Gynaecological Oncology (ESGO), the European Society for Radiotherapy and Oncology (ESTRO)
65 and the European Society of Pathology (ESP) drafted joint guidelines for the management of EC,
66 recommending the assessment of molecular signature as additional prognostic factor to be
67 integrated with classic pathological factors, such as histotype, International Federation of
68 Gynaecology and Obstetrics (FIGO) stage, FIGO grade, myometrial invasion, and lymphovascular
69 space invasion (LVSI) [21]. In fact, in 2013, The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) Research Network
70 identified four prognostic groups of ECs with a different molecular signature: POLE-
71 mutated/ultramutated (POLEmt), microsatellite-instable/hypermuted (MSI), copy-number-
72 high/p53-mutated (p53mt), and no specific molecular profile (NSMP) [17]. Afterwards, The Proactive
73 Molecular Risk Classifier for Endometrial Cancer (ProMise), which adopted immunohistochemistry
74 (cheap, fast and widely available) as a surrogate of sequencing techniques, was demonstrated to
75 be prognostically informative and more applicable in clinical practice [2,12,13].

76 However, how the molecular signature can be integrated with classic pathological factors is still
77 under investigation. In particular, the histotype seems to have a crucial prognostic value
78 independently of the TCGA groups, with non-endometrioid carcinomas having a worse prognosis in
79 each TCGA group [6]. On the other hand, deep myometrial invasion has shown to affect the risk of
80 recurrence independently from the TCGA groups, but not the risk of death of any cause [11]. On the
81 contrary, the prognostic independence of LVSI from the molecular signature has not been enough
82 investigated.

83 The aim of this study was to evaluate whether the prognostic value of LVSI is independent from the
84 TCGA group, through a systematic review and meta-analysis.

85

86 MATERIALS AND METHODS

87 Study protocol

88 All study steps were defined according to an *a priori* designed protocol and were independently
89 performed by two authors. In the case of disagreement, a discussion with a third author was adopted
90 as resolution method.

91 The study was reported according to the Preferred Reporting Item for Systematic Reviews and Meta-
92 analyses (PRISMA) statement and checklist [23].

93

94 Search strategy

95 MEDLINE, Web of Sciences, Google Scholar, Scopus and ClinicalTrial.gov were searched from their
96 inception to May 2021 through several combinations of the following text words: “endometr*”;

97 “carcinoma”; “cancer”; “tumor”; “neoplasia”; “malignancy”; “LVSI”; lymphovascular space invasion”;
98 “lymph*”; “immunohistochem*”; “marker”; “TCGA”; “ATLAS”; “genome”; “ProMisE”; “Proactive
99 Molecular Risk Classifier”; “TransPORTEC”; “PORTEC”; “prognosis”; “survival”; “hypermuted”;
100 “mismatch repair”; “microsatellite instability”; “MMR”; “MSI”; “MLH1”; “MSH2”; “MSH6”; “PMS2”;
101 “EPCAM”; “ultramutated”; “POLE”; “copy number”; “TP53”; “tumor protein 53”; “p53”; “ESMO”,
102 “ESGO”, “ESTRO”, “ESP”. All references from full-text screened studies were assessed for eligible
103 studies.

104

105 Study selection

106 Peer-reviewed studies with extractable data about LVSI as a prognostic factor independent of the
107 TCGA groups in EC were included. In detail, we selected all studies reporting multivariate hazard
108 ratios (HR) for LVSI and assessing the TCGA group as a variable in the multivariate analysis. Case
109 reports and reviews were excluded. In the cases of overlapping data between two studies (i.e. same
110 period of enrollment, institution and/or results), only the study with higher sample size was
111 considered for the analysis.

112

113

114 **Data extraction**

115 Data were extracted without modifications and in accordance with the PICO items [23]. “Population”
116 of the systematic review and meta-analysis consisted of women with EC.

117 “Intervention” (or risk factor) consisted of the presence of LVSI. For included studies that substratified
118 LVSI, “substantial” LVSI was considered as presence of LVSI.

119 “Comparator” consisted of the absence of LVSI. For included studies that substratified LVSI,
120 “absent” and “mild” LVSI were considered as absence of LVSI.

121 “Outcomes” consisted of overall survival (OS) as primary outcome, and disease-specific survival
122 (DSS) and disease-free survival (DFS) as secondary outcomes. In particular, OS (or time to death)
123 was defined as time from surgery until death of any cause. DSS (or time to death from disease) was
124 defined as time from surgery until death due to EC. DFS (or time to recurrence or progression) was
125 defined as time from surgery until there is evidence of recurrent or progressive disease (this was
126 based on either clinical evidence of recurrence or imaging confirmation of recurrence) or if death
127 from the disease occurred prior to the censoring date.

128

129 **Risk of bias within studies evaluation**

130 The risk of bias within studies was evaluated following The Methodological Index for Non-
131 Randomized Studies (MINORS) [24]. Each included study was judged for 7 applicable domains
132 related to risk of bias: 1) Aim (was the aim clear?); 2) Patient selection (were patients randomly or
133 consecutively selected?); 3) Prospective collection of data (were data prospectively collected?); 4)
134 Endpoints appropriate to the study (were OS, DSS and DFS assessed?); 5) Unbiased evaluation of
135 the study endpoints (were endpoints assessed without bias?); 6) Follow-up time (was the follow-up
136 at least 2 years?); 7) Lost to follow-up (were patients lost to follow-up less than 5% of the study
137 population?).

138 Judgments for each domain were the following: “low risk”, “unclear risk” or “high risk” of bias based
139 on information was “reported and adequate”, “not reported” and “reported but inadequate”,
140 respectively.

141

142

143

144 **Data synthesis**

145 For our analyses, we considered multivariable OS, DSS and DFS analyses that assessed the
146 prognostic value of LVSI and considered the TCGA group as a variable from the included studies.
147 In particular, all included studies used cox proportional hazard models.

148 Pooled HRs between EC women with and without LVSI were calculated based on the above-
149 mentioned multivariable analyses, separately for death of any cause, death due to EC, and
150 recurrence. The absence of LVSI was considered as a reference. HRs with 95% confidence interval
151 (CI) were graphically reported as individual and pooled estimates on forest plots.

152 The random effect model of DerSimonian and Laird was used in the analyses.

153 Statistical heterogeneity among studies was evaluated by using the inconsistency index I^2 , as
154 previously described [25-27]. In particular, heterogeneity was judged as: null for $I^2=0\%$, minimal for
155 $0<I^2<25\%$, low for $25\leq I^2<50\%$, moderate for $50\leq I^2<75\%$ and high for $I^2\geq 75\%$.

156 Comprehensive Meta-Analysis (Biostat,14 North Dean Street, Englewood, NJ 07631, USA) and
157 Review Manager v. 5.4 (Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, Cochrane Collaboration, 2014)
158 were used as software.

159

160 **RESULTS**

161 **Study selection**

162 Electronic databases searches led to 12,558 studies. Of them, 4,186 remained after duplicates
163 removal and 72 after title screening. Abstract screening led to 17 studies, which were evaluated for
164 eligibility [3,13-15,28-40]. Of them, 11 were excluded because of the absence of multivariable
165 survival analysis for LVSI [13,30,32,34-36] or the absence of LVSI as a prognostic factor
166 [29,31,33,37,38]. Therefore, 6 studies with 3,331 EC women were included in the systematic review
167 [3,14,15,28,39,40]. Lastly, 2 studies were excluded from the meta-analysis due to overlapping
168 patient data [3,40] with another included study [39], while one study was excluded because
169 multivariate survival analysis was reported only for the NSMP group [14]. In conclusion, three studies
170 with 2,276 EC women were included in the meta-analysis [15,28,39] (Figure S1).

171

172 **Included studies and patients**

173 Each included study performed *ad hoc* analyses on samples from previous cohorts of EC patients.
174 In particular, the cohort was retrospective for 4 studies [3,14,39,40], prospective for one study [28],
175 and provided from a randomized controlled trial for the latter one [15].

176 No included study adopted pathological criteria for patient selection, except for two studies [15,28]
177 which only assessed endometrioid ECs (Table S1).

178 Our study population had a age which ranged from 41 to 90 years, and a mean follow-up which
179 ranged from 60.6 to 131 months. ECs had endometrioid histotype in 85.7% of cases, International
180 Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics (FIGO) grade 3 in 27.3%, LVSI in 22.3%, and FIGO stage
181 I in 73.8%. Women underwent adjuvant treatment in 57.7% of cases (Table S2). Regarding TCGA
182 groups, 6.8% of ECs were POLE-mt, 29.3% were MMR-d, 50% were NSMP, and 13.8% were p53-
183 abn (Table S3).

184

185 **Risk of bias within studies evaluation**

186 All included studies were at low risk of bias for each domain, except for the “Endpoints appropriate
187 to the study” and “Unbiased evaluation of the study endpoints” domains.

188 In detail, the study by Stelloo et al. [15] was judged at unclear risk of bias for the “Endpoints
189 appropriate to the study” because it did not consider DSS as a study endpoint and assessed
190 separately locoregional and distant recurrence for DFS. On the other hand, the study by Kommos
191 et al. was judged at high risk of bias because multivariate survival analysis was reported only for the
192 NSMP group [14].

193

194 **Data synthesis**

195 Three out of six studies were included in the meta-analysis [15,28,39], as one study was excluded
196 due to the high risk of bias in the “Unbiased evaluation of the study endpoints” domain [14], and two
197 studies [3,40] were excluded due to overlapping data with another study [39]. In particular, all three
198 studies were suitable for OS analysis, while 2 were suitable for DSS and DFS [3,14,28,39,40]. In
199 detail, the study by Stelloo et al [15] was excluded from DSS analysis because it did not consider
200 DSS as a study endpoint, while it was included in additional DFS analysis because it assessed
201 separately locoregional and distant recurrence. Therefore, DFS analyses consisted of 3 separate
202 analyses: one excluding the study by Stelloo et al, one including such study as locoregional
203 recurrence, and one including it as distant recurrence.

204 Pooled HR of LVSI was:

- 205 - 1.818 (CI 95%, 1.378-2.399; p=0.0; I²=0%) for OS (Figure 1);
- 206 - 1.849 (CI 95%, 1.194-2.863; p=0.006; I² not calculable) for DSS (Figure 2);
- 207 - 1.377 (CI 95%, 1.008-1.880; p=0.044; I² not calculable) for DFS excluding the study by
208 Stelloo et al. [15] (Figure 3);
- 209 - 1.651 (CI 95%, 1.044-2.611; p=0.032; I²=45.7%) for DFS including the study by Stelloo et
210 al. [15] as locoregional recurrence (Figure 4);
- 211 - 1.684 (CI 95%, 1.05-2.701; p=0.03; I²=51.5%) for DFS including the study by Stelloo et al.
212 [15] as distant recurrence (Figure 5).

213

214 **DISCUSSION**

215 This study shows that, in EC patients, LVSI has a prognostic value independent of TCGA groups,
216 as well as age and adjuvant treatment. In particular, the presence of LVSI increased the risk of death
217 of any cause, death due to EC and recurrent or progressive disease by 1.5-2 times. These findings
218 may be the first pooled data in the field.

219 Since President Obama's 2014 State of the Union address [41,42], Precision Medicine initiative has
220 been essential in oncological studies [42,43]. Precision medicine appears as the most promising
221 approach to cancer, recommending measures tailored to the individual, with the paradigm “the right
222 therapy, at the right time, in the right patient...” [44]. In fact, rather than classifying tumors from the
223 organs in which they originated, they may be classified based on the molecular signature [42].
224 Among all cancers, this approach has provided the most promising results in EC, where TCGA
225 findings have shown the potential to subvert the negative epidemiological trend observed in the last
226 two decades and due to an inaccurate risk assessment [1-11,13,17].

227 On these bases, in the attempt to improve and tailor the risk stratification of EC women, the 2020
228 ESGO/ESTRO/ESP guidelines for the management of patients with EC recommend to integrate
229 classic pathological prognostic factors with TCGA molecular signature [21]. However, the allocation
230 of a patient to a specific risk group based on such an integration should presuppose prognostic
231 independence between factors [11]. To date, while the prognostic independence of molecular
232 signature from pathological factors appears demonstrated [3,13-17,28-40], the opposite has not
233 been well-assessed yet. In detail, while data sustaining the at least partial prognostic independence
234 of histotype and deep myometrial invasion have been recently provided [6,11], little is known about
235 LVSI, with only few studies assessing its impact in a specific TCGA group. In particular, while LVSI
236 was not associated with an increased risk of tumor recurrence or progression [32] and death from
237 disease [45] in POLE-mt ECs, it appeared as an independent predictor of poor outcome in the MSI
238 group [46,47]. Lastly, in the study by Stelloo et al., LVSI was the only pathological prognostic factor
239 independent of TCGA groups for recurrence and death of any cause [15].

240 Regarding the integrated risk stratification proposal, the 2020 ESGO/ESTRO/ESP guidelines
241 upgrade the risk group from low or intermediate to high–intermediate for stage I MMRd/NSMP
242 endometrioid ECs based on the presence of LVSI. Therefore, LVSI status would affect the
243 recommendation of adjuvant treatment in these patients. On the contrary, no role has been attributed
244 to LVSI in the risk stratification of POLE-mt and p53-mt ECs [21].

245 Our results seem to support the use of LVSI as additional prognostic factor to be integrated with
246 TCGA signature. The integration of molecular signature and pathological factors would ensure a
247 more tailored management of patients in accordance with the principles of the precision medicine.

248 On the one hand, this might reduce the under- and overtreatment of EC women observed in the last
249 years [4,6,8,11]; on the other hand, it might reduce the risk of wrong conclusion from oncological
250 trials as patients with different prognosis would not be lumped together based on histological
251 examination alone.

252 However, in order to further confirm 2020 ESGO/ESTRO/ESP recommendations and to obtain a
253 more and more tailored management of EC patients, additional studies are needed to separately
254 assess the prognostic value of LVSI in each TCGA group. This is necessary as each TCGA group
255 is differently affected from pathological factors, with the POLEmt group appearing as the group least
256 affected [4]. Indeed, the impossibility to provide pooled data about LVSI prognostic independence
257 separately in each TCGA group may be the major limitation of our study. In addition, there was only
258 a small number of studies which were suitable for our analysis. Another point to be clarified is the
259 criterion to categorize LVSI. In fact, in one of the included studies, as well as in the
260 ESGO/ESTRO/ESP guidelines [21], LVSI was dichotomized as “absent/focal” vs “substantial”
261 [15,21]; such system was also showed to work in cervical cancer [48]. By contrast, two of the included
262 studies dichotomized LVSI as “absent” vs “present” [28,39]. Lastly, we could not assess the
263 prognostic independence of LVSI from other histological factors, as only TCGA group, age and
264 adjuvant treatment were considered in the multivariate analysis of all individual studies. These
265 limitations highlight the great need for further studies in the field.

266

267 **CONCLUSION**

268 In EC patients, LVSI has a prognostic value independent of TCGA signature, as well as age and
269 adjuvant treatment, increasing the risk of death of any cause, death due to EC and recurrent or
270 progressive disease by 1.5-2 times.

271 Further studies are necessary to confirm these findings and to assess the prognostic impact of LVSI
272 separately in each TCGA group.

273

274 **CONTRIBUTION**

275 AR and AT independently assessed electronic search, eligibility of the studies, inclusion criteria, risk
276 of bias, data extraction and data analysis. DR, DN, MM, PC and AS contributed to the elaboration of
277 methods for risk of bias assessment, data extraction and analysis. AR, AT, DN, LI, FZ, GFZ, AM and
278 RS conceived the study; DR, FR, PC, AS and LI worked on the design of the study; AR, AT, DN,
279 DR, FR and LC worked on the manuscript preparation; PC, LI, FZ, GFZ, AM and RS supervised the
280 whole study.

281

282 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT**

283 Authors report no conflict of interest.

284

285 **FUNDING INFORMATION**

286 No financial support was received for this study.

287

288

289

290

291 **REFERENCES LIST**

- 292 1. World Health Organization. GLOBOCAN 2018: estimated cancer incidence, mortality and
293 prevalence worldwide in 2018, 2018. Available:
294 [http://gco.iarc.fr/today/data/factsheets/cancers/24- Corpus-uteri-fact-sheet.pdf](http://gco.iarc.fr/today/data/factsheets/cancers/24-Corpus-uteri-fact-sheet.pdf).
- 295 2. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2015. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2015 Jan-Feb;65(1):5-
296 29. doi: 10.3322/caac.21254.
- 297 3. Talhouk A, McConechy MK, Leung S, et al. A clinically applicable molecular-based classification
298 for endometrial cancers. *Br J Cancer*. 2015 Jul 14;113(2):299-310. doi: 10.1038/bjc.2015.190.
- 299 4. Raffone A, Travaglino A, Mascolo M, et al. TCGA molecular groups of endometrial cancer: Pooled
300 data about prognosis. *Gynecol Oncol*. 2019 Nov;155(2):374-383. doi:
301 10.1016/j.ygyno.2019.08.019.
- 302 5. Travaglino A, Raffone A, Gencarelli A, et al. TCGA Classification of Endometrial Cancer: the
303 Place of Carcinosarcoma. *Pathol Oncol Res*. 2020 Oct;26(4):2067-2073. doi: 10.1007/s12253-
304 020-00829-9.
- 305 6. Travaglino A, Raffone A, Stradella C, et al. Impact of endometrial carcinoma histotype on the
306 prognostic value of the TCGA molecular subgroups. *Arch Gynecol Obstet*. 2020
307 Jun;301(6):1355-1363. doi: 10.1007/s00404-020-05542-1.
- 308 7. Travaglino A, Raffone A, Mollo A, et al. TCGA molecular subgroups and FIGO grade in
309 endometrial endometrioid carcinoma. *Arch Gynecol Obstet*. 2020 May;301(5):1117-1125. doi:
310 10.1007/s00404-020-05531-4.
- 311 8. Raffone A, Travaglino A, Mascolo M, et al. Histopathological characterization of ProMisE
312 molecular groups of endometrial cancer. *Gynecol Oncol*. 2020 Apr;157(1):252-259. doi:
313 10.1016/j.ygyno.2020.01.008.
- 314 9. Travaglino A, Raffone A, Mascolo M, et al. TCGA Molecular Subgroups in Endometrial
315 Undifferentiated/Dedifferentiated Carcinoma. *Pathol Oncol Res*. 2020 Jul;26(3):1411-1416. doi:
316 10.1007/s12253-019-00784-0.
- 317 10. Travaglino A, Raffone A, Mascolo M, et al. Clear cell endometrial carcinoma and the TCGA
318 classification. *Histopathology*. 2020 Jan;76(2):336-338. doi: 10.1111/his.13976.
- 319 11. Raffone A, Travaglino A, Raimondo D, et al. Prognostic value of myometrial invasion and TCGA
320 groups of endometrial carcinoma. *Gynecol Oncol*. 2021. doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2021.05.029
- 321 12. Hoang LN, McConechy MK, Köbel M, et al. Histotype-genotype correlation in 36 high-grade
322 endometrial carcinomas. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 2013 Sep;37(9):1421-32. doi:
323 10.1097/PAS.0b013e31828c63ed.
- 324 13. Talhouk A, McConechy MK, Leung S, et al. Confirmation of ProMisE: A simple, genomics-based
325 clinical classifier for endometrial cancer. *Cancer*. 2017 Mar 1;123(5):802-813. doi:
326 10.1002/cncr.30496.

- 327 14. Kommos S, McConechy MK, Kommos F et al. Final validation of the ProMisE molecular
328 classifier for endometrial carcinoma in a large population-based case series. *Ann Oncol*. 2018
329 May 1;29(5):1180-1188. doi: 10.1093/annonc/mdy058.
- 330 15. Stelloo E, Nout RA, Osse EM, et al. Improved Risk Assessment by Integrating Molecular and
331 Clinicopathological Factors in Early-stage Endometrial Cancer-Combined Analysis of the
332 PORTEC Cohorts. *Clin Cancer Res*. 2016 Aug 15;22(16):4215-24. doi: 10.1158/1078-
333 0432.CCR-15-2878.
- 334 16. Stelloo E, Bosse T, Nout RA, et al. Refining prognosis and identifying targetable pathways for
335 high-risk endometrial cancer; a TransPORTEC initiative. *Mod Pathol*. 2015 Jun;28(6):836-44.
336 doi: 10.1038/modpathol.2015.43.
- 337 17. Getz G, Gabriel SB, Cibulskis K, et al. Integrated genomic characterization of endometrial
338 carcinoma. *Nature*. 2013;497(7447). doi:10.1038/nature12113
- 339 18. Raffone A, Travaglino A, D'Antonio A, et al. BAG3 expression correlates with the grade of
340 dysplasia in squamous intraepithelial lesions of the uterine cervix. *Acta ObstetGynecol Scand*.
341 2020 Jan;99(1):99-104. doi: 10.1111/aogs.13716.
- 342 19. Travaglino A, Raffone A, Saccone G, et al. Nuclear expression of β -catenin in endometrial
343 hyperplasia as marker of premalignancy. *APMIS*. 2019 Nov;127(11):699-709. doi:
344 10.1111/apm.12988.
- 345 20. Raffone A, Travaglino A, Saccone G, et al. Diagnostic and prognostic value of ARID1A in
346 endometrial hyperplasia: a novel marker of occult cancer. *APMIS*. 2019 Sep;127(9):597-606.
347 doi: 10.1111/apm.12977.
- 348 21. Concin N, Matias-Guiu X, Vergote I, et al. ESGO/ESTRO/ESP guidelines for the management
349 of patients with endometrial carcinoma. *Int J Gynecol Cancer*. 2021;31(1). doi:10.1136/ijgc-2020-
350 002230
- 351 22. Singh N, Hirschowitz L, Zaino R, et al. Pathologic Prognostic Factors in Endometrial Carcinoma
352 (Other Than Tumor Type and Grade). *Int J Gynecol Pathol*. 2019;38(1).
353 doi:10.1097/PGP.0000000000000524
- 354 23. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-
355 analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews* 2015;4:1
- 356 24. Slim K, Nini E, Forestier D et al. Methodological index for non-randomized studies (minors):
357 development and validation of a new instrument. *ANZ J Surg*. 2003;73(9):712-6
- 358 25. Travaglino A, Raffone A, Saccone G, et al. Endometrial hyperplasia and risk of coexistent cancer:
359 WHO vs EIN criteria. *Histopathology*. 2019 Apr;74(5):676-687.
- 360 26. Raffone A, Travaglino A, Saccone G, et al. Endometrial hyperplasia and progression to cancer:
361 which classification system stratifies the risk better? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch*
362 *Gynecol Obstet*. 2019 May;299(5):1233-1242.

- 363 27. Raffone A, Travaglino A, Saccone G, et al. Management of women with atypical polypoid
364 adenomyoma of the uterus: A quantitative systematic review. *Acta ObstetGynecol Scand*. 2019
365 Feb 3. doi: 10.1111/aogs.13553. [Epub ahead of print]
- 366 28. Cosgrove CM, Tritchler DL, Cohn DE, et al. An NRG Oncology/GOG study of molecular
367 classification for risk prediction in endometrioid endometrial cancer. *Gynecol Oncol*. 2018
368 Jan;148(1):174-180. doi: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2017.10.037. Epub 2017 Nov 11
- 369 29. Eriksson LSE, Nastic D, Lindqvist PG, et al. Sonographic, demographic characteristics, and the
370 Proactive Molecular Risk Classifier for Endometrial cancer (ProMisE) in the prediction of tumor
371 recurrence or progression . *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 2020. doi:10.1002/uog.23573
- 372 30. Britton H, Huang L, Lum A, et al. Molecular classification defines outcomes and opportunities in
373 young women with endometrial carcinoma. *Gynecol Oncol*. 2019;153(3):487-495.
374 doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2019.03.098
- 375 31. Conlon N, Da Cruz Paula A, Ashley CW, et al. Endometrial carcinomas with a “serous”
376 Component in young women are enriched for DNA mismatch repair deficiency, lynch syndrome,
377 and POLE exonuclease domain mutations. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 2020;44(5):641-648.
378 doi:10.1097/PAS.0000000000001461
- 379 32. He D, Wang H, Dong Y, et al. POLE mutation combined with microcystic, elongated and
380 fragmented (MELF) pattern invasion in endometrial carcinomas might be associated with poor
381 survival in Chinese women. *Gynecol Oncol*. 2020;159(1):36-42.
382 doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2020.07.102
- 383 33. Dubil EA, Tian C, Wang G, et al. Racial disparities in molecular subtypes of endometrial cancer.
384 *Gynecol Oncol*. 2018;149(1):106-116. doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2017.12.009
- 385 34. Haraga J, Nakamura K, Haruma T, et al. Molecular characterization of second primary
386 endometrial cancer. *Anticancer Res*. 2020;40(7). doi:10.21873/ANTICANRES.14370
- 387 35. León-Castillo A, Gilvazquez E, Nout R, et al. Clinicopathological and molecular characterisation
388 of ‘multiple-classifier’ endometrial carcinomas. *J Pathol*. 2020;250(3):312-322.
389 doi:10.1002/path.5373
- 390 36. Rau TT, Bettschen E, Büchi C, et al. Prognostic impact of tumor budding in endometrial
391 carcinoma within distinct molecular subgroups. *Mod Pathol*. 2021;34(1):222-232.
392 doi:10.1038/s41379-020-0626-9
- 393 37. DeLair DF, Burke KA, Selenica P, et al. The genetic landscape of endometrial clear cell
394 carcinomas. *J Pathol* 2017;243:230-41. doi:[10.1002/path.4947](https://doi.org/10.1002/path.4947)
- 395 38. Bosse T, Nout RA, McAlpine JN, et al. Molecular Classification of Grade 3 Endometrioid
396 Endometrial Cancers Identifies Distinct Prognostic Subgroups. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 2018;42(5).
397 doi:10.1097/PAS.0000000000001020

- 398 39. Talhouk A, Derocher H, Schmidt P, et al. Molecular subtype not immune response drives
399 outcomes in endometrial carcinoma. *Clin Cancer Res*. 2019;25(8):2537-2548. doi:10.1158/1078-
400 0432.CCR-18-3241
- 401 40. Karnezis AN, Leung S, Magrill J, et al. Evaluation of endometrial carcinoma prognostic
402 immunohistochemistry markers in the context of molecular classification. *J Pathol Clin Res*.
403 2017;3(4):279-293. doi:10.1002/cjp2.82
- 404 41. Collins FS, Varmus H. A New Initiative on Precision Medicine. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;372(9).
405 doi:10.1056/nejmp1500523
- 406 42. Barroilhet L, Matulonis U. The NCI-MATCH trial and precision medicine in gynecologic cancers.
407 *Gynecol Oncol*. 2018;148(3). doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2018.01.008
- 408 43. Coyne GOS, Takebe N, Chen AP. Defining precision: The precision medicine initiative trials NCI-
409 MPACT and NCI-MATCH. *Curr Probl Cancer*. 2017;41(3).
410 doi:10.1016/j.currproblcancer.2017.02.001
- 411 44. Coleman RL, Matulonis UA. Precision medicine. *Gynecol Oncol*. 2016 Apr;141(1):1. doi:
412 10.1016/j.ygyno.2016.03.017. PMID: 27016221.
- 413 45. McAlpine JN, Chiu DS, Nout RA, et al. Evaluation of treatment effects in patients with endometrial
414 cancer and POLE mutations: An individual patient data meta-analysis. *Cancer*. 2021:1-14.
415 doi:10.1002/cncr.33516
- 416 46. Loukovaara M, Pasanen A, Bützow R. Mismatch repair protein and MLH1 methylation status as
417 predictors of response to adjuvant therapy in endometrial cancer. *Cancer Med*. 2021;(December
418 2020):1-9. doi:10.1002/cam4.3691
- 419 47. Pasanen A, Loukovaara M, Bützow R. Clinicopathological significance of deficient DNA
420 mismatch repair and MLH1 promoter methylation in endometrioid endometrial carcinoma. *Mod*
421 *Pathol*. 2020;33(7):1443-1452. doi:10.1038/s41379-020-0501-8
- 422 48. Ronsini C, Anchora LP, Restaino S, et al. The role of semiquantitative evaluation of lympho-
423 vascular space invasion in early stage cervical cancer patients. *Gynecol Oncol*. 2021
424 Aug;162(2):299-307.

425

426

427 **LEGENDS FOR TABLES AND FIGURES**

428 **Figure 1.** Forest plot of individual and pooled hazard ratios for death of any cause between
429 endometrial carcinoma patients with and without lymphovascular space invasion; multivariable
430 analyses including TCGA group as a variable were considered from included studies. The absence
431 of lymphovascular space invasion was considered as a reference.

432

433 **Figure 2.** Forest plot of individual and pooled hazard ratios for death due to endometrial carcinoma
434 between patients with and without lymphovascular space invasion; multivariable analyses including
435 TCGA group as a variable were considered from included studies. The absence of lymphovascular
436 space invasion was considered as a reference.

437

438 **Figure 3.** Forest plot of individual and pooled hazard ratios for recurrent or progressive disease
439 between endometrial carcinoma patients with and without lymphovascular space invasion;
440 multivariable analyses including TCGA group as a variable were considered from included studies.
441 The absence of lymphovascular space invasion was considered as a reference. The study by Stelloo
442 et al. [15] was not included.

443

444 **Figure 4.** Forest plot of individual and pooled hazard ratios for recurrent or progressive disease
445 between endometrial carcinoma patients with and without lymphovascular space invasion;
446 multivariable analyses including TCGA group as a variable were considered from included studies.
447 The absence of lymphovascular space invasion was considered as a reference. Locoregional
448 recurrence was considered for the study by Stelloo et al. [15].

449

450 **Supplementary Figure 1.** Flow diagram of studies identified in the systematic review (Prisma
451 template [Preferred Reporting Item for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses]).

452

453 **Supplementary Figure 2. a)** Assessment of risk of bias. Summary of risk of bias for each study;
454 Plus sign: low risk of bias; minus sign: high risk of bias; question mark: unclear risk of bias; **b)** Risk
455 of bias graph about each risk of bias item presented as percentages across all included studies.

456 **Supplementary Table 1. Characteristics of the studies included in the qualitative synthesis.**

457 **FIGO:** International Federation of Gynaecology and Obstetrics

458 **RCT:** Randomized controlled trial

459 **OS:** overall survival

460 **DFS:** disease-free survival

461 **DSS:** disease-specific survival

462 *: DFS was assessed as locoregional recurrence-free survival and distant recurrence-free survival

463

464 **Supplementary Table 2. Characteristics of patients from studies included in the qualitative**
465 **synthesis.**

466 **FIGO:** International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics

467 **LVSI:** Lymphovascular space invasion

468 *: In the Stelloo et al. study, LVSI was assessed as absent/mild or substantial

469

470 **Supplementary Table 3. Distribution of TCGA groups in the studies included in qualitative**
471 **synthesis.**

472

473 **Supplementary Table 4. List of variables considered at multivariable analyses in the studies**
474 **included in the qualitative synthesis.**

475 **FIGO:** International Federation of Gynaecology and Obstetrics

476 **L1CAM:** L1 Cell Adhesion Molecule