

Editorial

Management of Endometrial Cancer: Molecular Identikit and Tailored Therapeutic Approach

Ottavia D'Oria^{1,2}, Andrea Giannini^{2,3,*}, Aris Raad Besharat^{2,4}, Donatella Caserta⁴

Academic Editor: Michael H. Dahan

Submitted: 6 July 2023 Revised: 11 July 2023 Accepted: 14 July 2023 Published: 12 October 2023

Gynecologic oncology management has undergone numerous changes over the past few years. A greater understanding of tumor biology and genetic patterns has changed the therapeutic approach, especially with ovarian and endometrial cancers.

Efforts have focused on improving safety, efficiency, and cost of care in gynecologic oncology.

Endometrial cancer (EC) is the most common gynecological malignancy in developed countries. Considerable progress has recently been made in the management of patients affected by EC, mostly regarding molecular biology and minimally invasive treatment.

90% of patients with EC have abnormal vaginal bleeding as the first main symptom, most frequently during the postmenopausal period, making an early diagnosis possible. Endometrial sampling and imaging based on pelvic Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) are mandatory to provide an accurate diagnosis [1–3].

Pathologic analysis to determine the tumor type and grade, is the standard for tumor risk stratification. Due to a new diagnostic classification centered on molecular and immunohistochemical indicators, the risk classification is much more accurate. On the basis of the outcomes of the Cancer Genome Atlas, and the ProMisE (Proactive Molecular Risk Classifier for EC), tumors are divided into four subgroups according to the presence of polymeraseepsilon (POLE) exonuclease domain mutations (EDMs), and protein 53 (p53) immunohistochemistry and mismatch repair (MMR) proteins, creating four different subgroups: POLEmut, p53 wild type (low copy number-CNL-or nonspecific molecular profile-NSMP) p53 null/missense mutations (high copy number) and mismatch repair deficient (MMRd) [4–8]. This molecular classification optimizes EC clinical management, defining different risk classes. If this molecular classification is not available, it is necessary to consider traditional pathologic classification. The prognostic risk group defines the adjuvant treatment; European Society of Medical Oncology (ESMO), European Society of Gynaecological Oncology (ESGO), European Society for Radiotherapy and Oncology (ESTRO) and European Society of Pathology (ESP) guidelines recommend specific management depending on the risk category: low, intermediate, high- intermediate, high, and advanced disease [9]. Each category has a precise management profile for patients with EC, predicting the outcome and making the management of EC very focused, based on protocols by the principal international gynecological oncological societies for the treatment of EC patients.

No adjuvant treatment is recommended for low-risk patients. The low-risk category includes stage I and II POLE ultramutated and stage IA MMRd/NSMP endometrioid carcinoma, without lymph vascular space invasion (LVSI) [10].

Adjuvant brachytherapy decreases vaginal recurrence in patients with intermediate risk. This category includes patients with stage IB MMRd/NSMP endometrioid carcinomas and low grade, LVSI negative, stage IA MMRd/NSMP endometrioid carcinomas and high grade, no LVSI or focal invasion and stage IA p53abn, and/or non-endometrioid carcinomas [11].

Adjuvant radiotherapy is recommended in the intermediate-high-risk group. This risk group comprises stage IA or IB low-grade endometrioid carcinomas with positive LVSI or stage IB high-grade endometrioid carcinomas unrelated to LVSI, and stage II endometrioid carcinomas [9].

Stage III–IVA MMR-d or NSMP endometrioid carcinomas and stage I–IVA p53abn all-histology or stage IB-IVA non-endometrioid carcinomas are included in the highrisk group. Because of the high risk of recurrence for patients in this group, post-operative combined chemo-radiotherapy is recommended. Patients who underwent combined therapy (chemo-radiotherapy) showed better overall survival than patients who underwent chemotherapy alone, according to PORTEC-3 trial results [1,12,13].

The molecular biology state creates an EC patient identikit that guides individualized therapeutic approach and follow-up, avoiding overtreatment and improving the

¹Obstetrics and Gynecological Unit, Department of Woman's and Child's Health, San Camillo-Forlanini Hospital, 00152 Rome, Italy

²Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences and Translational Medicine, PhD Course in "Translational Medicine and Oncology", Sapienza University, 00189 Rome, Italy

³Department of Maternal and Child Health and Urological Sciences, Sapienza University of Rome, Policlinico Umberto I, 00161 Rome, Italy

⁴Gynecology Division, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences and Translational Medicine, Sant'Andrea University Hospital, Sapienza University of Rome, 00189 Rome, Italy

^{*}Correspondence: andrea.giannini@uniroma1.it (Andrea Giannini)

clinical outcomes of these patients. NCCNNational Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) guidelines identified more risk factors for EC patients: age >60 years, LVSI status, and tumor size, making the identikit even more precise. Studies have also focused on the effect of comorbidities and/or drugs on EC prognosis [14].

Molecular classification can be considered the future standard approach for gynecological cancer management, particularly for endometrial and ovarian cancer, and has avoided unnecessary treatments in patients with good molecular profiles.

Author Contributions

OD and DC designed the research study. AG contributed to the analysis of the data and supervision. AG and ARB wrote the manuscript. All authors contributed to editorial changes in the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate

Not applicable.

Acknowledgment

Not applicable.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest. Andrea Giannini and Donatella Caserta are serving as one of the Editorial Board members of this journal. Ottavia D'Oria, Andrea Giannini and Aris Raad Besharat are serving as one of Guest editors of this journal. We declare that Andrea Giannini, Donatella Caserta, Ottavia D'Oria and Aris Raad Besharat had no involvement in the peer review of this article and has no access to information regarding its peer review. Full responsibility for the editorial process for this article was delegated to Michael H. Dahan.

References

 Restaino S, Paglietti C, Arcieri M, Biasioli A, Della Martina M, Mariuzzi L, et al. Management of Patients Diagnosed with Endometrial Cancer: Comparison of Guidelines. Cancers. 2023; 15: 1091.

- [2] Berek JS, Matias-Guiu X, Creutzberg C, Fotopoulou C, Gaffney D, Kehoe S, et al. FIGO staging of endometrial cancer: 2023. International Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics. 2023. (online ahead of print)
- [3] Promwattanaphan L, Satitniramai S. The Accuracy of Endometrial Sampling and Clinical Affecting Factors as a Predictor of Final Surgical Pathology in Endometrial Cancer. Clinical and Experimental Obstetrics & Gynecology. 2022; 49: 94.
- [4] Talhouk A, McConechy MK, Leung S, Yang W, Lum A, Senz J, et al. Confirmation of ProMisE: A simple, genomics-based clinical classifier for endometrial cancer. Cancer. 2017; 123: 802– 813.
- [5] Cuccu I, D'Oria O, Sgamba L, De Angelis E, Golia D'Augè T, Turetta C, et al. Role of Genomic and Molecular Biology in the Modulation of the Treatment of Endometrial Cancer: Narrative Review and Perspectives. Healthcare. 2023; 11: 571.
- [6] Golia D'Augè T, Cuccu I, Santangelo G, Muzii L, Giannini A, Bogani G, et al. Novel Insights into Molecular Mechanisms of Endometrial Diseases. Biomolecules. 2023; 13: 499.
- [7] Di Donato V, Giannini A, Bogani G. Recent Advances in Endometrial Cancer Management. Journal of Clinical Medicine. 2023; 12: 2241.
- [8] Celli V, Guerreri M, Pernazza A, Cuccu I, Palaia I, Tomao F, et al. MRI- and Histologic-Molecular-Based Radio-Genomics Nomogram for Preoperative Assessment of Risk Classes in Endometrial Cancer. Cancers. 2022; 14: 5881.
- [9] Concin N, Matias-Guiu X, Vergote I, Cibula D, Mirza MR, Marnitz S, et al. ESGO/ESTRO/ESP guidelines for the management of patients with endometrial carcinoma. International Journal of Gynecological Cancer. 2021; 31: 12–39.
- [10] Wortman BG, Creutzberg CL, Putter H, Jürgenliemk-Schulz IM, Jobsen JJ, Lutgens LCHW, et al. Ten-year results of the PORTEC-2 trial for high-intermediate risk endometrial carcinoma: improving patient selection for adjuvant therapy. British Journal of Cancer. 2018; 119: 1067–1074.
- [11] Nout RA, Smit VTHBM, Putter H, Jürgenliemk-Schulz IM, Jobsen JJ, Lutgens LCHW, et al. Vaginal brachytherapy versus pelvic external beam radiotherapy for patients with endometrial cancer of high-intermediate risk (PORTEC-2): an open-label, non-inferiority, randomised trial. Lancet. 2010; 375: 816–823.
- [12] Maggi R, Lissoni A, Spina F, Melpignano M, Zola P, Favalli G, et al. Adjuvant chemotherapy vs radiotherapy in high-risk endometrial carcinoma: results of a randomised trial. British Journal of Cancer. 2006; 95: 266–271.
- [13] Rodrigues da Cunha Colombo Bonadio R, Gondim Meira Velame Azevedo R, Harada G, Cabral Severino da Costa S, Costa Miranda V, de Freitas D, et al. Adjuvant Carboplatin and Paclitaxel Chemotherapy Followed by Radiotherapy in High-Risk Endometrial Cancer: A Retrospective Analysis. Journal of Global Oncology. 2018; 4: 1–8.
- [14] Di Donato V, D'Oria O, Giannini A, Bogani G, Fischetti M, Santangelo G, et al. Age-Adjusted Charlson Comorbidity Index Predicts Survival in Endometrial Cancer Patients. Gynecologic and Obstetric Investigation. 2022; 87: 191–199.

