

Title Cardiovascular Mortality in Patients with Gynecological Cancers: A Population-based Cohort Study

Running title Cardiovascular Mortality in Gynecological Cancer Patients

Authors Yue Yang^{1*}, Jun-Ping Yang^{2*}, Bing-Shu Li^{3*}, Li-Wei Cheng⁴, Shu-Jian Wei^{1†}, Yu-Guo Chen^{1†}

Affiliations of all authors

¹ Department of Emergency and Chest Pain Center, Key Laboratory of Emergency and Critical Care Medicine of Shandong Province, Qilu Hospital of Shandong University, Jinan, 250012, Shandong, China.

² Department of Radiation Oncology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou, 450000, Henan, China.

³ Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, Renmin Hospital of Wuhan University, Hubei Province People's Republic of China, Wuhan, 430060, Hubei, China.

⁴ Department of Scientific Research, Renmin Hospital of Wuhan University, Hubei Province People's Republic of China, Wuhan, 430060, Hubei, China.

* Y Yang, JP Yang, and BS Li contributed equally to this article and shared the first authorships.

† SJ Wei and CY Guo contributed equally to this article and shared the corresponding authorships.

Corresponding author

Chen-Yu Guo

Qilu Hospital of Shandong University

107#, WenhuaXilu Road, Ji'nan, 250012, Shandong, China

Email: chen919085@sdu.edu.cn.

Shu-Jian Wei

Qilu Hospital of Shandong University

107#, WenhuaXilu Road, Ji'nan, 250012, Shandong, China

Email: weishujian@sdu.edu.cn.

HIGHLIGHTS

⇒ 29% of patients with gynecological cancers died from cancer, while 4.1% died from CVD, with 73.2% of CVD deaths attributed to heart disease.

⇒ In recent years, SMRs for CVD mortality increased steadily across all GC subtypes, except vulvar cancer.

⇒ Higher CVD mortality was linked to older age, black race, localized disease stage, unmarried/single/divorced status, and prior radiation therapy, especially in vaginal and vulvar cancers.

⇒ We developed and validated a nomogram to predict CVD death risk in GC patients, aiding personalized patient management.

ABSTRACT

Objective The survival rate of gynecological cancers (GCs) has improved significantly in recent decades. Patients with GCs did not necessarily succumb to the primary cancer. Cardiovascular health might be a critical determinant of long-term survival. This study aimed to investigate the mortality rate and risk factors associated with cardiovascular disease (CVD) death in patients with GCs.

Methods A total of 399,399 cases of GCs diagnosed between 2000 and 2020 from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) database were included in this study. The standardized mortality ratio (SMR) for CVD mortality was estimated. Prognostic factors for CVD death were assessed using cause-specific hazard ratios with 95% confidence intervals within a competing risk model, considering non-cardiovascular death as a competing risk.

Results Of the 399,399 patients with GCs, 117,551 (29%) died from GCs, and 16,371 (4.1%) died from CVD. Of the CVD deaths, 73.2% were attributed to heart disease. The SMR of CVD mortality was highest in survivors diagnosed before age 45 years, and the risk of CVD mortality remained elevated throughout the follow-up period compared to the general United States (US) population. In recent years, the SMRs for CVD mortality risk increased steadily in all subtypes of GCs, except for vulvar cancer. Older age, black race, localized stage, unmarried/single/divorced, vaginal and vulvar cancers, and radiation therapy were associated with a higher risk of CVD mortality. A nomogram was developed and validated using these variables to predict CVD death risk in patients with GCs.

Conclusions The risk of CVD mortality in patients with GCs was increased and was significantly higher compared with the general US population. A nomogram was constructed and validated to forecast the risk of CVD mortality in individuals with GCs. More attention should be paid to cardiovascular health during diagnosis to improve survival rates.

Keywords Gynecological cancers; cardiovascular disease; mortality; competing risk; prognosis; standardized mortality ratio;

INTRODUCTION

Gynecologic cancers (GCs), including cancers of the cervix, ovaries, fallopian tubes, and uterus, accounted for approximately 11% of all cancers in women¹. The overall incidence rate of GCs was second to breast cancer among women, posing a serious threat to their physical and mental health². In the United States (US), the estimated number of new cases in 2022 was 65,950 for endometrial cancer, 19,880 for ovarian cancer, and 14,100 for cervical cancer³. In 2022, there were an estimated 12,810 deaths due to ovarian cancer and 32,830 deaths due to GCs in the US³.

The survival for advanced and recurrent GCs remained poor but advances in early detection, surgery, chemotherapy, and targeted therapies improved clinical outcomes⁴⁻⁸. However, the long-term survival of cancer patients has drawn attention to the impact of cardiovascular disease (CVD) as a significant contributor to mortality⁹⁻¹¹. Cancer survivors were particularly vulnerable to CVD mortality due to the cardiotoxic effects of cancer treatments and common risk factors such as obesity, smoking, and alcohol consumption¹²⁻¹⁴. Cancer survivors had twice the risk of dying from CVD within the first year following a cancer diagnosis compared to the general US population¹¹. This increased risk persisted throughout the survival period, highlighting the need for continued cardiovascular care in cancer survivors^{11, 15}. In particular, survivors diagnosed with GCs faced an elevated risk of CVD mortality compared to the general US population^{9, 10, 16}. Patients with endometrial or ovarian cancer were at a higher risk of dying from CVD than from the cancer itself, especially as time since diagnosis increased^{9, 10, 17-20}. Factors such as age, hypertension, and pre-existing heart conditions were associated with increased CVD death risk in patients with GCs^{11, 21-23}.

Although CVD death was widely discussed for various malignancies, including breast cancer and lung cancer, the CVD mortality risk associated with GCs was not clearly described. To address this gap, we used the SEER data to determine the prevalence, trend, and risk factors for CVD death in patients with GCs.

METHODS

Data

This cohort study utilized data from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) Registry. The SEER, representing nearly 28% of the US population, was an authoritative source of high-quality cancer registries worldwide, relying on systematic, standardized, and regular data collection procedures to ensure quality and prevent surveillance bias²⁴. Ethics committee approval was waived because de-identified data were used. This report adhered to the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines for observational studies.

Study Population

The International Classification of Diseases for Oncology, Third Edition (ICD-O-3) histology code was used to assign causes of death and cancer types. We defined CVD mortality due to cardiac disease, cerebrovascular disease, hypertension without cardiac disease, atherosclerosis, aortic aneurysm and dissection, and other diseases of the arteries, arterioles, and capillaries²⁵. Data on patients diagnosed with GCs such as ovarian cancer, uterine cancer, cervical cancer, vaginal cancer, vulvar cancer, and others (malignant neoplasm of other and unspecified female genital organs, or malignant neoplasm of placenta) between 2000 and 2020 were extracted from the SEER database²⁶. The exclusion criteria were as follows: (1) GCs were not the first malignancy; (2) patients were diagnosed only by autopsy or death certificate; (3) pediatric patients (age <18 years) were excluded from this study because diagnostic and therapeutic interventions might differ compared to adults; (4) causes of death were unknown.

Clinical variables of interest included age at diagnosis, race, year of diagnosis, stage, grade, marital status, cancer type, and initial treatment regimen. Age at diagnosis was divided into three categories: less than 45, 45 to 65, and 65 years and older. Race was recorded as White, Black, and Other. The calendar years at diagnosis were categorized as 2000 to 2005, 2005 to 2010, 2010 to 2015, and 2015 to 2020. Tumor stage was classified as localized, regional, and distant. Tumor grade was divided into grade I (well differentiated), grade II (moderately differentiated), grade III (poorly differentiated), and grade IV (undifferentiated). Marital status was categorized as "married" and "unmarried/single/divorced". Patients were divided into the following treatment categories: surgery and not/unknown, chemotherapy and not/unknown, and radiotherapy and not/unknown.

Statistical Analysis

Categorical variables in baseline characteristics were assessed using the chi-square test. To further evaluate the interaction between GCs and CVD mortality, we calculated the standardized mortality ratios (SMRs) to quantify the risk of CVD death in GC patients. The SMR was

calculated as the ratio of observed deaths to expected deaths²⁷. Joinpoint regression was used to calculate average annual percentage changes (AAPC) for evaluating trends over time²⁸.

CVD-specific mortality hazard ratios (HRs) with corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated to estimate the relative association between individual risk and prognostic factors for CVD mortality using univariate and multivariate competing risk models (with non-cardiovascular death as a competing risk)^{29,30}. The classical proportional hazard model examined the effect of covariates on the cause-specific hazard function but ignored the competing nature of multiple causes for the same event, leading to inaccurate evaluation of variables in the marginal probability analysis for cause-specific events³⁰. Fine and Gray developed a survival analysis method using the inverse probability censoring weighting technique with a time-dependent weight function to correctly estimate the marginal probability of an event in the presence of competing events^{31, 32}. This competing risk model was used to determine whether baseline clinical characteristics and treatment strategies were associated with CVD death. Independent variables included age at diagnosis, race, tumor grade, stage, and initial treatments such as surgery, chemotherapy, and radiation³³.

Seventy percent of patients with GCs were randomly assigned to the discovery cohort and the remaining 30 percent to the validation cohort. A nomogram was created based on the multivariate analysis results³⁴. The performances of the nomogram in the discovery and validation cohorts were evaluated as follows: The area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) was calculated to evaluate the discriminative ability of the nomogram³⁵. An AUC value above 0.7 was considered indicative of good predictive ability³⁶. The concordance index (C-index) was used to evaluate the predictive performance of the nomogram³⁷. A calibration plot was used to compare the actual and predicted values and assess the model's consistency³⁸. Better model accuracy was indicated when the calibration curve aligned with the 45° reference line³⁹. The model's clinical validity was evaluated through decision-curve analysis (DCA), where the ordinate represented threshold probability and the abscissa corresponded to net benefit⁴⁰. A higher DCA curve indicated a greater net benefit for the model⁴⁰.

The analysis was conducted using SEER*Stat 8.3.6 (National Cancer Institute, USA), Microsoft Excel 15.0.4 (Microsoft, Redmond, WA), GraphPad Prism 5 (GraphPad Software Inc., San Diego, CA, USA), Joinpoint Regression Program 5.0.2 (Variance Covariance Matrix Beta), and R 3.4.4 software (Vienna, Austria). Two-tailed hypothesis tests were performed, with statistical significance at $P < 0.05$ ⁴¹.

RESULTS

Patient Characteristics

From 2000 to 2020, a total of 399,399 patients with GCs were enrolled in the SEER database, including 94,563 patients (24%) with ovarian cancer, 210,664 patients (53%) with uterine cancer, 64,025 patients (16%) with cervical cancer, 16,370 patients (4.1%) with vulvar cancer, and 4,176 patients (1.0%) with vaginal cancer. Most tumors occurred in white patients (80%). A total of 202,153 patients with GCs (51%) had localized cancer, and 98,995 patients (25%) had distant cancer. The patients' information was presented in **Table 1**.

CVD Death

The cumulative mortality for causes of death in patients with GCs was shown in **Figure 1**. The highest cumulative mortality was due to cancer-specific deaths (72.1%), followed by non-CVD causes (13.6%) and CVD causes (10.0%). Vaginal cancer patients (18.2%) had the highest risk of dying from CVD, followed by patients with uterine cancer (15.4%) and vulvar cancer (10.6%) (**Figure 1**). Among non-cancer deaths in patients with GCs, CVD mortality was the most common cause (41.1%). The majority (73.2%) of CVD deaths were due to heart disease (**Figure 1**). We observed that increasing age at diagnosis was associated with an increased percentage of cancer patients dying from index cancer and cardiovascular disease. The CVD death rate in patients younger than age 40 years was 1.1% at 20 years, compared with 14.0% in patients aged 65 years or older (**Table S1**). We also observed a trend indicating that a greater percentage of cancer patients who were recently diagnosed had a higher chance of developing cardiovascular disease and experiencing its consequent effects.

The SMR of CVD mortality was highest in survivors diagnosed under the age of 45 years compared to the general US population. The younger a cancer survivor was at diagnosis, the higher their risk of dying from cardiovascular disease. Survivors diagnosed with GCs before age 45 had a risk of CVD mortality more than 2.12 times higher than the general US population. The risk of CVD death among cancer survivors gradually decreased with increasing age at diagnosis (**Figure 2** and **Table 2**). The risk of CVD mortality remained elevated throughout the follow-up period compared to the general US population (**Figure 2**). In recent years, the SMR of CVD death increased in survivors with ovarian cancer (AAPC = 0.0668, 95% CI = 0.0537 to 0.0798), uterine cancer (AAPC = 0.0229, 95% CI = 0.0184 to 0.0274), cervical cancer (AAPC = 0.0417, 95% CI = 0.027 to 0.0564), and vaginal cancer (AAPC = 0.1071, 95% CI = 0.0662 to 0.1479), except vulvar cancer (AAPC = -0.0239, 95% CI = -0.0413 to -0.0064) (**Figure 2** and **Table S2**).

Factors Associated with CVD Mortality

We assessed factors associated with CVD mortality using a multivariable competing risk model (with non-cardiovascular death as a competing risk). In patients with GCs, the mortality

was higher with increasing age (> 65 vs. < 40 , hazard ratio [HR] 15.3, 95% CI 13.1–17.9; $P < 0.001$). Black women were more likely to die due to cardiovascular disease (HR 1.12, 95% CI 1.07-1.18; $P < 0.001$), as were unmarried/single/divorced individuals (HR 1.57, 95% CI 1.52-1.62; $P < 0.001$). Patients treated with surgery (HR 0.64, 95% CI 0.61-0.67; $P < 0.001$) or chemotherapy (HR 0.59, 95% CI 0.56-0.62; $P < 0.001$) had lower CVD mortality. (**Figure 4** and **Table 3**).

Nomogram for CVD Mortality

Patients were randomly divided into the discovery cohort ($N = 279,580$) and the validation cohort ($N = 119,819$). The clinical characteristics of patients in the discovery and validation cohorts were summarized in **Table S3**. The nomogram was developed based on the final multivariate model and included the following variables: age at diagnosis, race, stage, grade, marital status, cancer type, and initial treatment regimens (**Figure 5**). The nomogram showed the value for each risk factor, with the total value representing the sum of all variable values. The risk of CVD death could be determined by drawing a line from the total score to the risk score.

In the discovery cohort, the nomogram achieved a C-index of 0.808 (95% CI: 0.784-0.832) for CVD mortality. After validation, the nomogram gained a C-index of 0.797 (95% CI: 0.758-0.837). As shown in the calibration curves, the nomogram achieved a significant agreement between the predicted and actual observations in both the discovery and validation cohorts, as the prediction curves closely aligned with the diagonal. The AUC values in the discovery cohort for 20-year CVD mortality were 74.9% (**Figure S2**). After validation, the nomogram achieved an AUC of 75.7% for 20-year CVD death (**Figure S2**). These results suggested a satisfactory potential clinical effect of this model for predicting CVD mortality risk in patients with GCs. To test the agreement between the real and ideal values of the model, the calibration plot was utilized to confirm the discrimination ability. The calibration plots for 10-, 15-, and 20-year CVD death probabilities closely aligned with the standard line, indicating a high level of calibration (**Figure S3**). A DCA curve was subsequently utilized to illustrate the clinical validity of the nomogram (**Figure S4**).

DISCUSSION

In recent years, survival rates for GCs have markedly improved⁴²⁻⁴⁴. This study investigated CVD mortality risk in GC patients and found it higher than the general US population, particularly in younger patients. Factors such as age at diagnosis, ethnicity, cancer types, and treatment modalities were associated with the increased CVD death risk. A predictive model was developed to assess the CVD mortality risk in GC patients, emphasizing the importance of cardiovascular health in improving long-term survival rates.

Women encountered an elevated risk of both cardiovascular disease and cancer, especially as they aged^{21, 45-48}. Both CVD and specific types of cancer had common risk factors including smoking, physical inactivity, obesity, diabetes, hypertension, and hypercholesterolemia^{21, 49}. Physical inactivity was associated with increased risks of both CVD and cancer, whereas highly active women exhibited a lower risk of endometrial cancer⁵⁰⁻⁵⁴. Notably, women with endometrial cancer exhibited an increased risk of CVD⁵⁵. Obesity was correlated with elevated risks of endometrial and breast cancers, as well as increased cancer-related morbidity and mortality⁵⁶⁻⁵⁹. This research found that patients with GCs had a CVD mortality rate of 10.0%. Remarkably, younger cancer survivors, particularly those diagnosed before age 45, had a higher risk of mortality from CVD compared to the general US population. Among GC patients, older age and being unmarried, single, or divorced were linked to higher CVD death risk, whereas treatments involving surgery or chemotherapy were associated with lower risk. These findings underscored the importance of addressing common risk factors and delivering comprehensive care for women to confront both cancer and cardiovascular diseases.

GCs accounted for 11% of all cancers in women, encompassing endometrial, ovarian, and cervical cancers¹. Advances in detection and treatment had significantly improved outcomes for advanced and recurrent GC cases^{4-8, 42, 60}. However, treatments were associated with risks such as therapy-related cardiovascular toxicity, a growing concern in oncology^{61, 62}. The interplay between cardiovascular care and GC survivors was increasingly critical due to their elevated risk of CVD mortality from cancer treatments^{9, 11, 15, 49, 55, 63-66}. Various treatments for GCs carried distinct CVD risks^{42, 67-71}. Anthracyclines, including doxorubicin and its pegylated liposomal form, were crucial for treating advanced ovarian and endometrial cancers but exhibited dose-dependent cardiotoxicity⁷²⁻⁷⁴. Pegylated liposomal doxorubicin (PLD) had lower cardiotoxicity compared to doxorubicin and was utilized in the treatment of gynecologic malignancies and uterine sarcomas⁷⁵. Platinum-based drugs, such as cisplatin, commonly used for cervical, endometrial, and ovarian cancers, increased the risk of thromboembolic events and cardiovascular complications⁷⁶⁻⁷⁹. Paclitaxel and docetaxel, frequently employed in the treatment of cervical, endometrial, and ovarian cancers, might induce arrhythmias⁸⁰⁻⁸⁴. Antimetabolites, such as fluorouracil (5-FU), commonly used for cervical and ovarian cancers, could precipitate heart problems, particularly in patients with pre-existing coronary artery disease⁸⁵⁻⁸⁷. Antiangiogenic drugs, including

bevacizumab and pazopanib, used to treat cervical, epithelial, and mucinous ovarian cancers, as well as leiomyosarcoma, were linked to cardiovascular issues such as hypertension, heart failure, and arterial thromboembolic events⁸⁸⁻⁹¹. Immune checkpoint inhibitors, approved for the treatment of uterine and cervical cancers, could cause rare but serious cardiac complications, including myocarditis and acute myocardial infarction⁹²⁻⁹⁴. Tamoxifen, frequently used in the treatment of endometrial cancer, could exert estrogen-like effects on the heart, potentially leading to fatal long-term complications related to serious blood clots^{95, 96}. Additionally, women with GCs might experience unique consequences of cancer treatment, such as premature menopause and reduced fertility⁹⁷⁻⁹⁹. Factors such as ovarian reserve, exposure to cancer treatments, and duration of therapy could influence the onset of early menopause^{100, 101}. These factors elevated the risk of coronary artery disease, worsened cancer patient outcomes, and heightened the likelihood of cardiovascular diseases, heart failure, and stroke, primarily due to the prolonged absence of estrogen affecting metabolic and vascular function¹⁰¹⁻¹⁰³.

Various strategies have been investigated to mitigate the risk of cardiotoxicity in patients undergoing treatment for GCs, emphasizing the customization of approaches based on individual cardiovascular risk factors¹⁰⁴. These strategies included avoiding cardiotoxic treatments when feasible, considering alternative therapies, and consulting with a multidisciplinary team before initiating treatments^{104, 105}. For instance, in the case of doxorubicin treatment, potential strategies included adjusting infusion schedules, using dexrazoxane, or opting for liposomal formulations^{106, 107}. In ovarian cancer, pegylated liposomal doxorubicin (PLD) was commonly employed in cardioprotective regimens^{108, 109}. Additionally, dose reduction or modification of the infusion schedule could help alleviate cardiotoxicity associated with 5-fluorouracil (5-FU)¹¹⁰. The nomogram had been developed to predict the CVD mortality risk in patients with GCs, providing valuable guidance.

The study encountered several limitations. The primary concern was the potential introduction of bias due to the retrospective nature of the data derived from the SEER database. Inadequate information on cardiovascular complications, risk factors, disease history, and therapeutic methods hindered the assessment of their impact on CVD death risk. Additionally, the absence of crucial factors such as genetic markers, behavioral patterns, and other characteristics limited the study's accuracy. To address these limitations, future cohort studies should prioritize identifying prognostic markers and incorporating a wider range of factors to enhance precision.

CONCLUSIONS

This research underscored the heightened risk of CVD mortality faced by individuals with GCs, particularly among younger survivors. Various factors including age, ethnicity, cancer type, and treatment approaches contributed to this risk. As a result, a predictive model was created to evaluate the likelihood of CVD mortality in patients with GCs, emphasizing the significance of prioritizing heart health to improve survival. These findings underscored the necessity for

personalized interventions and proactive management of cardiovascular risk factors in individuals with GCs, with the ultimate goal of reducing the impact of cardiovascular disease.

Acknowledgments The data used in this study was from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) Registry database.

Contributors YY: conceptualization, methodology, software, formal analysis, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing, guarantor. YJP: conceptualization, methodology, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing, guarantor. LBS: methodology, formal analysis, writing – review and editing, supervision. CLW: conceptualization, methodology, writing – review and editing, supervision. WSJ: conceptualization, methodology, project administration, writing – review and editing, supervision. CYG: conceptualization, methodology, data curation, project administration, funding acquisition, writing – review and editing, supervision.

Funding This work was supported by the State Key Program of the National Natural Science Foundation of China (82030059), National Natural Science Foundation of China (82072141, 82072144, 82070388, 82172178, 82172127, 82272240, 82202376), National Key R&D Program of China (2020YFC1512700, 2020YFC1512705, 2020YFC1512703, 2022YFC0868600), Taishan Pandeng Scholar Program of Shandong Province (tspd20181220), Natural Science Foundation of Shandong Province (ZR2022QH225), and Clinical Research Foundation of Shandong University (2020SDUCRCC014).

Competing interests No potential conflicts of interest were disclosed.

Patient consent for publication Not applicable.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data availability statement Data may be obtained from a third party and are not publicly available.

Supplemental material This content has been supplied by the author(s). It has not been vetted by BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) and may not have been peer-reviewed. Any opinions or recommendations discussed are solely those of the author(s) and are not endorsed by BMJ. BMJ disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on the content. Where the content includes any translated material, BMJ does not warrant the accuracy and reliability of the translations (including but not limited to local regulations, clinical guidelines, terminology, drug names, and drug dosages), and is not responsible for any error and/or omissions arising from translation and adaptation or otherwise.

REFERENCES

1. Wilson, E. M.; Eskander, R. N.; Binder, P. S., Recent Therapeutic Advances in Gynecologic Oncology: A Review. *Cancers* **2024**, *16* (4).
2. Chokoeva, A. A.; Tchernev, G.; Cardoso, J. C.; Patterson, J. W.; Dechev, I.; Valkanov, S.; Zanardelli, M.; Lotti, T.; Wollina, U., Vulvar sarcomas: Short guideline for histopathological recognition and clinical management. Part 1. *International journal of immunopathology and pharmacology* **2015**, *28* (2), 168-77.
3. Siegel, R. L.; Miller, K. D.; Fuchs, H. E.; Jemal, A., Cancer statistics, 2022. *CA: a cancer journal for clinicians* **2022**, *72* (1), 7-33.
4. Zhang, C.; Sheng, Y.; Sun, X.; Wang, Y., New insights for gynecological cancer therapies: from molecular mechanisms and clinical evidence to future directions. *Cancer metastasis reviews* **2023**, *42* (3), 891-925.
5. Small, W., Jr.; Bacon, M. A.; Bajaj, A.; Chuang, L. T.; Fisher, B. J.; Harkenrider, M. M.; Jhingran, A.; Kitchener, H. C.; Mileskin, L. R.; Viswanathan, A. N.; Gaffney, D. K., Cervical cancer: A global health crisis. *Cancer* **2017**, *123* (13), 2404-2412.
6. Moufarrij, S.; Dandapani, M.; Arthofer, E.; Gomez, S.; Srivastava, A.; Lopez-Acevedo, M.; Villagra, A.; Chiappinelli, K. B., Epigenetic therapy for ovarian cancer: promise and progress. *Clinical epigenetics* **2019**, *11* (1), 7.
7. Berek, J. S.; Renz, M.; Kehoe, S.; Kumar, L.; Friedlander, M., Cancer of the ovary, fallopian tube, and peritoneum: 2021 update. *International journal of gynaecology and obstetrics: the official organ of the International Federation of Gynaecology and Obstetrics* **2021**, *155* Suppl 1 (Suppl 1), 61-85.
8. Erickson, B. K.; Slomovitz, B.; Powell, M.; Eskander, R. N., Top advances of the year: Uterine cancer. *Cancer* **2024**, *130* (14), 2409-2412.
9. Al-Badawi, I. A.; Alomar, O.; Alsehaimi, S. O.; Jamjoom, M. Z.; Abdulmalik, N. A.; Bukhari, I. A.; Alyousef, A.; Alabdrabalamir, S.; Baradwan, S.; Sayasneh, A.; Alqarni, S. M. S.; Abu-Zaid, A., Cardiovascular Mortality in Ovarian Cancer Patients: An Analysis of Patient Characteristics Using the SEER Database. *Medicina (Kaunas, Lithuania)* **2023**, *59* (8).
10. Felix, A. S.; Bower, J. K.; Pfeiffer, R. M.; Raman, S. V.; Cohn, D. E.; Sherman, M. E., High cardiovascular disease mortality after endometrial cancer diagnosis: Results from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) Database. *International journal of cancer* **2017**, *140* (3), 555-564.
11. Muhandiramge, J.; Zalcborg, J. R.; van Londen, G. J.; Warner, E. T.; Carr, P. R.; Haydon, A.; Orchard, S. G., Cardiovascular Disease in Adult Cancer Survivors: a Review of Current Evidence, Strategies for Prevention and Management, and Future Directions for Cardio-oncology. *Current oncology reports* **2022**, *24* (11), 1579-1592.

12. Karlstaedt, A.; Moslehi, J.; de Boer, R. A., Cardio-onco-metabolism: metabolic remodelling in cardiovascular disease and cancer. *Nature reviews. Cardiology* **2022**, *19* (6), 414-425.
13. Lyon, A. R.; Yousaf, N.; Battisti, N. M. L.; Moslehi, J.; Larkin, J., Immune checkpoint inhibitors and cardiovascular toxicity. *The Lancet. Oncology* **2018**, *19* (9), e447-e458.
14. Zhang, Y. B.; Pan, X. F.; Chen, J.; Cao, A.; Xia, L.; Zhang, Y.; Wang, J.; Li, H.; Liu, G.; Pan, A., Combined lifestyle factors, all-cause mortality and cardiovascular disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *Journal of epidemiology and community health* **2021**, *75* (1), 92-99.
15. Gilchrist, S. C.; Barac, A.; Ades, P. A.; Alfano, C. M.; Franklin, B. A.; Jones, L. W.; La Gerche, A.; Ligibel, J. A.; Lopez, G.; Madan, K.; Oeffinger, K. C.; Salamone, J.; Scott, J. M.; Squires, R. W.; Thomas, R. J.; Treat-Jacobson, D. J.; Wright, J. S., Cardio-Oncology Rehabilitation to Manage Cardiovascular Outcomes in Cancer Patients and Survivors: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation* **2019**, *139* (21), e997-e1012.
16. Maduro, J. H.; den Dekker, H. A.; Pras, E.; de Vries, E. G.; van der Zee, A. G.; Klokman, W. J.; Reyners, A. K.; van Leeuwen, F. E.; Langendijk, J. A.; de Bock, G. H.; Gietema, J. A., Cardiovascular morbidity after radiotherapy or chemoradiation in patients with cervical cancer. *International journal of radiation oncology, biology, physics* **2010**, *78* (5), 1337-44.
17. Sturgeon, K. M.; Deng, L.; Bluethmann, S. M.; Zhou, S.; Trifiletti, D. M.; Jiang, C.; Kelly, S. P.; Zaorsky, N. G., A population-based study of cardiovascular disease mortality risk in US cancer patients. *European heart journal* **2019**, *40* (48), 3889-3897.
18. Simon, M. S.; Hastert, T. A.; Barac, A.; Banack, H. R.; Caan, B. J.; Chlebowski, R. T.; Foraker, R.; Hovsepian, G.; Liu, S.; Luo, J.; Manson, J. E.; Neuhouser, M. L.; Okwuosa, T. M.; Pan, K.; Qi, L.; Ruterbusch, J. J.; Shadyab, A. H.; Thomson, C. A.; Wactawski-Wende, J.; Waheed, N.; Beebe-Dimmer, J. L., Cardiometabolic risk factors and survival after cancer in the Women's Health Initiative. *Cancer* **2021**, *127* (4), 598-608.
19. Coviello, J. S., Cardiovascular and Cancer Risk: The Role of Cardio-oncology. *Journal of the advanced practitioner in oncology* **2018**, *9* (2), 160-176.
20. Hu, Z. L.; Yuan, Y. X.; Xia, M. Y.; Li, Y.; Yang, Y.; Wang, S. N.; Meng, X. Z.; Sun, M. Y.; Wang, N., Cardiovascular mortality risk in patients with ovarian cancer: a population-based study. *Journal of ovarian research* **2024**, *17* (1), 88.
21. Wilcox, N. S.; Amit, U.; Reibel, J. B.; Berlin, E.; Howell, K.; Ky, B., Cardiovascular disease and cancer: shared risk factors and mechanisms. *Nature reviews. Cardiology* **2024**, *21* (9), 617-631.

22. Mohammed, T.; Singh, M.; Tiu, J. G.; Kim, A. S., Etiology and management of hypertension in patients with cancer. *Cardio-oncology (London, England)* **2021**, *7* (1), 14.
23. Soisson, S.; Ganz, P. A.; Gaffney, D.; Rowe, K.; Snyder, J.; Wan, Y.; Deshmukh, V.; Newman, M.; Fraser, A.; Smith, K.; Herget, K.; Hanson, H. A.; Wu, Y. P.; Stanford, J.; Al-Sarray, A.; Werner, T. L.; Setiawan, V. W.; Hashibe, M., Long-term Cardiovascular Outcomes Among Endometrial Cancer Survivors in a Large, Population-Based Cohort Study. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* **2018**, *110* (12), 1342-1351.
24. Kuo, T. M.; Mobley, L. R., How generalizable are the SEER registries to the cancer populations of the USA? *Cancer causes & control : CCC* **2016**, *27* (9), 1117-26.
25. Amini, M.; Zayeri, F.; Salehi, M., Trend analysis of cardiovascular disease mortality, incidence, and mortality-to-incidence ratio: results from global burden of disease study 2017. *BMC public health* **2021**, *21* (1), 401.
26. Dwivedi, S. K. D.; Rao, G.; Dey, A.; Mukherjee, P.; Wren, J. D.; Bhattacharya, R., Small Non-Coding-RNA in Gynecological Malignancies. *Cancers* **2021**, *13* (5).
27. Richardson, D. B.; Keil, A. P.; Cole, S. R.; MacLehose, R. F., Observed and Expected Mortality in Cohort Studies. *American journal of epidemiology* **2017**, *185* (6), 479-486.
28. Cao, F.; Liu, Y. C.; Ni, Q. Y.; Chen, Y.; Wan, C. H.; Liu, S. Y.; Tao, L. M.; Jiang, Z. X.; Ni, J.; Pan, H. F., Temporal trends in the prevalence of autoimmune diseases from 1990 to 2019. *Autoimmunity reviews* **2023**, *22* (8), 103359.
29. Sun, J. Y.; Zhang, Z. Y.; Qu, Q.; Wang, N.; Zhang, Y. M.; Miao, L. F.; Wang, J.; Wu, L. D.; Liu, Y.; Zhang, C. Y.; Wang, R. X., Cardiovascular disease-specific mortality in 270,618 patients with non-small cell lung cancer. *International journal of cardiology* **2021**, *330*, 186-193.
30. Austin, P. C.; Lee, D. S.; Fine, J. P., Introduction to the Analysis of Survival Data in the Presence of Competing Risks. *Circulation* **2016**, *133* (6), 601-9.
31. Austin, P. C.; Fine, J. P., Practical recommendations for reporting Fine-Gray model analyses for competing risk data. *Statistics in medicine* **2017**, *36* (27), 4391-4400.
32. Coemans, M.; Verbeke, G.; Döhler, B.; Süsal, C.; Naesens, M., Bias by censoring for competing events in survival analysis. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)* **2022**, *378*, e071349.
33. Chi, K.; Luo, Z.; Zhao, H.; Li, Y.; Liang, Y.; Xiao, Z.; He, Y.; Zhang, H.; Ma, Z.; Zeng, L.; Zhou, R.; Feng, M.; Li, W.; Rao, H.; Yi, M., The impact of tumor characteristics on cardiovascular disease death in breast cancer patients with CT or RT: a population-based study. *Frontiers in cardiovascular medicine* **2023**, *10*, 1149633.
34. Wang, Y.; Liu, J.; Huang, C.; Zeng, Y.; Liu, Y.; Du, J., Development and validation of a nomogram for predicting survival of pulmonary invasive mucinous adenocarcinoma based on surveillance, epidemiology, and end results (SEER) database. *BMC cancer* **2021**, *21* (1), 148.

35. Zhang, W.; Ji, L.; Wang, X.; Zhu, S.; Luo, J.; Zhang, Y.; Tong, Y.; Feng, F.; Kang, Y.; Bi, Q., Nomogram Predicts Risk and Prognostic Factors for Bone Metastasis of Pancreatic Cancer: A Population-Based Analysis. *Frontiers in endocrinology* **2021**, *12*, 752176.
36. White, N.; Parsons, R.; Collins, G.; Barnett, A., Evidence of questionable research practices in clinical prediction models. *BMC medicine* **2023**, *21* (1), 339.
37. Wu, J.; Zhang, H.; Li, L.; Hu, M.; Chen, L.; Xu, B.; Song, Q., A nomogram for predicting overall survival in patients with low-grade endometrial stromal sarcoma: A population-based analysis. *Cancer communications (London, England)* **2020**, *40* (7), 301-312.
38. Xie, W.; Li, Y.; Meng, X.; Zhao, M., Machine learning prediction models and nomogram to predict the risk of in-hospital death for severe DKA: A clinical study based on MIMIC-IV, eICU databases, and a college hospital ICU. *International journal of medical informatics* **2023**, *174*, 105049.
39. Zhang, K.; Liu, C.; Sha, X.; Yao, S.; Li, Z.; Yu, Y.; Lou, J.; Fu, Q.; Liu, Y.; Cao, J.; Zhang, J.; Yang, Y.; Mi, W.; Li, H., Development and validation of a prediction model to predict major adverse cardiovascular events in elderly patients undergoing noncardiac surgery: A retrospective cohort study. *Atherosclerosis* **2023**, *376*, 71-79.
40. Vickers, A. J.; Holland, F., Decision curve analysis to evaluate the clinical benefit of prediction models. *The spine journal : official journal of the North American Spine Society* **2021**, *21* (10), 1643-1648.
41. Ludbrook, J., Should we use one-sided or two-sided P values in tests of significance? *Clinical and experimental pharmacology & physiology* **2013**, *40* (6), 357-61.
42. Bodriagova, O.; Previs, R. A.; Gaba, L.; Shankar, A.; Vidal, L.; Saini, K. S., Recent Advances in Gynecological Malignancies: Focus on ASCO 2023. *Oncology and therapy* **2023**, *11* (4), 397-409.
43. Bejar, F. G.; Oaknin, A.; Williamson, C.; Mayadev, J.; Peters, P. N.; Secord, A. A.; Wield, A. M.; Coffman, L. G., Novel Therapies in Gynecologic Cancer. *American Society of Clinical Oncology educational book. American Society of Clinical Oncology. Annual Meeting* **2022**, *42*, 1-17.
44. Annunziata, C. M.; Kohn, E. C., Clinical trials in gynecologic oncology: Past, present, and future. *Gynecologic oncology* **2018**, *148* (2), 393-402.
45. Ji, H.; Kim, A.; Ebinger, J. E.; Niiranen, T. J.; Claggett, B. L.; Bairey Merz, C. N.; Cheng, S., Sex Differences in Blood Pressure Trajectories Over the Life Course. *JAMA Cardiol* **2020**, *5* (3), 19-26.
46. Sung, H.; Ferlay, J.; Siegel, R. L.; Laversanne, M.; Soerjomataram, I.; Jemal, A.; Bray, F., Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality

- Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. *CA: a cancer journal for clinicians* **2021**, *71* (3), 209-249.
47. Schwartz, S. M., Epidemiology of Cancer. *Clinical chemistry* **2024**, *70* (1), 140-149.
48. DeGregori, J., Challenging the axiom: does the occurrence of oncogenic mutations truly limit cancer development with age? *Oncogene* **2013**, *32* (15), 1869-75.
49. Ge, C.; Jiang, Z.; Long, B.; Lu, Q.; He, Y., Associations between cardiovascular diseases and cancer mortality: insights from a retrospective cohort analysis of NHANES data. *BMC public health* **2024**, *24* (1), 1049.
50. McTiernan, A.; Friedenreich, C. M.; Katzmarzyk, P. T.; Powell, K. E.; Macko, R.; Buchner, D.; Pescatello, L. S.; Bloodgood, B.; Tennant, B.; Vaux-Bjerke, A.; George, S. M.; Troiano, R. P.; Piercy, K. L., Physical Activity in Cancer Prevention and Survival: A Systematic Review. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise* **2019**, *51* (6), 1252-1261.
51. Patel, A. V.; Friedenreich, C. M.; Moore, S. C.; Hayes, S. C.; Silver, J. K.; Campbell, K. L.; Winters-Stone, K.; Gerber, L. H.; George, S. M.; Fulton, J. E.; Denlinger, C.; Morris, G. S.; Hue, T.; Schmitz, K. H.; Matthews, C. E., American College of Sports Medicine Roundtable Report on Physical Activity, Sedentary Behavior, and Cancer Prevention and Control. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise* **2019**, *51* (11), 2391-2402.
52. Raglan, O.; Kalliala, I.; Markozannes, G.; Cividini, S.; Gunter, M. J.; Nautiyal, J.; Gabra, H.; Paraskevaidis, E.; Martin-Hirsch, P.; Tsilidis, K. K.; Kyrgiou, M., Risk factors for endometrial cancer: An umbrella review of the literature. *International journal of cancer* **2019**, *145* (7), 1719-1730.
53. Schmid, D.; Behrens, G.; Keimling, M.; Jochem, C.; Ricci, C.; Leitzmann, M., A systematic review and meta-analysis of physical activity and endometrial cancer risk. *European journal of epidemiology* **2015**, *30* (5), 397-412.
54. Elagizi, A.; Kachur, S.; Carbone, S.; Lavie, C. J.; Blair, S. N., A Review of Obesity, Physical Activity, and Cardiovascular Disease. *Current obesity reports* **2020**, *9* (4), 571-581.
55. Anderson, C.; Olshan, A. F.; Bae-Jump, V. L.; Brewster, W. R.; Lund, J. L.; Nichols, H. B., Cardiovascular disease diagnoses among older women with endometrial cancer. *Gynecologic oncology* **2022**, *167* (1), 51-57.
56. Dehesh, T.; Fadaghi, S.; Seyedi, M.; Abolhadi, E.; Ilaghi, M.; Shams, P.; Ajam, F.; Mosleh-Shirazi, M. A.; Dehesh, P., The relation between obesity and breast cancer risk in women by considering menstruation status and geographical variations: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC women's health* **2023**, *23* (1), 392.
57. Onstad, M. A.; Schmandt, R. E.; Lu, K. H., Addressing the Role of Obesity in

- Endometrial Cancer Risk, Prevention, and Treatment. *Journal of clinical oncology : official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology* **2016**, *34* (35), 4225-4230.
58. Crosbie, E. J.; Kitson, S. J.; McAlpine, J. N.; Mukhopadhyay, A.; Powell, M. E.; Singh, N., Endometrial cancer. *Lancet (London, England)* **2022**, *399* (10333), 1412-1428.
59. Colditz, G. A.; Peterson, L. L., Obesity and Cancer: Evidence, Impact, and Future Directions. *Clinical chemistry* **2018**, *64* (1), 154-162.
60. Galicia-Carmona, T.; Arango-Bravo, E. A.; Coronel-Martínez, J. A.; Cetina-Pérez, L.; Vanoye-Carlo, E. G.; Villalobos-Valencia, R.; García-Pacheco, J. A.; Cortés-Esteban, P., Advanced, recurrent, and persistent cervical cancer management: in the era of immunotherapy. *Front Oncol* **2024**, *14*, 1392639.
61. Manhas, A.; Tripathi, D.; Thomas, D.; Sayed, N., Cardiovascular Toxicity in Cancer Therapy: Protecting the Heart while Combating Cancer. *Current cardiology reports* **2024**.
62. Morelli, M. B.; Bongiovanni, C.; Da Pra, S.; Miano, C.; Sacchi, F.; Lauriola, M.; D'Uva, G., Cardiotoxicity of Anticancer Drugs: Molecular Mechanisms and Strategies for Cardioprotection. *Frontiers in cardiovascular medicine* **2022**, *9*, 847012.
63. Shelburne, N.; Adhikari, B.; Brell, J.; Davis, M.; Desvigne-Nickens, P.; Freedman, A.; Minasian, L.; Force, T.; Remick, S. C., Cancer treatment-related cardiotoxicity: current state of knowledge and future research priorities. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* **2014**, *106* (9).
64. Nathan, P. C.; Amir, E.; Abdel-Qadir, H., Cardiac Outcomes in Survivors of Pediatric and Adult Cancers. *The Canadian journal of cardiology* **2016**, *32* (7), 871-80.
65. Ogilvie, L. M.; Coyle-Asbil, B.; Brunt, K. R.; Petrik, J.; Simpson, J. A., Therapy-naïve malignancy causes cardiovascular disease: a state-of-the-art cardio-oncology perspective. *American journal of physiology. Heart and circulatory physiology* **2024**, *326* (6), H1515-h1537.
66. Kassaian, S. E.; Gandhi, B.; Barac, A., Cardio-oncology: Implications for Clinical Practice for Women. *Current cardiology reports* **2022**, *24* (11), 1685-1698.
67. Wang, Q.; Peng, H.; Qi, X.; Wu, M.; Zhao, X., Targeted therapies in gynecological cancers: a comprehensive review of clinical evidence. *Signal Transduct Target Ther* **2020**, *5* (1), 137.
68. Yang, M. X.; Li, Q. L.; Wang, D. Q.; Ye, L.; Li, K. M.; Lin, X. J.; Li, X. S.; Fu, C.; Ma, X. M.; Guo, Y. K.; Yin, R. T.; Yang, Z. G., Myocardial microvascular function assessed by CMR first-pass perfusion in patients treated with chemotherapy for gynecologic malignancies. *European radiology* **2022**, *32* (10), 6850-6858.
69. Curigliano, G.; Cardinale, D.; Suter, T.; Plataniotis, G.; de Azambuja, E.; Sandri, M. T.; Criscitiello, C.; Goldhirsch, A.; Cipolla, C.; Roila, F., Cardiovascular toxicity induced by chemotherapy, targeted agents and radiotherapy: ESMO Clinical Practice

- Guidelines. *Annals of oncology : official journal of the European Society for Medical Oncology* **2012**, *23 Suppl 7*, vii155-66.
70. Liu, E.; Guan, X.; Wei, R.; Jiang, Z.; Liu, Z.; Wang, G.; Chen, Y.; Wang, X., Association Between Radiotherapy and Death From Cardiovascular Disease Among Patients With Cancer: A Large Population-Based Cohort Study. *Journal of the American Heart Association* **2022**, *11* (6), e023802.
 71. Swift, B. E.; Maeda, A.; Bouchard-Fortier, G., Low incidence of venous thromboembolism after gynecologic oncology surgery: Who is at greatest risk? *Gynecologic oncology* **2022**, *164* (2), 311-317.
 72. Qiu, Y.; Jiang, P.; Huang, Y., Anthracycline-induced cardiotoxicity: mechanisms, monitoring, and prevention. *Frontiers in cardiovascular medicine* **2023**, *10*, 1242596.
 73. Saleh, Y.; Abdelkarim, O.; Herzallah, K.; Abela, G. S., Anthracycline-induced cardiotoxicity: mechanisms of action, incidence, risk factors, prevention, and treatment. *Heart failure reviews* **2021**, *26* (5), 1159-1173.
 74. Mohsenizadeh, S. A.; Rajaeinejad, M.; Khoshfetrat, M.; Arefizadeh, R.; Mousavi, S. H.; Mosaed, R.; Kazemi-Galougahi, M. H.; Jalaeikhoo, H.; Faridfar, A.; Nikandish, M.; Alavi-Moghadam, S.; Arjmand, B., Anthracycline-Induced Cardiomyopathy in Cancer Survivors: Management and Long-Term Implications. *Advances in experimental medicine and biology* **2024**.
 75. Tahover, E.; Patil, Y. P.; Gabizon, A. A., Emerging delivery systems to reduce doxorubicin cardiotoxicity and improve therapeutic index: focus on liposomes. *Anti-cancer drugs* **2015**, *26* (3), 241-58.
 76. Iwai, C.; Jo, T.; Konishi, T.; Fujita, A.; Michihata, N.; Matsui, H.; Fushimi, K.; Yasunaga, H., Thrombotic risk of platinum combination chemotherapy with and without immune checkpoint inhibitors for advanced non-small cell lung cancer: a nationwide inpatient database study. *Cancer immunology, immunotherapy : CII* **2023**, *72* (11), 3581-3591.
 77. Herrmann, J.; Yang, E. H.; Ilescu, C. A.; Cilingiroglu, M.; Charitakis, K.; Hakeem, A.; Toutouzas, K.; Leesar, M. A.; Grines, C. L.; Marmagkiolis, K., Vascular Toxicities of Cancer Therapies: The Old and the New--An Evolving Avenue. *Circulation* **2016**, *133* (13), 1272-89.
 78. Moore, R. A.; Adel, N.; Riedel, E.; Bhutani, M.; Feldman, D. R.; Tabbara, N. E.; Soff, G.; Parameswaran, R.; Hassoun, H., High incidence of thromboembolic events in patients treated with cisplatin-based chemotherapy: a large retrospective analysis. *Journal of clinical oncology : official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology* **2011**, *29* (25), 3466-73.
 79. Dilruba, S.; Kalayda, G. V., Platinum-based drugs: past, present and future. *Cancer*

- chemotherapy and pharmacology* **2016**, 77 (6), 1103-24.
80. Guglin, M.; Aljayeh, M.; Saiyad, S.; Ali, R.; Curtis, A. B., Introducing a new entity: chemotherapy-induced arrhythmia. *Europace : European pacing, arrhythmias, and cardiac electrophysiology : journal of the working groups on cardiac pacing, arrhythmias, and cardiac cellular electrophysiology of the European Society of Cardiology* **2009**, 11 (12), 1579-86.
 81. Koshiyama, M.; Kinezaki, M.; Uchida, T.; Sumitomo, M., Chemosensitivity testing of paclitaxel versus docetaxel in human gynecological carcinomas: a comparison with carboplatin. *Anticancer Res* **2006**, 26 (5b), 3655-9.
 82. Della Corte, L.; Barra, F.; Foreste, V.; Giampaolino, P.; Evangelisti, G.; Ferrero, S.; Bifulco, G., Advances in paclitaxel combinations for treating cervical cancer. *Expert Opin Pharmacother* **2020**, 21 (6), 663-677.
 83. Chan, J. K.; Brady, M. F.; Penson, R. T.; Huang, H.; Birrer, M. J.; Walker, J. L.; DiSilvestro, P. A.; Rubin, S. C.; Martin, L. P.; Davidson, S. A.; Huh, W. K.; O'Malley, D. M.; Boente, M. P.; Michael, H.; Monk, B. J., Weekly vs. Every-3-Week Paclitaxel and Carboplatin for Ovarian Cancer. *The New England journal of medicine* **2016**, 374 (8), 738-48.
 84. Montisci, A.; Palmieri, V.; Liu, J. E.; Vietri, M. T.; Cirri, S.; Donatelli, F.; Napoli, C., Severe Cardiac Toxicity Induced by Cancer Therapies Requiring Intensive Care Unit Admission. *Frontiers in cardiovascular medicine* **2021**, 8, 713694.
 85. Shiga, T.; Hiraide, M., Cardiotoxicities of 5-Fluorouracil and Other Fluoropyrimidines. *Current treatment options in oncology* **2020**, 21 (4), 27.
 86. Deac, A. L.; Burz, C. C.; Bocsan, I. C.; Buzoianu, A. D., Fluoropyrimidine-induced cardiotoxicity. *World journal of clinical oncology* **2020**, 11 (12), 1008-1017.
 87. Almomen, A.; Alhowyan, A., A Comprehensive Study on Folate-Targeted Mesoporous Silica Nanoparticles Loaded with 5-Fluorouracil for the Enhanced Treatment of Gynecological Cancers. *Journal of functional biomaterials* **2024**, 15 (3).
 88. des Guetz, G.; Uzzan, B.; Chouahnia, K.; Morère, J. F., Cardiovascular toxicity of anti-angiogenic drugs. *Targeted oncology* **2011**, 6 (4), 197-202.
 89. Neves, K. B.; Montezano, A. C.; Lang, N. N.; Touyz, R. M., Vascular toxicity associated with anti-angiogenic drugs. *Clinical science (London, England : 1979)* **2020**, 134 (18), 2503-2520.
 90. Luvero, D.; Plotti, F.; Lopez, S.; Scaletta, G.; Capriglione, S.; Montera, R.; Antonelli, G.; Ciuffreda, S.; Carassiti, R.; Oliveti, A.; Angioli, R., Antiangiogenics and immunotherapies in cervical cancer: an update and future's view. *Medical oncology (Northwood, London, England)* **2017**, 34 (6), 115.
 91. Wang, L.; Liu, W. Q.; Broussy, S.; Han, B.; Fang, H., Recent advances of anti-

- angiogenic inhibitors targeting VEGF/VEGFR axis. *Front Pharmacol* **2023**, *14*, 1307860.
92. Xie, Y.; Kong, W.; Zhao, X.; Zhang, H.; Luo, D.; Chen, S., Immune checkpoint inhibitors in cervical cancer: Current status and research progress. *Front Oncol* **2022**, *12*, 984896.
93. Lehmann, L. H.; Cautela, J.; Palaskas, N.; Baik, A. H.; Meijers, W. C.; Allenbach, Y.; Alexandre, J.; Rassaf, T.; Müller, O. J.; Aras, M.; Asnani, A. H.; Deswal, A.; Laufer-Perl, M.; Thuny, F.; Kerneis, M.; Hayek, S. S.; Ederhy, S.; Salem, J. E.; Moslehi, J. J., Clinical Strategy for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Immune Checkpoint Inhibitor-Associated Myocarditis: A Narrative Review. *JAMA Cardiol* **2021**, *6* (11), 1329-1337.
94. Mirza, M. R.; Chase, D. M.; Slomovitz, B. M.; dePont Christensen, R.; Novák, Z.; Black, D.; Gilbert, L.; Sharma, S.; Valabrega, G.; Landrum, L. M.; Hanker, L. C.; Stuckey, A.; Boere, I.; Gold, M. A.; Auranen, A.; Pothuri, B.; Cibula, D.; McCourt, C.; Raspagliesi, F.; Shahin, M. S.; Gill, S. E.; Monk, B. J.; Buscema, J.; Herzog, T. J.; Copeland, L. J.; Tian, M.; He, Z.; Stevens, S.; Zografos, E.; Coleman, R. L.; Powell, M. A., Dostarlimab for Primary Advanced or Recurrent Endometrial Cancer. *The New England journal of medicine* **2023**, *388* (23), 2145-2158.
95. Emons, G.; Mustea, A.; Tempfer, C., Tamoxifen and Endometrial Cancer: A Janus-Headed Drug. *Cancers* **2020**, *12* (9).
96. van Weelden, W. J.; Massuger, L.; Pijnenborg, J. M. A.; Romano, A., Anti-estrogen Treatment in Endometrial Cancer: A Systematic Review. *Front Oncol* **2019**, *9*, 359.
97. Chitoran, E.; Rotaru, V.; Mitroiu, M. N.; Durdu, C. E.; Bohiltea, R. E.; Ionescu, S. O.; Gelal, A.; Cirimbei, C.; Alecu, M.; Simion, L., Navigating Fertility Preservation Options in Gynecological Cancers: A Comprehensive Review. *Cancers* **2024**, *16* (12).
98. Di Nisio, V.; Daponte, N.; Messini, C.; Anifandis, G.; Antonouli, S., Oncofertility and Fertility Preservation for Women with Gynecological Malignancies: Where Do We Stand Today? *Biomolecules* **2024**, *14* (8).
99. Gonçalves, V.; Ferreira, P. L.; Saleh, M.; Tamargo, C.; Quinn, G. P., Perspectives of Young Women With Gynecologic Cancers on Fertility and Fertility Preservation: A Systematic Review. *The oncologist* **2022**, *27* (3), e251-e264.
100. Cavalcante, M. B.; Sampaio, O. G. M.; Câmara, F. E. A.; Schneider, A.; de Ávila, B. M.; Proszek, J.; Masternak, M. M.; Campos, A. R., Ovarian aging in humans: potential strategies for extending reproductive lifespan. *GeroScience* **2023**, *45* (4), 2121-2133.
101. Hickey, M.; Basu, P.; Sassarini, J.; Stegmann, M. E.; Weiderpass, E.; Nakawala Chilowa, K.; Yip, C. H.; Partridge, A. H.; Brennan, D. J., Managing menopause after cancer. *Lancet (London, England)* **2024**, *403* (10430), 984-996.
102. Zhu, D.; Chung, H. F.; Dobson, A. J.; Pandeya, N.; Giles, G. G.; Bruinsma, F.; Brunner, E. J.; Kuh, D.; Hardy, R.; Avis, N. E.; Gold, E. B.; Derby, C. A.; Matthews,

- K. A.; Cade, J. E.; Greenwood, D. C.; Demakakos, P.; Brown, D. E.; Sievert, L. L.; Anderson, D.; Hayashi, K.; Lee, J. S.; Mizunuma, H.; Tillin, T.; Simonsen, M. K.; Adami, H. O.; Weiderpass, E.; Mishra, G. D., Age at natural menopause and risk of incident cardiovascular disease: a pooled analysis of individual patient data. *The Lancet. Public health* **2019**, *4* (11), e553-e564.
103. Nappi, R. E.; Chedraui, P.; Lambrinoudaki, I.; Simoncini, T., Menopause: a cardiometabolic transition. *The lancet. Diabetes & endocrinology* **2022**, *10* (6), 442-456.
104. Lyon, A. R.; Dent, S.; Stanway, S.; Earl, H.; Brezden-Masley, C.; Cohen-Solal, A.; Tocchetti, C. G.; Moslehi, J. J.; Groarke, J. D.; Bergler-Klein, J.; Khoo, V.; Tan, L. L.; Anker, M. S.; von Haehling, S.; Maack, C.; Pudil, R.; Barac, A.; Thavendiranathan, P.; Ky, B.; Neilan, T. G.; Belenkov, Y.; Rosen, S. D.; Iakobishvili, Z.; Sverdlov, A. L.; Hajjar, L. A.; Macedo, A. V. S.; Manisty, C.; Ciardiello, F.; Farmakis, D.; de Boer, R. A.; Skouri, H.; Suter, T. M.; Cardinale, D.; Witteles, R. M.; Fradley, M. G.; Herrmann, J.; Cornell, R. F.; Wechelaker, A.; Mauro, M. J.; Milojkovic, D.; de Lavallade, H.; Ruschitzka, F.; Coats, A. J. S.; Seferovic, P. M.; Chioncel, O.; Thum, T.; Bauersachs, J.; Andres, M. S.; Wright, D. J.; López-Fernández, T.; Plummer, C.; Lenihan, D., Baseline cardiovascular risk assessment in cancer patients scheduled to receive cardiotoxic cancer therapies: a position statement and new risk assessment tools from the Cardio-Oncology Study Group of the Heart Failure Association of the European Society of Cardiology in collaboration with the International Cardio-Oncology Society. *European journal of heart failure* **2020**, *22* (11), 1945-1960.
105. Albin, A.; Pennesi, G.; Donatelli, F.; Cammarota, R.; De Flora, S.; Noonan, D. M., Cardiotoxicity of anticancer drugs: the need for cardio-oncology and cardio-oncological prevention. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* **2010**, *102* (1), 14-25.
106. Alberts, D. S.; Garcia, D. J., Safety aspects of pegylated liposomal doxorubicin in patients with cancer. *Drugs* **1997**, *54 Suppl 4*, 30-5.
107. Yu, X.; Ruan, Y.; Huang, X.; Dou, L.; Lan, M.; Cui, J.; Chen, B.; Gong, H.; Wang, Q.; Yan, M.; Sun, S.; Qiu, Q.; Zhang, X.; Man, Y.; Tang, W.; Li, J.; Shen, T., Dexrazoxane ameliorates doxorubicin-induced cardiotoxicity by inhibiting both apoptosis and necroptosis in cardiomyocytes. *Biochemical and biophysical research communications* **2020**, *523* (1), 140-146.
108. Yuan, Z.; Zhang, Y.; Cao, D.; Shen, K.; Li, Q.; Zhang, G.; Wu, X.; Cui, M.; Yue, Y.; Cheng, W.; Wang, L.; Qu, P.; Tao, G.; Hou, J.; Sun, L.; Meng, Y.; Li, G.; Li, C.; Shi, H.; Chen, Y., Pegylated liposomal doxorubicin in patients with epithelial ovarian cancer. *Journal of ovarian research* **2021**, *14* (1), 12.
109. Li, X. R.; Zhu, Y.; Zhang, G. N.; Huang, J. M.; Pei, L. X., The impact of Pegylated liposomal doxorubicin in recurrent ovarian cancer: an updated meta-analysis of

randomized clinical trials. *Journal of ovarian research* **2021**, *14* (1), 42.

110. More, L. A.; Lane, S.; Asnani, A., 5-FU Cardiotoxicity: Vasospasm, Myocarditis, and Sudden Death. *Current cardiology reports* **2021**, *23* (3), 17.

Captions and Legends

Table 1. Participant Characteristics. *Abbreviations: CVD: cardiovascular disease. ^a malignant neoplasm of other and unspecified female genital organs, or malignant neoplasm of placenta.*

Table 2. Standardized Mortality Ratios in Patients with Gynecological Cancers. The SMRs were estimated as the ratios of observed to expected number of deaths. The observed values represented the number of CVD deaths in patients with gynecological cancers, and the expected values represented the number of individuals who died of CVD in the US general population, with a similar distribution of age, sex, race, and calendar year. *Abbreviations: SMR: standardized mortality ratio; CI: confidence interval; ^a * suggested that the 95% confidence interval did not cross 1.0 and the SMR was significant. ^b Reference population: the general US population based on the 2000 US standard population, Patients with multiple primary tumors were excluded automatically.*

Table 3. Univariate and Multivariate Analysis for CVD Death in Patients with Gynecological Cancers. *Abbreviations: CVD: cardiovascular disease; HR: hazard ratio; CI: confidence interval. ^a malignant neoplasm of other and unspecified female genital organs, or malignant neoplasm of placenta.*

Table S1. Cumulative Incidence of CVD Mortality. *Abbreviations: CVD: cardiovascular disease.*

Table S2. Average Annual Percentage Change of CVD Death in Patients with Gynecological Cancers. AAPC was a summary measure that used a single number to describe the average APCs over multiple years, even when the changes in trends were indicated by the joinpoint model. It was computed as a weighted average of the APCs from the joinpoint model, with weights equal to the length of the APC interval. *Abbreviations: CVD: cardiovascular disease; AAPC: average annual percentage change; CI: confidence interval; ^a* indicated that 95% confidence interval does not cross 0 and the AAPC was significant.*

Table S3. Participant Characteristics in the Discovery and Validation Cohorts. *Abbreviations: CVD: cardiovascular disease.*

Figure 1. Distribution of the Most Common Causes of Death in Patients with Gynecological Cancers.

Figure 2. Standardized Mortality Ratios in Patients with Gynecological Cancers by (A) Age at Diagnosis, (B) Attained Age, and (C) Time After Diagnosis.

Figure 3. Trends in CVD Death by Calendar Years (2010–2020) among Survivors Diagnosed with Gynecological Cancers by Cancer Types. *Abbreviations: CVD: cardiovascular disease; AAPC: average annual percentage change;*

Figure 4. Cumulative Mortality for CVD in Patients with Gynecological Cancers. Cumulative mortality for CVD among gynecological cancer survivors, by age at diagnosis (A), race (B), stage (C), grade (D), marital status at diagnosis (E), cancer types (F), and initial treatment regimens, such as surgery (G), chemotherapy (H), and radiation (I). *Abbreviations: CVD: cardiovascular disease.*

Figure 5. The Nomogram Prediction Model for CVD in Patients with Gynecological Cancers. This nomogram could predict the risk of cardiovascular disease over 10, 15, and 20 years in gynecological cancer patients, using the Fine and Gray competing risk model. *Abbreviations: CVD: cardiovascular disease.*

Figure S1. Cumulative Mortality for Cancer-Specific Death and CVD in Patients with Gynecological Cancers. *Abbreviations: CVD: cardiovascular disease.*

Figure S2. ROC Curves for the Nomogram of CVD in the Discovery (A) and Validation Cohort (B). *Abbreviations: CVD: cardiovascular disease; ROC: receiver operator characteristic.*

Figure S3. Calibration plots for the Nomogram of CVD in the Discovery (A) and Validation Cohort (B). The perfect predictions were shown by the 45° line, demonstrating a high level of similarity between the predicted and actual CVD death rates. *Abbreviations: CVD: cardiovascular disease.*

Figure S4. Decision Curve Analyses for the Nomogram of CVD in the Discovery (A-C) and Validation Cohort (D-F). The green line suggested that patients should not take the necessary measures, while the red line demonstrated that all patients should. The y-axis represented the net benefit by adding benefit points and subtracting harm points. Our findings indicated the net benefit offered by the nomogram (blue line) in the discovery (A-C) and validation (D-F) cohorts. *Abbreviations: CVD: cardiovascular disease.*

Table 1. Participant Characteristics.

Characteristics	Gynecological cancer	Ovarian cancer	Uterine cancer	Cervical cancer	Vaginal cancer	Vulvar cancer	Other ^a
Age at diagnosis							
<40	35,474 (8.9%)	7,222 (7.6%)	8,686 (4.1%)	17,738 (28%)	870 (5.3%)	160 (3.8%)	798 (8.3%)
40-65	152,431 (38%)	33,772 (36%)	79,842 (38%)	29,877 (47%)	4,935 (30%)	1,234 (30%)	2,771 (29%)
≥65	211,494 (53%)	53,569 (57%)	122,136 (58%)	16,410 (26%)	10,565 (65%)	2,782 (67%)	6,032 (63%)
Attained age							
<40	15,093 (3.8%)	3,829 (4.0%)	3,158 (1.5%)	7,286 (11%)	301 (1.8%)	66 (1.6%)	453 (4.7%)
40-65	99,161 (25%)	23,758 (25%)	39,024 (19%)	30,477 (48%)	3,048 (19%)	808 (19%)	2,046 (21%)
≥65	285,145 (71%)	66,976 (71%)	168,482 (80%)	26,262 (41%)	13,021 (80%)	3,302 (79%)	7,102 (74%)
Race							
White	321,910 (81%)	78,069 (83%)	169,829 (81%)	48,645 (76%)	14,306 (87%)	3,249 (78%)	7,812 (81%)
Black	39,965 (10%)	7,677 (8.1%)	20,905 (9.9%)	8,555 (13%)	1,345 (8.2%)	621 (15%)	862 (9.0%)
Other	37,524 (9.4%)	8,817 (9.3%)	19,930 (9.5%)	6,825 (11%)	719 (4.4%)	306 (7.3%)	927 (9.7%)
Stage							
Localized	202,153 (51%)	18,139 (19%)	142,407 (68%)	29,187 (46%)	9,741 (60%)	1,288 (31%)	1,391 (14%)
Regional	79,546 (20%)	10,416 (11%)	37,938 (18%)	23,134 (36%)	4,737 (29%)	1,628 (39%)	1,693 (18%)
Distant metastasis	98,995 (25%)	59,970 (63%)	22,616 (11%)	8,784 (14%)	990 (6.0%)	834 (20%)	5,801 (60%)
None/unknown	18,705 (4.7%)	6,038 (6.4%)	7,703 (3.7%)	2,920 (4.6%)	902 (5.5%)	426 (10%)	716 (7.5%)
Grade							
Grade I	7,927 (1.8%)	9,654 (10%)	39,684 (19%)	16,202 (25%)	4,048 (25%)	910 (22%)	429 (4.5%)
Grade II	72,608 (18%)	24,047 (25%)	28,034 (13%)	15,631 (24%)	1,760 (11%)	1,059 (25%)	2,077 (22%)
Grade III	25,162 (6.3%)	11,411 (12%)	10,542 (5.0%)	1,341 (2.1%)	119 (0.7%)	133 (3.2%)	1,616 (17%)
Grade IV	158,411 (40%)	43,955 (46%)	74,133 (35%)	25,496 (40%)	7,679 (47%)	1,818 (44%)	5,330 (56%)
Unknown	256 (6.1%)	149 (1.6%)	256 (6.1%)	149 (1.6%)	256 (6.1%)	149 (1.6%)	149 (1.6%)
Marital status							
Married	191,226 (48%)	45,557 (48%)	105,911 (50%)	27,039 (42%)	6,281 (38%)	1,555 (37%)	4,883 (51%)
Unmarried/Single/Divorced	187,879 (47%)	45,164 (48%)	94,140 (45%)	33,243 (52%)	8,687 (53%)	2,309 (55%)	4,336 (45%)
None/unknown	20,294 (5.1%)	3,842 (4.1%)	10,613 (5.0%)	3,743 (5.8%)	1,402 (8.6%)	312 (7.5%)	382 (4.0%)
Year at diagnosis							
2000-2004	83,169 (21%)	22,777 (24%)	38,720 (18%)	16,010 (25%)	3,520 (22%)	996 (24%)	1,146 (12%)
2005-2009	88,677 (22%)	22,995 (24%)	44,377 (21%)	15,316 (24%)	3,609 (22%)	953 (23%)	1,427 (15%)
2010-2014	98,200 (25%)	22,898 (24%)	53,410 (25%)	14,707 (23%)	3,980 (24%)	1,027 (25%)	2,178 (23%)
2015-2020	129,353 (32%)	25,893 (27%)	74,157 (35%)	17,992 (28%)	5,261 (32%)	1,200 (29%)	4,850 (51%)
Surgery							
None/unknown	79,176 (20%)	23,112 (24%)	19,749 (9.4%)	28,042 (44%)	3,131 (19%)	2,783 (67%)	2,359 (25%)
Yes	320,223 (80%)	71,451 (76%)	190,915 (91%)	35,983 (56%)	13,239 (81%)	1,393 (33%)	7,242 (75%)
Radiation							
None/unknown	301,928 (76%)	93,153 (99%)	156,001 (74%)	29,899 (47%)	12,213 (75%)	1,398 (33%)	9,264 (96%)
Yes	97,471 (24%)	1,410 (1.5%)	54,663 (26%)	34,126 (53%)	4,157 (25%)	2,778 (67%)	337 (3.5%)
Chemotherapy							
None/unknown	257,678 (65%)	33,607 (36%)	170,596 (81%)	34,566 (54%)	13,833 (85%)	2,272 (54%)	2,804 (29%)
Yes	141,721 (35%)	60,956 (64%)	40,068 (19%)	29,459 (46%)	2,537 (15%)	1,904 (46%)	6,797 (71%)
Treatment							
Surgery only	177,046 (44%)	19,752 (21%)	122,569 (58%)	22,272 (35%)	10,566 (65%)	543 (13%)	1,344 (14%)
Radiation only	7,876 (2.0%)	121 (0.1%)	2,849 (1.4%)	3,613 (5.6%)	553 (3.4%)	676 (16%)	64 (0.7%)
Chemotherapy only	14,378 (3.6%)	9,172 (9.7%)	2,655 (1.3%)	1,478 (2.3%)	102 (0.6%)	116 (2.8%)	855 (8.9%)
Chemotherapy and radiation	21,889 (5.5%)	233 (0.2%)	1,370 (0.7%)	17,794 (28%)	1,071 (6.5%)	1,320 (32%)	101 (1.1%)
Surgery and radiation	37,723 (9.4%)	148 (0.2%)	32,303 (15%)	3,524 (5.5%)	1,309 (8.0%)	382 (9.1%)	57 (0.6%)
Surgery and chemotherapy	75,471 (19%)	50,643 (54%)	17,902 (8.5%)	992 (1.5%)	140 (0.9%)	68 (1.6%)	5,726 (60%)
Surgery, radiation and chemotherapy	29,983 (7.5%)	908 (1.0%)	18,141 (8.6%)	9,195 (14%)	1,224 (7.5%)	400 (9.6%)	115 (1.2%)
None/unknown	35,033 (8.8%)	13,586 (14%)	12,875 (6.1%)	5,157 (8.1%)	1,405 (8.6%)	671 (16%)	1,339 (14%)
Cause of death							
Alive	236,258 (59%)	36,594 (39%)	144,536 (69%)	40,074 (63%)	8,484 (52%)	1,619 (39%)	4,951 (52%)
CVD	16,371 (4.1%)	2,569 (2.7%)	10,178 (4.8%)	1,708 (2.7%)	1,434 (8.8%)	271 (6.5%)	211 (2.2%)
Cancer-index	117,551 (29%)	50,821 (54%)	38,432 (18%)	18,362 (29%)	4,096 (25%)	1,848 (44%)	3,992 (42%)
Cancer-non-index	6,984 (1.7%)	1,021 (1.1%)	4,156 (2.0%)	1,040 (1.6%)	550 (3.4%)	116 (2.8%)	101 (1.1%)
None-CVD other cause	22,235 (5.6%)	3,558 (3.8%)	13,362 (6.3%)	2,841 (4.4%)	1,806 (11%)	322 (7.7%)	346 (3.6%)

Abbreviations: CVD: cardiovascular disease

^a malignant neoplasm of other and unspecified female genital organs, or malignant neoplasm of placenta.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.13.24315340>; this version posted October 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 2. Standardized Mortality Ratios in Patients with Gynecological Cancers.

Characteristics	Observed	Expected	SMR (95% CI) ^{a, b}
Age at diagnosis			
< 45	383	173	2.218 (2.001-2.451) *
45-54	1024	633	1.618 (1.521-1.721) *
55-64	2616	1974	1.325 (1.275-1.377) *
65-74	4103	3886	1.056 (1.024-1.088) *
≥ 75	7311	7253	1.008 (0.985-1.031)
Race			
White	12857	12131	1.06 (1.042-1.078) *
Black	1722	1217	1.415 (1.348-1.483) *
Other	858	571	1.502 (1.404-1.606) *
Stage			
Localized	5524	5591	0.988 (0.962-1.014)
Regional	2500	1979	1.263 (1.214-1.314) *
Distant metastasis	1166	977	1.194 (1.126-1.264) *
Marital status			
Unmarried/Single/Divorced	9132	7293	1.252 (1.227-1.278) *
Married	5412	5950	0.910 (0.885-0.934)
Grade			
Grade II	4056	3655	1.110 (1.076-1.145) *
Grade III	3030	2664	1.137 (1.097-1.179) *
Grade IV	686	705	0.973 (0.902-1.049) *
Year at diagnosis			
2000-2004	6646	6036	1.101 (1.075-1.128) *
2005-2009	4464	4052	1.102 (1.069-1.134) *
2010-2014	2925	2620	1.116 (1.076-1.158) *
2015-2020	1402	1211	1.158 (1.098-1.22) *
Cancer type			
Gynecological cancer	15437	13919	1.109 (1.092-1.127) *
Ovarian cancer	2123	2233	0.951 (0.911-0.992)
Uterine cancer	9711	9219	1.053 (1.032-1.074) *
Cervical cancer	1632	1032	1.582 (1.506-1.660) *
Vaginal cancer	257	165	1.560 (1.375-1.762) *
Vulvar cancer	1387	968	1.432 (1.358-1.51) *
Surgery			
None/unknown	3329	1451	2.294 (2.217-2.374) *
Yes	12108	12468	0.971 (0.954-0.989)
Chemotherapy			
None/unknown	12568	11069	1.135 (1.116-1.155) *
Yes	2869	2850	1.007 (0.97-1.044)
Radiation			
None/unknown	11329	10521	1.077 (1.057-1.097) *
Yes	4108	3398	1.209 (1.172-1.247) *

The SMRs were estimated as the ratios of observed to expected number of deaths. The observed values represented the number of CVD deaths in patients with gynecological cancers, and the expected values represented the number of individuals who died of CVD in the US general population, with a similar distribution of age, sex, race, and calendar year.

Abbreviations: SMR: standardized mortality ratio; CI: confidence interval; ^a* suggested that the 95% confidence interval did not cross 1.0 and the SMR was significant. ^b Reference population: the general US population based on the 2000 US standard population, Patients with multiple primary tumors were excluded automatically.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.13.24315240>; this version posted October 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Table 3. Univariate and Multivariate Analysis for CVD Death in Patients with Gynecological Cancers.


Characteristic	Univariate analysis			Multivariate analysis		
	HR	(95% CI)	<i>P</i> value	HR	(95% CI)	<i>P</i> value
Age at diagnosis			<0.001			
<40		ref			ref	
40-65	3.46	(2.96, 4.05)		3.71	(3.17, 4.36)	<0.001
≥65	15.2	(13.0, 17.7)		15.3	(13.1, 17.9)	<0.001
Race			<0.001			
White		ref			ref	
Black	1.16	(1.11, 1.22)		1.12	(1.07, 1.18)	<0.001
Other	0.62	(0.58, 0.67)		0.81	(0.75, 0.86)	<0.001
Stage			<0.001			
Localized		ref			ref	
Regional	0.98	(0.94, 1.02)		0.97	(0.93, 1.01)	0.200
Distant metastasis	0.52	(0.50, 0.54)		0.48	(0.45, 0.51)	<0.001
Grade			<0.001			
Grade I		ref			ref	
Grade II	1.05	(1.01, 1.09)		1.1	(1.06, 1.15)	<0.001
Grade III	0.83	(0.80, 0.86)	<0.001	1.01	(0.96, 1.06)	0.700
Grade IV	0.59	(0.55, 0.63)		0.79	(0.73, 0.84)	<0.001
Marital status						
Married		ref			ref	
Unmarried/Single/Divorced	1.82	(1.76, 1.88)		1.57	(1.52, 1.62)	<0.001
Cancer type			<0.001			
Ovarian cancer		ref			ref	
Uterine cancer	1.9	(1.82, 1.98)		1.09	(1.03, 1.15)	0.003
Cervical cancer	0.98	(0.92, 1.04)		0.93	(0.87, 1.00)	0.046
Vaginal cancer	3.39	(3.18, 3.62)		1.56	(1.45, 1.68)	<0.001
Vulvar cancer	2.48	(2.19, 2.81)		1.12	(0.98, 1.28)	0.087
Other ^a	0.94	(0.82, 1.08)		0.9	(0.78, 1.04)	0.200
Surgery			<0.001			
None/unknown		ref			ref	
Yes	0.72	(0.69, 0.74)		0.64	(0.61, 0.67)	<0.001
Chemotherapy			<0.001			
None/unknown		ref			ref	
Yes	0.41	(0.40, 0.43)		0.59	(0.56, 0.62)	<0.001
Radiation			<0.001			
None/unknown		ref			ref	
Yes	1.07	(1.03, 1.11)		0.98	(0.94, 1.02)	0.400

Abbreviations: CVD: cardiovascular disease; HR: hazard ratio; CI: confidence interval.


^a malignant neoplasm of other and unspecified female genital organs, or malignant neoplasm of placenta.

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.13.24315340>; this version posted October 14, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.


A





B



C



A**B****C**