Research Article *Open Access*

Journal of Clinical Oncology & Advanced Therapy

ISSN: 3070-3786

DOI: doi.org/10.63721/26JCOAT0119

Ecological MHT Practice: ESM Pathways to Precision Women's Health

Dolores Catherino

Independent Researcher, USA

Citation: *Dolores Catherino (2026 Ecological MHT Practice: ESM Pathways to Precision Women's Health. J of Clin Onco & Adv Thpy 2(2), 01-13. WMJ/JCOAT-119*

***Corresponding author**: Dolores Catherino, Independent Researcher, USA.

Submitted: 13.03.2026 **Accepted**: 17.03.2026 **Published**: 15.04.2026

Executive Summary

This article applies the Evidence-Selective Medicine (ESM) framework to trace how E3N and synthetic-dominated meta-analyses crystallized MHT breast cancer dogma, then reanalyzes those signals through formulation-stratified cohort evidence and mechanistic pharmacology, and concludes by proposing an ecological clinical paradigm that integrates competing risks, bioidentical MHT and structured shared decision-making tools for frontline clinicians.

The FDA's November 2025 announcement initiated the removal of black-box warnings for breast cancer, CVD and dementia from "menopausal hormone therapy (MHT)" or "hormone replacement therapy (HRT)" products. One exception, "systemic estrogen-alone products", left intact the boxed warning for endometrial cancer risk with systemic estrogen-only products in women with a uterus. In February 2026, the FDA issued label approvals for six leading MHT formulations (Prometrium, Divigel, Cenestin, Enjuvia, Estring, Bijuva), with black box warnings removed as well as "lowest effective dose for the shortest amount of time" language.21 These regulatory actions mark an institutional inflection point.

However, the notion that "estrogen feeds breast cancer" lingers on, stemming from a mechanistically anomalous artifact: the E3N paradox, in which transdermal estradiol alone (tE2, RR 1.29, 95% CI 1.02–1.65) showed higher breast cancer risk than tE2 + micronized progesterone (RR 0.96, 0.62–1.49) [11].

Evidence provides no direct association between bioidentical transdermal estradiol (tE2) + micronized progesterone (MP) and breast cancer. Synthetic progestins produce risk signals in pooled analyses, while bioidentical formulations display null or protective signals in observational cohorts. Risk-stratified continuation in newly diagnosed low-risk HR+ disease requires tumor biology, competing risks, and patient values assessment (see Toolkit 4.2–4.3) [1,9,11,22].

Within an ecological paradigm, menopause is viewed as systemic endocrine insufficiency requiring restoration, not merely as a cluster of vasomotor or urogenital symptoms. This reconciles gynecology's focus

on hormonal balance with oncology's risk-oriented framework.

Bioidentical MHT demonstrates systemic superiority with approximate 5–10% absolute reduction in major cardiovascular events, 2–5% in cardiovascular mortality, and 5–8% in major fractures over 10 years in early initiators (<60 or <10 years since menopause) compared with non-users in contemporary cohort and trial data.19,25 This substantially outweighs the 0–0.5% absolute breast cancer mortality reduction associated with aromatase inhibitors in low-risk disease—gains achieved at the cost of increased cardiovascular events (+7–12%), fractures (+10–15%), and profound quality-of-life deterioration [17,19,12,14].

Part I: Evidence-Selective Medicine Framework Summary

The Six Nested Levels: From Bias to Institutional Dogma

Evidence-selective medicine examines how discrete methodological flaws propagate through institutional systems, ultimately forming entrenched therapeutic paradigms resistant to change.5

Methodological Asymmetry: Equivalent methodological flaws are accepted when outcomes support prevailing narratives (E3N's paradox dismissed) but become grounds for rejection when they contradict established doctrine.

Reporting Asymmetry: Biologically implausible or statistically marginal results are amplified in abstracts and press summaries ("estrogen increases risk"), while neutral or protective results are buried in supplementary tables.

Category Error: Heterogeneous exposures are aggregated into misleading categories, as in the E3N "estrogen alone" cohort that conflates pure transdermal estradiol users with those previously exposed to synthetic progestins.

Semantic Obfuscation: Imprecise terminology obscures mechanistically crucial differences, as when the term "progestogen" conflates synthetic progestins with bioidentical progesterone.

Institutional Commitment: Guidelines recycle prior iterations, sustaining selfreferential authority. Any substantive revision would require acknowledging systemic failure, generating organizational resistance.

Ethical Asymmetry: Disclosure practices within informed consent frameworks are inconsistently applied, often excluding formulation-specific risks and systemic advantages in favor of broad class-based cautions.

Table 1: ESM Cascade in MHT Breast Cancer Dogma

ESM Level5	MHT Application	Persistence Mechanism
1	E3N paradox tolerated despite biological implausibility	Confirms "estrogen feeds cancer" paradigm
2	Headlines emphasize tE2 alone RR 1.29; marginalize protective MP RR 0.96	Selective amplification
3	E3N "Estrogen alone" category includes prior synthetic exposure history	Misclassification as pure exposure
4	"Progestogen" erases synthetic vs. bioidentical distinction	Semantic uniformity
5	2019 Lancet → 2020–2024 metas → guidelines cite chain	Self-referential loop
6	Consent emphasizes "MHT increases breast cancer" without formulation specificity and preventive benefits	Categorical prohibition

Evidence Dissection

This section does not dispute residual uncertainty, but it demonstrates that when exposures are correctly classified by formulation and route, the risk gradient maps primarily to synthetic progestins rather than to estradiol or bioidentical progesterone.

The E3N Paradox: Mechanistically anomalous artifact

E3N reanalysis hypothesizes methodological artifacts explaining the paradox, pending full individual-level sensitivity analyses that adjust for earlier synthetic progestin use and for how risk changes over time. The E3N cohort (n=80,377, 2,354 breast cancer cases) reported a finding that conflicts with basic pharmacology: transdermal estradiol alone demonstrated RR 1.29 (95% CI 1.02–1.65) while transdermal estradiol combined with micronized progesterone showed RR 0.96 (0.62–1.49) [11].

This finding contradicts breast tissue pharmacology. Progesterone constrains estrogen-driven proliferation via PR-A mediated pathways, lobular differentiation, and ERα downregulation. Physiologically, micronized progesterone should mitigate, not reverse, estradiol's impact. The apparent paradox is plausibly explained by unadjusted confounders: ~25% of 'E-alone' women had prior synthetic progestin exposure, plus surveillance bias among post-hysterectomy users. Modeling confirms these factors alone could elevate a biologically neutral tE2 signal to the observed RR 1.29.

E3N Methodological Flaws

- Prior Synthetic Contamination: Women classified as "transdermal estradiol alone" had high rates of prior combined MHT use with synthetic progestins (known RR 1.4– 1.7), which E3N demonstrated independently increased breast cancer risk. No adjustment for cumulative progestin-years was performed [11].
- Selection Bias: Women who selected estrogen-alone regimens were typically posthysterectomy or otherwise at low baseline risk for endometrial malignancy, a profile that should bias outcomes toward fewer cancers but failed to do so. Additionally, increased surveillance and screening in this population likely boosted diagnostic yield, inflating apparent risk signals.
- Clean Comparator: Women starting on transdermal estradiol plus micronized progesterone were generally new to hormone therapy, initiated directly on a combined regimen for endometrial safety, resulting in a more clearly defined exposure that captures progesterone's protective influence.
- ESM Level 1: The paradox was not only tolerated but leveraged to reinforce "estrogen risk" narratives, precisely because it echoed post-WHI beliefs, despite biological implausibility.

Table 2: E3N Exposure Misclassification

Group	Reported RR (95% CI)	Uncontrolled Confounder	True Signal
tE2 Alone	1.29 (1.02–1.65) ↑11	Prior synthetic progestins + surveillance bias	Artifact
tE2 + Micronized Progesterone (MP)	0.96 (0.62–1.49)11	Cleaner incident users	Null/ Protective1

Prior synthetic contamination (~25% E-alone users; synthetics RR 1.4–1.7, unadjusted progestin-years) + post-hysterectomy surveillance bias. Sensitivity modeling: 20–30% contamination at RR 1.6 elevates clean tE2 (RR 1.0) → observed 1 [29].

Norwegian Contrast: Biologically Coherent Hierarchy

A 2024 Norwegian population-based cohort study (Støer/Abedini et al., n=1.3M) found that oral estradiol combined with daily progestin was associated with the highest breast cancer risk (HR 2.42, 95% CI 2.31-2.54), with drug specific hazard ratios ranging from approximately 1.6 to 2.7 across commonly used combination products [1].

In contrast, hazard ratios for transdermal estradiol fell in an intermediate range (~1.2–1.5), but this

"transdermal" category was small, underpowered, and pooled prior/mixed synthetic progestin exposure with women starting transdermal estradiol for the first time, under conditions of heightened mammographic surveillance. As a result, the transdermal HR likely reflects residual synthetic progestin carry-over and detection bias rather than a clean, mechanistically coherent tE2-alone signal. Taken together with E3N's tE2+micronized progesterone neutrality (RR 0.96) and the UK QResearch analysis, the Norwegian registry reinforces a biologically coherent hierarchy in which synthetic progestins emerge as the primary risk driver, while bioidentical transdermal estradiol—particularly when combined with micronized progesterone—remains null or potentially protective.

Complementing the E3N RR 0.96 for tE2+micronized progesterone and Norwegian registry's intermediate transdermal signals, the UK QResearch analysis (Vinogradova et al., BMJ 2020) provides formulation-stratified evidence of lower risk with dydrogesterone (OR 1.24) than other progestogens, with past/short combined therapy null (OR ~1.0)—data sparsity limits micronized progesterone precision, but signals consistently trend toward synthetic variation as the primary risk discriminator rather than class-effect estrogen [22].

Table 3: Key Studies—Formulation-Specific Breast Cancer Risks and Limitations

Study	Formulation	n / % of Cohort	RR/HR/OR (95% CI)	Key Limitations
E3N (2008)	tE2 alone	n=80,377 (2,354 cases)	RR 1.29 (1.02–1.65)11	Prior synthetic progestin contamination; surveillance bias
E3N (2008)	tE2 + micronized progesterone	n=80,377 (2,354 cases)	RR 0.96 (0.62–1.49)11	Cleaner incident users; protective signal
Norway (2024)	Oral E2 + synthetic progestin	n=1.3M	HR ~1.2–1.51	Underpowered, prior progestin use, surveillance bias
UK QResearch (2020)	Bioidentical E2 + dydrogesterone	n>2M woman-years	n>2M woman-years	Underpowered subgroups; dydrogesterone (not MP) shows lowest combined risk OR 1.24; formulation-stratified signals synthetic variation but limited MP data.
Lancet Meta (2019)	Estrogen + synthetic progestogen (>90%)	143,887 cases	RR 1.60 (1.52–1.69)9	Synthetic-dominated; MP <5% (underpowered)
Lancet Meta (2019)	Estrogen + MP/dydrogesterone	143,887 cases (<5%)	RR ~1.2–1.49	Wide CIs; data sparsity

ESM Level 3 resolution: When category errors are corrected and exposures accurately classified, synthetic progestins emerge as the primary risk driver.

Table 4: E3N Artifact vs. Norwegian Risk Hierarchy

Exposure	E3N (2008)11	Norway 2024 (n=1.3M)1	Interpretation
tE2 Alone	RR 1.29 (1.02–1.65) ↑ artifact	Not isolated (sparse transdermal data)	Pharmacy data power-limited; E3N recall bias
tE2 + MP	RR 0.96 (0.62–1.49) null	Pooled transdermal (~1.2-1.5↑)	Intermediate; oral E2 contamination possible
Oral E2 + Synthetic	RR 1.5–2.4 ↑ (medrogestone 2.74, chlormadinone 2.02)	RR 2.23 (2.14–2.33) NETA ↑↑	Highest risk confirmed
Overall HT	Not stratified	RR 1.45 (1.41–1.49) ↑	Synthetic-dominated pooled estimate

The 2019 Lancet Meta-Analysis: Category Error Cascade

The Collaborative Group on Hormonal Factors in Breast Cancer pooled data from 58 studies (n=143,887 breast cancer cases) and asserted that "every MHT type, except vaginal estrogens, was associated with excess breast cancer risk".9 This broad conclusion masks critical data limitations:

- Micronized progesterone underrepresentation: Users of micronized progesterone (MP) constituted <5% of the total dataset, providing inadequate statistical power for robust, independent risk assessment
- Subgroup analysis: Estrogen combined with micronized progesterone or dydrogesterone yielded lower relative risks (~1.2–1.4) than synthetic progestins (1.6– 2.3), though wide confidence intervals precluded statistical separation due to sparse case numbers in the MP subgroup
- Pooled RR estimate: The composite estrogen + progestogen MHT relative risk stood at 1.60 (95% CI 1.52–1.69), reflecting near-total dominance by synthetic progestins that comprised over 90% of the combined-therapy cohort

ESM Levels 2–4 in sequence:

- Reporting: Emphasizes uniform risk across "all systemic types" despite acknowledging micronized progesterone data limitations elsewhere
- Category: "Estrogen + progestogen" lumps mechanistically heterogeneous agents into a single misleading class
- Semantics: "Progestogen" erases synthetic vs. bioidentical differences essential for clinical interpretation

Reinforcing Cascade:

Across major meta-analyses, cohorts using micronized progesterone consistently lack the statistical power for precise subgroup risk estimates, yet their effect direction reliably differs from synthetic progestins—trending toward null or reduced relative risks rather than the elevated 1.6–2.3 range seen with medroxyprogesterone acetate and similar synthetic agents.

The synthetic progestin-dominated 2019 Lancet meta-analysis fueled 2020–2024 reviews and guidelines (USPSTF, NICE, ACOG), maintaining estrogen+progestogen risk emphasis while downgrading bioidentical neutrality signals (E3N MP RR 0.96; Norwegian data) as
Preliminary [9,11,13].

The MHT debate shouldn't deny uncertainty but redirect it—from categorical 'MHT cautionary restriction' to targeted questions about how specific formulations, routes, timing, and individual risks differentially impact breast cancer versus cardiovascular/fracture benefits.

MHT evidence gaps aren't about 'safety vs danger' but precise unknowns: sparse micronized progesterone cohorts limiting bioidentical risk precision; BRCA/high-risk subgroup data deficits; and competing-risk

analyses balancing breast cancer against CV protection, fractures, mortality, and quality of life benefits.

Part III: Ecological Paradigm Shift

Anatomic Reductionism vs. Ecological Medicine

Menopause represents a unique "orphan" endocrine insufficiency as the only major hormone deficiency without unified clinical ownership. It occupies a care fragmentation gap across OBGYN (symptom relief), oncology (risk restriction), primary care (prevention), and geriatrics (competing risks). Unlike hypothyroidism's standardized protocols or male hypogonadism's dedicated infrastructure, menopause receives disjointed symptom-focused care rather than systemic restoration. Evidence-based tools now empower women, gynecologists, and primary clinicians to prioritize systemic hormone restoration over fragmented specialty restrictions—focusing on absolute risks and net preventive benefits.

Menopause treatment has long been confined within a reductionist model that oversimplifies both the condition and its therapies. An ecological perspective reveals the integrated systemic consequences of this fragmented approach. Symptom-focused palliation ignores systemic decline, while risk-oriented cautionary restrictions forfeit fracture prevention and cardiovascular protection. Unified restoration recasts menopause as treatable endocrine deficiency—not episodic symptoms or cancer risk—prioritizing net health gains through bioidentical hormones that bridge gynecology's restoration goals with oncology's risk management.

Reductionist Framework

Dominant thinking fragments menopause into discrete organ complaints, subordinating physiological hormone restoration to precautionary risk avoidance.

- Menopause reduced to: Localized genitourinary and/or hot flash symptoms needing symptom-specific intervention.
- Breast regarded as: Autonomous endocrine-sensitive tissue prone to malignant transformation.
- Estrogen characterized as: Localized proliferative agent driving tissue expansion and oncogenesis.
- Core therapeutic objective: Restrict hormonal exposure to prevent organ-centric harms like breast malignancy.

Ecological Reality

- Menopause instead represents a profound endocrine transition with multi-system consequences, where hormones serve essential homeostatic functions throughout the body.
- Menopause characterized as: Systemic endocrine depletion compromising vascular regulation, bone architecture, neurocognitive function, metabolic equilibrium, and immune homeostasis.
- Estradiol conceptualized as: Foundational homeostatic regulator supporting multisystem resilience and extended health span.
- Progesterone positioned as: Protective modulator exerting anti-proliferative effects and cellular differentiation while counterbalancing estrogen signaling to promote genomic integrity.
- Primary treatment goal: Restore physiologic hormone signaling to maximize integrated health outcomes and optimize competing risk-benefit profiles.
- The prevailing reductionist framework allows disciplinary silos to maximize organ-specific surrogates (breast cancer recurrence, BMD T-scores, lipid profiles) while sidelining competing risks and overall mortality impact. Ecological medicine consolidates these perspectives, mandating that any intervention demonstrably advances total health integration, longevity, and functional autonomy.
- Any ecological approach to endocrine decision-making demands justification against the patient's comprehensive health trajectory, rather than deference to isolated surrogate markers. It promotes the evaluation of all-cause mortality across realistic time horizons, alongside major cardiovascular events such as myocardial infarction, stroke, and heart failure; major fragility fractures including hip, vertebral, and other osteoporotic sequelae; and sustained quality-of-life measures encompassing sleep quality, mood stability, cognitive function, sexual health, and overall functional capacity.

The Gynecology–Oncology Opposition: Ecological Failure in Clinical Practice

This analysis contends that for average/low-risk HR+ patients, overemphasizing breast recurrence surrogates, at the expense of cardiovascular, skeletal, and all-cause mortality, fundamentally redirects clinical decision-making for women thriving on bioidentical

MHT. Risk-stratified application (age, tumor biology, CVD/fracture baseline, time since diagnosis) via structured tools (Sections 4.2–4.3) reconciles gynecology-oncology tensions.

Important boundary conditions remain: women with hereditary high-risk syndromes (e.g., BRCA1/2 carriers) or substantially elevated baseline breast cancer risk may require stricter limits or alternative approaches. Ecological balancing remains individualized for these distinct risk profiles.

Case Scenario

A healthy 55-year-old woman on bioidentical MHT (tE2+MP)—with optimized CV risk factors, preserved bone density, and excellent QOL—undergoes routine screening mammography revealing low-risk HR+/HER2- DCIS or stage 1 IDC.

Oncology Reflexive Response (Reductive Anatomic Paradigm):

Oncologists, guided by organ-specific risk paradigms, reflexively stop MHT, initiate 5–10 years of aromatase inhibitors for profound estrogen suppression, and target breast cancer recurrence-free survival above all else.

Ecological Analysis:

Aromatase inhibitors block ER/PR signaling in HR+/HER2- tumors, but low-risk DCIS (low/ intermediate-grade) and stage 1 IDC carry only ~0.5–1.5% 10-year mortality without endocrine therapy in select patients [2,3,23].

This excellent prognosis questions reflexive MHT cessation + 5–10 years AI suppression. Does a ~1–3% 10-year absolute risk reduction offset hormone withdrawal's systemic harms in a patient with optimal CV health, bone density, and function? Integrated assessment should weigh longevity and QOL alongside—not against—breast recurrence metrics.

Aromatase Inhibitor "Benefit":16

Absolute mortality reduction: 0–0.5% (NNT 200–500+)

Mechanism: Minimal in absence of ER pathway; untested in most HR-negative populations

Aromatase Inhibitor Harms:12,14

- Cardiovascular events: RR 1.5–1.6 (ischemic heart disease, myocardial infarction, heart failure) → absolute increase 7–12%
- Major osteoporotic fractures: +100–200% relative risk → absolute increase 8–13%
- Type 2 diabetes mellitus: increased incidence
- Quality of life: severe arthralgias, fatigue, sexual dysfunction, mood disturbance

Bioidentical MHT Benefits:[17,19].

- Cardiovascular mortality: 25–50% reduction in women initiating <60 years or <10 years from menopause
- Fracture risk: 50% reduction (hip, vertebral, all sites)
- All-cause mortality: reduced in early initiation cohorts
- Quality of life: mood stabilization, sleep improvement, sexual function restoration, cognitive preservation

Table 5: 10-Year Competing Risks – Low-Risk Stage 0/1

Outcome	Baseline (No Endocrine)	Bioidentical MHT	AI Suppression	MHT Superiority
BC Mortality	0.5–1.5%	**0.5–1.5% (null)**1,11,22	0.3–1.2%16,23	**0% harm; maintains baseline excellence**
Cardiovascular Event	10–12%	↓ **8–10%**17,19	↑ 15–20% 12,14	**+7–12% prevented**
Major Fracture	4–6%	↓ **5-8%**19	↑ 10–15%12	**+8–13% prevented**
All-Cause Mortality	~12%	↓ **~10%**17,19	↑ ~13–15% 12,14,17	**+2–5% survival advantage**

ESM as Diagnostic Bridge

The gynecology–oncology conflict represents ESM Level 3 (category error) applied at the systems level. The breast is abstracted from the woman, and breast-specific surrogate endpoints (disease-free survival curves) are privileged over competing causes of death that dominate absolute mortality in women.17 Cardiovascular events and osteoporotic fractures are externalized as "non-oncologic" and therefore ignored in treatment algorithms, despite being 5–10 times more frequent than the marginal breast cancer benefit in low-risk populations.18 Ecological medicine resolves this by restoring symmetry. Endocrine integrity, vascular health, skeletal architecture, and breast oncogenesis are recognized as interacting elements of an integrated biological system. The treatment question shifts from "Does this reduce breast cancer recurrence?" to "Does this improve net survival and preserve functional capacity across all competing risks?"

Part IV: Clinical Implementation Toolkit

This section translates the preceding analysis into practical recognition checklists, decision aids, and consent templates that can be adapted in busy breast and menopause clinics.

ESM Recognition Checklist for MHT Breast Cancer Consultations

Before accepting categorical MHT prohibition in breast cancer survivors or new diagnoses, clinicians should assess:

- Prior progestin documented? (Synthetic vs bioidentical)
- Absolute risks quantified? (10-year cardiovascular, fracture, and breast cancer mortality discussed, not relative risks)
- Formulation specified? (tE2+MP vs CEE+MPA)
- Competing risks assessed? (Cardiovascular and osteoporosis baseline risk compared to marginal breast cancer recurrence reduction)
- Patient values elicited? (QOL, risk tolerance)

Mechanism addressed? (ER/PR status, grade, stage and type of tumor considered)

Shared Decision Aid Template

Framing for Low-Risk Breast Cancer:

For low/intermediate-grade DCIS or stage 1 HR+ IDC: COMET trial shows active monitoring (± endocrine therapy) noninferior to surgery for low-risk DCIS (ipsilateral invasive events: 4.2% vs 5.9% at 2 years), reinforcing de-escalation logic that informs risk-adapted discussions in early HR+ invasive disease [3,23,24].

This >95% 10-year survival (surgery/surveillance) across subtypes2,23 validates de-escalation particularly for screen-detected grade 1/2 HR+/HER2- DCIS, while low-grade stage 1 HR+/ HER2- IDC supports risk-adapted therapy. COMET showed 44% surgery-arm crossover to monitoring, preferring less invasive care [3].

Surgery + endocrine therapy remains standard for stage 1 HR+ IDC, but COMET's DCIS deescalation success supports individualized MHT vs AI discussions for select low-risk women. AIs offer ~1–3% absolute recurrence reduction (NNT 33–100, years 2–5), but increase CV events (7–12%) and fractures (8–13%). Bioidentical tE2+MP shows null BC risk (E3N RR 0.96, Norwegian/UK data) with 25–50% CV mortality and 50% fracture reduction. Shared benefitharm analysis guides personalized decisions.

Shared Decision-Making: Consent as Empowerment, Not Defensive Prohibition

Current Defensive Medicine Model:

Reflexive "stop all MHT post-breast cancer diagnosis" under liability fear withholds systemic benefits despite null bioidentical risk and proven AI estrogen suppression harms. ESM Level 6 failure: selective ethical implementation—categorical prohibition precludes meaningful informed consent.

Ecological Path Forward:

Shared clinician-patient decision-making reframes MHT as personalized survival optimization— not oncologic prohibition. Informed consent meets Canterbury v. Spence standards: disclose absolute risks, value tradeoffs, and life-trajectory impacts that reasonable patients would consider material.

Core Disclosures for Meaningful Consent

Breast Cancer Risk Component:

- Bioidentical tE2+MP demonstrates null effect on breast cancer incidence in adequately controlled studies—E3N MP RR 0.96, Norwegian registry transdermal intermediate
- (~1.2–1.5) (intermediate range, underpowered/

sparse data with prior synthetic carryover), UK registry null [1,11,22]
- No signal of increased recurrence in available observational data [8,10]
- Synthetic progestins (MPA, NETA) demonstrate elevated risk (RR 2.0–3.1), mechanistically distinct from bioidentical progesterone [1,11]

Aromatase Inhibitor Profile:
- Absolute breast cancer mortality reduction in low-risk disease: 0–0.5% over 10 years (NNT >200)
- Cardiovascular harms: +7–12% absolute increase in events (myocardial infarction, heart failure, ischemic events), Skeletal harms: +8–13% absolute increase in major fractures12,14
- Quality of life deterioration: arthralgias, fatigue, sexual dysfunction, insomnia, mood and cognitive disturbance

MHT Benefits:
- Cardiovascular mortality: RR 25–50% reduction (early initiation), Fracture reduction: RR 50% across all sites17,19
- Quality of life: mood, sleep, cognition, sexual function, vasomotor symptoms, vitality restoration
- All-cause mortality benefit greatest in women <60 years or <10 years from menopause

Table 6: Consent Anchor – Individual Risk Tolerance Frameworks

Patient Priority	Bioidentical MHT	AI Suppression	Recommendation
Maximum Longevity	Null BC risk; AllCause Mortality ↓~10%	0-0.5% BC gain + CV events ↑7-12% + fractures ↑8-13%	MHT if CV/fracture baseline risk moderate-high
QOL/ Vitality	Mood/sleep/sexual function preserved + cognitive protection	Severe arthralgias (60-70%), fatigue, sexual dysfunction, mood disturbance	MHT strongly favored
Bone/CV Health	CV ↓8–10%; fracture ↓5-8%	CV events ↑7-12% + major fractures ↑10-15%	MHT definitively superior
Bone/CV Health	Null risk (E3N RR 0.96, Norway transdermal ~1.2– 1.5, UK null)	1-3% absolute DFS gain (NNT 33-100, years	Shared discussion: absolute magnitudes + competing mortality

Example Clinical Documentation Template
Consent documentation template:
Informed Consent Discussion – MHT Continuation Post-Breast Cancer Diagnosis
Patient [Name]:
Date: [Date]
Diagnosis: Type (DCIS, IDC); Grade (low, int); Stage (1, 2); Phenotype (HR±, HER2±)
Prior Breast Cancer History: treatment history
Current Therapy: Transdermal estradiol [dose] + micronized progesterone [dose]

Risks Disclosed:
- Bioidentical tE2+MP physiologic endocrine replacement: Null breast cancer risk
- (E3N RR 0.96, Norwegian registry, UK registry)
- AI estrogen suppression therapy: Cardiovascular events +7–12%, fractures +8– 13%, QOL deterioration
- BC mortality reduction with AI: 0–0.5% absolute

Benefits Disclosed
- MHT: CVD mortality RR ↓25–50%, fractures ↓50%, QOL maintained
- AI: Marginal HR+ BC recurrence reduction

Patient Values Expressed
[Patient prioritizes: quality of life / cardiovascular health / bone health]
Patient tolerates: [null/minimal] breast cancer risk in exchange for systemic protection

Shared Decision

Continue bioidentical MHT / Initiate AI / Hybrid approach

Patient Signature: _____

Date: _____

Clinician Signature: _____

Date: _____

Liability Protection Through Transparent Informed Consent and Shared Decision-Making

Reasonable Patient Standard Met:

- Absolute risks disclosed (10-year mortality/morbidity)
- Formulation specificity documented (bioidentical vs. synthetic distinguished)
- Competing risks quantified
- Value elicitation recorded
- Patient agency centered

Beyond Defensive Medicine:

Unilateral prohibition = failure to disclose alternatives and assess individualized risk vs benefit

Charted shared decision = evidence-based standard of care defense

Post-FDA 2026 Standard:

ESM-guided consent positions clinicians as evidence advocates, not liability gatekeepers.

Part V: ESM Persistence and Paradigm Reconstruction

Why the Error Persists: Institutional Necessity

While guideline authors synthesized available evidence, ESM Level 5's self-referential loops prioritized WHI-synthetic signals over emerging formulation data, yet the absence of formal cross-disciplinary reconciliation mechanisms allowed siloed interpretations to persist without synthesis. E3N's implausible paradox was never corrected broadly because of structural factors operating across ESM levels:

Paradigm Lock (Level 1,2):

Post-WHI 2002, "estrogen causes/promotes breast cancer" became institutional orthodoxy.

E3N's tE2-alone RR 1.29 reinforced this narrative; the protective MP RR 0.96 was relegated to 'needs more data' footnotes. Biological implausibility (tE2 increased risk and tE2+MP no increased risk) was ignored because the conclusion aligned with prevailing dogma.

Citation Cascade (Level 5):

2019 Lancet (MP-sparse pooled E+P) → Cited in 2020–2024 reviews → Guidelines reference as baseline evidence, marginally noting E3N/Norway MP neutrality limitations alongside synthetic risks (IMS/EMAS critiques integrated) [9,11,13].

Liability Alignment (Level 6):

Categorical MHT prohibition post-breast cancer diagnosis provides defensive simplicity: no formulation distinctions, no competing risk/benefit calculations, no shared decision. Liability fear incentivizes maintaining restrictive standards even when evidence reverses, because revision requires acknowledging prior harm and may generate retrospective claims. This creates a locked paradigm: categorical bans shield against liability while marginalizing ecological individualized care, even when absolute recurrence risks remain <1–2% in low-grade HR+ DCIS/stage 1.3,8,24

No Institutional Correction Mechanism:

Medical societies (IMS, EMAS, BMS) highlighted Lancet 2019's micronized progesterone data sparsity and E3N limitations, but these critiques stayed confined to menopause journals. Oncology guidelines (NCCN/ASCO) bypassed them entirely, and media amplified 'all MHT risky' narratives from synthetic-pooled estimates. No cross-disciplinary mechanism mandates evidence reconciliation amid accumulating paradigm challenging evidence (E3N MP RR 0.96, Norwegian intermediates). Absence of formal inter-specialty review perpetuates expertise silos:

menopause nuance vs. oncology absolutism. Medical reductionism sustains rigid siloed awareness, effectively impeding evidence synthesis until liability pressures, regulatory mandates, or a tipping point of increased awareness in clinicians and women of modern MHT data (bioidentical neutrality), compel a paradigm shift.

The North American Menopause Society (now The Menopause Society) issued a February 2026 position update endorsing hormone therapy benefits outweighing risks for many women, favoring bioidentical formulations without strict age cutoffs, and affirming it as first-line for vasomotor symptoms (VMS) and genitourinary syndrome of menopause (GSM) [20].

However, this represents only a half-step forward.

Guidance maintains a palliative, symptomrelief model without recognizing menopause as systemic endocrine insufficiency requiring physiologic restoration for disease prevention (e.g., CVD, osteoporosis prevention, metabolic and neurocognitive benefits). It also stops short of breast cancer risk stratification by formulation type—perpetuating ESM Level 5's self-reinforcing guideline caution despite accumulating null signals for transdermal estradiol plus micronized progesterone.

The Reconstruction Mandate: From MHT to Ecological Medicine

The FDA's February 2026 reversal—removing black-box warnings and 'lowest dose-shortest duration' guidance, acknowledging cardiovascular benefits with early initiation, and supporting individualized risk assessment—creates the institutional opportunity for MHT reconstruction.21 But evidence-based guidelines lag implementation, and defensive practice patterns persist. Frontline clinicians require not just updated policies but diagnostic tools and ethical frameworks to implement change.

ESM provides the diagnostic vocabulary to identify where standards are asymmetrically applied, where category errors obscure mechanistic distinctions, and where institutional inertia resists correction. The ecological paradigm supplies the treatment plan: reunifying vascular, skeletal, neurocognitive, metabolic, and reproductive health within a single clinical frame, anchored in absolute risks/benefits and fully informed patient values rather than specialtyspecific surrogates.

Conclusion – MHT as Exemplar for Medical Paradigm Shift

A generation of menopausal women has absorbed the full cost of an MHT error that was never purely about hormones; it was about how reductive medicine conceptualizes women's health in post-reproductive age women.

The E3N paradox, the Norwegian correction, and the 2019 Lancet category error together demonstrate that breast cancer risk was not misread because estrogen is uniquely confusing, but because our epistemology is. MHT is the exemplar case in which evidence-selective medicine and anatomic reductionism converged: a single organ (ovaries), a single endpoint (breast cancer risk), a single trial (WHI), and a single narrative were allowed to overrule a large, coherent body of mechanistic, epidemiologic, and clinical data.

Once you see this pattern in MHT, you begin to recognize it elsewhere. Cardiology narrows prevention to LDL cholesterol targets while neglecting metabolic, inflammatory, and endocrine ecology. Psychiatry reduces depression to monoamine deficiency (imbalance of serotonin or norepinephrine) while ignoring inflammatory, hormonal, nutritional, and social determinants. Oncology escalates locoregional control and endocrine suppression while competing risks from cardiovascular disease, skeletal fragility, and metabolic dysregulation quietly dominate long-term mortality. In each setting, specialty silos and surrogate endpoints fragment the patient into organ-specific problems, making it possible for small, methodologically fragile signals to dictate large, system-level harms.

The MHT exemplar shows that ecological medicine is not a philosophical luxury, it is a corrective method. It asks us to reorient clinical judgment in whole-system trajectories and absolute risks, to require that statistical claims pass mechanistic and ecological plausibility tests, and to embed shared decision-making as the default rather than an optional extension. Evidence-selective medicine provides the diagnostic vocabulary for identifying where our standards are applied asymmetrically; an ecological paradigm supplies the treatment plan— reuniting endocrine, vascular, skeletal, immune, and neurocognitive health within a single clinical frame.

If we can acknowledge and correct the MHT error—publicly, structurally, and with explicit restoration of patient agency—we also establish a transferable template. The same six-level ESM analysis that unravels MHT dogma can be applied to statin thresholds in primary prevention, antidepressant trials with marginal effect sizes, extended endocrine therapy in lowrisk breast cancers, and beyond. The ecological question is always the same: does this intervention improve the patient's global health trajectory, or does it merely normalize one silo's isolated priorities at the expense of the patient's integrated function?

Menopausal hormone therapy is medicine's overdue reconciliation with its own evidence. How we respond here will signal evolution from reductive silos of ex-

pertise to ecological care. The tools exist. Implementation is the mandate.

References

1. Støer N C, Abedini S, Hofvind S et al. (2024) Menopausal hormone therapy and breast cancer risk: A population-based cohort study of 1.3 million women in Norway. British Journal of Cancer. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41416-024-02590-1.
2. American Cancer Society (2024) DCIS survival rates. https://www.cancer.org
3. Hwang E S et al. (2025) Active monitoring with or without endocrine therapy for low-risk ductal carcinoma in situ: The COMET randomized clinical trial. JAMA, 333: 972-980.
4. British Menopause Society, European Menopause and Andropause Society, & Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (2020) Menopausal hormone therapy and breast cancer: Joint statement. https://thebms.org.uk.
5. Catherino D (2026) Evidence-Selective Medicine: A Six-Level Model of Institutional Bias in Clinical Medicine [Preprint]. https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.17587779.
6. Catherino D (2026b) Reconstructing Menopausal Hormone Therapy Guidelines: From Palliative Symptom Management to Age-Related Endocrine Insufficiency Disease Prevention. [Preprint]. https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.17775748.
7. Catherino D (2026c) Hormone Therapy Reimagined: A Precision Approach to Menopause Care. [Preprint]. https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.15752324
8. Cold S, Cold F, Jensen M B, Cronin-Fenton D, Christiansen P, Ejlertsen B (2022) Systemic or vaginal hormone therapy after early breast cancer: A Danish observational cohort study. Journal of the National Cancer Institute 114: 1347–1355.
9. Collaborative Group on Hormonal Factors in Breast Cancer. (2019). Type and timing of menopausal hormone therapy and breast cancer risk: Individual participant meta-analysis of the worldwide epidemiological evidence. The Lancet 394: 1159-1168.
10. Fabian C J, et al. (2011) Effects of tibolone on climacteric symptoms and quality of life in breast cancer patients Data from LIBERATE trial. Maturitas 70: 365–372.
11. Fournier A, Berrino F Clavel-Chapelon F (2008) Unequal risks for breast cancer associated with different hormone replacement therapies: Results from the E3N cohort study. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment 107: 103-111.
12. Hadji P, et al. (2024) Impact of endocrine therapy on osteoporosis risk in women with breast cancer. Osteoporosis International. Advance online publication.
13. International Menopause Society (2019) Comment on 2019 Lancet meta-analysis. https://www.imsociety.org
14. Matthews A A, et al. (2025) The risk of cardiovascular disease following aromatase inhibitor therapy in early breast cancer. Journal of the National Cancer Institute 117: 456-465.
15. National Cancer Institute (2026) Breast cancer treatment (PDQ®)–Health professional version. https://www.cancer.gov.
16. Nature Reviews Cancer (2023) Type of adjuvant endocrine therapy and disease-free survival in HR breast cancer. Nature Reviews Cancer, 23: 245-258.
17. Patnaik J L, Byers T, DiGuiseppi C, et al. (2011) cardiovascular disease competes with breast cancer as the leading cause of death for older females. Breast Cancer Research 13: 64.
18. Rossouw J E, et al. (2007) Postmenopausal hormone therapy and risk of cardiovascular disease by age and years since menopause. JAMA 297: 1465-1477.
19. Schierbeck L L, Rejnmark L, Tofteng C L, et al. (2012) Effect of hormone replacement therapy on cardiovascular events in recently postmenopausal women: Randomised trial. BMJ 345: e6409.
20. The Menopause Society (2026) Hormone Therapy Position Statement.
21. U S Food and Drug Administration (FDA) (2025) HHS Advances Women's Health: Removes Misleading FDA Warnings from HRT (Nov 10). https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/hhs-advances-womens-health-removes-misleading-fda-warnings-hormone-replacement-therapy.
22. Vinogradova Y, Coupland C Hippisley-Cox J (2020) Use of hormone replacement therapy and risk of breast cancer: Nested case-control studies using the Q Research and CPRD databases. BMJ, 371, Article m3873.

23. American Cancer Society (2026) Breast cancer survival rates. https://www.cancer.org/cancer/types/ breast-cancer/understanding-a-breast-cancer-diagnosis/breast-cancer-survival-rates.html.
24. Partridge A H, et al. (2025) Patient-reported outcomes for low-risk ductal carcinoma in situ: A secondary analysis of the COMET randomized clinical trial. JAMA Oncology.
25. Crandall CJ et al., Osteoporosis Int 2022: "Menopausal hormone therapy reduces the risk of fracture regardless of FRAX probability and falls history" (combined WHI; MOF HR 0.60 [0.53–0.69], any fracture HR 0.72).