

# British Menopause Society consensus statement: The risks and benefits of HRT before and after a breast cancer diagnosis

Post Reproductive Health

2019, Vol. 25(1) 33–37

© The Author(s) 2019

Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/2053369119825716

journals.sagepub.com/home/prh



Jo Marsden ; on behalf of the British Menopause Society

## Abstract

In women at population risk of breast cancer (i.e. most), short-term exposure to hormone replacement therapy (i.e. up to five years' use) for symptom relief exceeds its potential harms, including the associated, increased risk of breast cancer diagnosis. Many women and health care professionals, however, consider this to be unacceptably high, although the degree of risk conferred appears equivalent to, or less than that of, other lifestyle risk factors for this condition. In contrast, it is recommended that symptomatic women at high baseline risk due to a family history or a biopsy-confirmed high-risk benign breast condition and those with previous breast cancer should be managed initially with lifestyle changes and non-hormonal alternatives. In a minority, whose symptoms are refractory, hormone replacement therapy and or topical estrogen can be considered but prescription should only take place after a discussion between the patient, her primary health care and breast specialist teams.

## Keywords

Hormone replacement therapy, lifestyle risk factors, risk of breast cancer diagnosis, vasomotor symptoms

## Introduction

The risk of breast cancer diagnosis associated with hormone replacement therapy (HRT) is often assumed by health care professionals and the lay public alike to be very high, which may adversely influence decisions about its initiation and continuance.<sup>1</sup> This is despite the fact that the risk conferred by HRT is of a similar degree to other postmenopausal lifestyle risk factors for breast cancer (e.g. obesity, alcohol), irrespective of phenotype.<sup>2</sup> There appear to be several reasons why HRT garners such adverse attention. Media reporting accompanying the publication of some clinical trials has often over emphasised the risks of HRT, whilst studies not showing the adverse risks get little attention. The impact of HRT on breast cancer diagnosis is often discussed in isolation of its benefits and there is no or little simultaneous reference to the other lifestyle risk factors for breast cancer, to provide context when counselling women about its use.

## HRT and the risk of being diagnosed with and dying from breast cancer

Numerous, mostly uncontrolled, observational studies have evaluated the association between HRT and

outcomes from breast cancer with varying conclusions. However, clinical advice and prescribing habits have been largely influenced by findings from the 1997 Collaborative Group on Hormonal Factors in Breast Cancer (CGHFBC) re-analysis of 51 world-wide observational studies and initial publications from the placebo-controlled, randomised Women's Health Initiative Study (WHI) and observational Million Women's Study (MWS) in 2002 and 2003, respectively.<sup>3–6</sup> The collaborative group re-analysis established a duration-dependent association of HRT with risk of diagnosis, emerging after five years' exposure (an overall risk ratio of 1.35). This appeared greater with combined rather than unopposed HRT and fell following cessation. The degree of risk with any HRT exposure was estimated to be equivalent to the impact of a delayed menopause (2.3% vs. 2.8% per year respectively).<sup>3</sup> The WHI and MWS confirmed risk was greater

King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

### Corresponding author:

Jo Marsden, King's College Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Denmark Hill, London SE5 9RS, UK.

Email: jo\_marsden@yahoo.com

with combined HRT but whilst the degree of estimated risk was in keeping with that from previous clinical studies (reported as an up to twofold increase), the results caused such concern that HRT prescribing fell significantly world-wide and this persisted regardless of subsequent studies also estimating associated risk was similar and small.<sup>4-7</sup> The WHI and MWS investigators placed emphasis on the use of risk ratios and percentage change in risk, whose mis-interpretation spawned considerable, negative publicity. This could have been avoided by presenting findings using absolute excess or attributable risk.<sup>8</sup>

Taken as a whole, clinical studies to date have shown that where risk is increased, it is limited to lean women, there does not appear to be a dosage effect and there is no additive effect in women at elevated personal risk due to a family history or high-risk benign breast condition.<sup>3,9</sup> Overall, with use up to five years, exposure to *any* unopposed estrogen (i.e. conjugated equine estrogen (CEE), oestradiol or oestriol) is associated with minimal or no increased risk.<sup>5,7</sup> This appears to be unaffected by estrogen type or route of administration (excepting implants where there are no clinical data). Some studies suggest that risk might be increased with long-term use (that is for more than 10 years), but this requires further confirmation.<sup>7</sup> For combined HRT, a duration-dependent increase in risk is associated with sequential and continuous preparations and appears elevated, regardless of route of administration, including delivery of progestogen via the levonorgestrel intra-uterine system (LNG-IUS).<sup>7,9</sup> There is some evidence suggesting that risk may not be elevated if dydrogesterone or micronized progesterone are used in preference to synthetic progestogens in combined preparations.<sup>7</sup> In women with premature ovarian insufficiency (POI), in whom HRT is effective for the management of vasomotor symptoms and likely to lower the long-term risk of cardiovascular disease, prevent osteoporosis and have a beneficial effect on cognitive function, it is recommended that years of HRT exposure should be counted from the age of 50 and not at the age of HRT commencement (i.e. when POI is diagnosed).<sup>3,10</sup>

In 2015, The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), published its menopause guidance (NG23).<sup>11</sup> This evidence-based review included evaluation of the short-term outcomes of HRT, with use for up to five years for the treatment of menopausal symptoms on breast cancer outcomes. The clinical studies eligible for review were mostly observational and ranged from low to moderate quality at best. Of randomised trials, only the WHI study was sufficiently powered for inclusion. Overall, the findings did not differ significantly from those of previous evidence

and it was recommended to base discussion of HRT around the following statements:

1. HRT with estrogen alone is associated with no or little change in risk.
2. HRT with estrogen and progestogen 'can be associated with an increase in the risk'.
3. Risk of diagnosis is not elevated in past users of HRT.
4. Any increase in risk 'is related to treatment duration and reduces after stopping HRT'.
5. No significant increase in breast cancer mortality was found. This has been confirmed subsequently with long-term follow-up of the WHI study and a large meta-analysis, where use of unopposed or combined HRT was not associated with any adverse effect on all cause, total cancer or breast cancer mortality.<sup>12,13</sup>

One of the strengths of the guidance is that findings related to the risk of diagnosis were presented using absolute excess risk as recommended for enhancing patient experience in adult NHS services.<sup>11</sup> Doing so illustrates that most women, if exposed to HRT, will never be diagnosed with breast cancer and are even more apparent and least biased if absolute risk is framed, which shows the number of women who could be diagnosed and those who could not be diagnosed if exposed to HRT (Table 1).

NICE also recommended that HRT counselling should be individualized, accounting for non-modifiable factors that determine baseline breast cancer risk and exposure to modifiable lifestyle risk factors. It has been estimated that just under a quarter of breast cancer diagnoses in the UK may be preventable by minimizing modifiable risk factor exposure where the proportion of breast cancers attributable to HRT exposure is estimated to be the same as that associated with lack of exercise (i.e. 3%) and less than those attributed to alcohol (6%) or postmenopausal overweight and obesity (9%).<sup>14</sup> Whilst risk factor modification will therefore have benefit for the population as a whole in reducing breast cancer diagnosis, it is not possible to predict on an *individual* level who will benefit or not as most women exposed to known risk factors, including HRT, are never diagnosed with breast cancer during their lifetime (Table 2).

Finally, in women at *population risk* for breast cancer, the overall risk: benefit ratio for both unopposed and combined HRT is favourable with overall reductions in all-cause mortality. It is factitious to discuss HRT without consideration that a risk factor for one health condition may protect against another.

**Table 1.** NICE menopause guidance (NG23) reference Table 3 with insertion of negative and positive framing of absolute risk.<sup>11</sup>

	Absolute excess risk of breast cancer diagnosis per 1000 women aged 45 to 79 <sup>a</sup>					
	Observational studies			Randomised studies		
	Excess	Diagnosed	Not diagnosed	Excess	Diagnosed	Not diagnosed
No HRT	–	23	977	–	23	977
Estrogen only						
Past use	0	23	977	–	–	–
Current use	+6	29	971	–4	19	981
Duration of use < 5 years	+4	27	973	–	–	–
Duration of use 5 to 10 years	+5	28	972	–	–	–
Time since last use > 5 years	–5	18	982	–5	18	982
Combined HRT						
Past use	–3	20	980	–	–	–
Current use	+17	40	960	+5	28	972
Duration of use < 5 years	+12	35	965	–	–	–
Duration of use 5 to 10 years	+21	44	956	–	–	–
Time since last use > 5 years	–9	14	986	+8	31	969

<sup>a</sup>The absolute number of events has been calculated using a baseline risk population risk of 23/1000 women aged 45 to 79 years with 7.5 years of follow-up as estimated by NICE from 2010 Office of National Statistics data.<sup>11</sup> The duration of use selected (i.e. up to five years) reflects the average duration of HRT exposure in women in the UK prior to publication of the MWS.<sup>6</sup>

**Table 2.** The impact of lifestyle risk factors on the absolute risk of breast cancer diagnosis in women at population risk: Comparison of HRT with other lifestyle risk factors with negative and positive framing.<sup>9</sup>

	Absolute risk of diagnosis per 1000 women aged 45 to 79 <sup>a</sup>		
	Cancers diagnosed	Cancers not diagnosed	Excess risk
No exposure	23	977	–
Risk Increased			
Postmenopausal obesity or overweight	27–40	960–973	+4 to +17
Combined HRT (NICE observational studies)	40	960	+17
Alcohol (regular intake $\geq 6$ g/day)	29	971	+6
Unopposed HRT (NICE observational studies)	29	971	+6
Combined HRT (NICE randomised studies)	29	971	+6
Smoking (current smoker)	26	974	+3
Risk reduced			
Unopposed HRT (NICE randomised studies)	17	983	–6
Physical activity (>9 MET-h/week)	13	987	–10

<sup>a</sup>The absolute number of events has been calculated using a baseline risk population risk of 23/1000 women aged 45 to 79 years with 7.5 years of follow-up as estimated by NICE from 2010 Office of National Statistics data.<sup>11</sup>

## HRT in women at high baseline risk of breast cancer

In women with a familial risk or a high-risk benign breast condition (i.e. biopsy-proven epithelial atypia or Lobular Carcinoma In Situ), HRT exposure has not been shown to have an additive effect on the risk of diagnosis.<sup>7,9</sup> Its absolute impact therefore increases as a woman's baseline risk rises. Although it is recommended that lifestyle and non-hormonal alternatives should be used as first-line management of vasomotor symptoms in high-risk women, HRT may be needed

for severe, refractory symptoms and should be considered on an individual basis following specialist and patient discussion.<sup>7,9,11,15</sup> In the absence of data, it would be difficult to justify the use of HRT for indications other than symptom relief, where longer duration therapy would be indicated as for example in population-risk women with POI. The exception to this is BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutation carriers, who have undergone prophylactic bilateral salpingo-oophorectomy (BSO). Here, add-back HRT (unopposed or combined) has not been shown to diminish the risk-reducing benefit of prophylactic BSO on

subsequent risk of breast cancer diagnosis but clinical data are very limited.<sup>7,9</sup> The current recommendation is that after prophylactic BSO, add-back HRT is used until the age of an expected natural menopause, after which non-hormonal alternatives are used as first-line management for symptom control and the prevention of chronic, estrogen-deficiency health problems.<sup>7,15</sup>

### Use of HRT after breast cancer

Women treated for breast cancer may experience multiple symptoms including hot flushes and vulvo-vaginal atrophy as a consequence of a natural menopause or as a side effect of treatment aimed at reducing the activity or synthesis of estrogen. Iatrogenic symptoms are not limited to women with hormone sensitive disease as chemotherapy-induced ovarian suppression will occur irrespective of the estrogen receptor (ER) status of the primary tumour. Systemic HRT and topical (vaginal) estrogen are the most efficacious treatments but contraindicated in women with ER positive disease. HRT, however, may not be without risk for those with an ER negative primary. Although there is high concordance in hormone receptor status between first and second primary breast cancers, a minority with an ER negative primary may present with an ER positive contralateral cancer (up to 30%) and approximately 8% may present with ER positive metastatic disease.<sup>16,17</sup> It is unknown whether lifestyle risk factors have a part in this. It has been hypothesised risk will not be increased in women taking concurrent tamoxifen due to the very high binding affinity for the estrogen receptor. However, as aromatase inhibitors reduce estrogen production it would be counter-intuitive to prescribe concomitant exogenous sex hormones.<sup>7,9,11</sup> Despite theoretical predictions, clinical evidence is inconclusive due to the premature closure of all three randomised trials of HRT in breast cancer patients, when all were underpowered. These were stopped when interim analysis of one trial showed an increased risk of recurrence. Overall risk was not increased following interim analysis of the two other trials or meta-analysis of all three (hazard ratio (HR) 1.45, 95% confidence interval (CI) 0.93–2.26).<sup>18</sup> Tibolone, a synthetic steroid with weak estrogen, progestogen and/or androgen activity, has been used as an alternative to HRT for symptom relief but a large randomised study in breast cancer patients was also stopped prematurely due to an increased risk of recurrence (HR 1.40, 95% CI 1.14–1.70).<sup>19</sup>

NICE has taken a pragmatic approach, recommending lifestyle and non-hormonal alternatives for first-line management of vasomotor symptoms, recognising HRT could be considered if symptoms are refractory.<sup>11,20</sup> For women with symptoms due to

vulvo-vaginal atrophy if treatment with vaginal moisturisers fails to alleviate symptoms, topical estrogen can be discussed.<sup>11</sup> There is generally lower concern about systemic absorption from low and ultra-low dose topical estrogen, which is minimal and could be acceptable where systemic therapy would not be. Neither systemic HRT nor topical estrogen are recommended in women taking an aromatase inhibitor and with both, prescription should only take place after discussion between the patient, her primary health care and breast specialist team.<sup>11</sup>

### Summary

In women with a low underlying risk of breast cancer (i.e. most of the population):

1. The benefits of HRT in the short-term (up to five years' use) for symptom relief will exceed potential harm;
2. The risk of breast cancer diagnosis associated with HRT is equivalent to, or less than that of, other lifestyle risk factors for breast cancer;
3. Communicating risk in terms of absolute excess risk with framing, minimizes bias and misinterpretation;
4. The potential risk of breast cancer diagnosis associated with unopposed or combined HRT should not be discussed in isolation of its other short- and long-term benefits and risks;
5. In women at high risk, if the use of HRT is considered, this should only be for the management of estrogen deficiency symptoms.

### Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) is a council member of the British Menopause Society and British Association of Day Surgery and chief investigator for the UK randomised trial of HRT in symptomatic women with early breast cancer. She has also undertaken paid teaching and educational commitments for pharma companies including Mylan, Wyeth, Novo, and Organon.

### Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### ORCID iD

Jo Marsden  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8452-1548>

### References

1. Morris E and Currie H. Informed choice: is it achievable? *Menopause Int* 2011; 17: 115.
2. Makama M, Drukker CA, Rutgers EJT, et al. An association study of established breast cancer reproductive

- and lifestyle risk factors with tumour subtype defined by the prognostic 70-gene expression signature (MammaPrint®). *Eur J Cancer* 2017; 75: 5–13.
3. Collaborative Group on Hormonal Factors for Breast Cancer. Breast cancer and hormone replacement therapy: collaborative reanalysis from 51 individual epidemiological studies. *Lancet* 1997; 350: 1047–1060.
  4. Writing Group for the Women's Health Initiative Investigators. Risks and benefits of estrogen plus progestin in healthy postmenopausal women. *JAMA* 2002; 288: 321–333.
  5. Anderson GL, Limacher M, Assaf AR, et al; Womens's Health Initiative Steering Committee. Effects of conjugated equine estrogen in postmenopausal women with hysterectomy: the Women's Health Initiative randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2004; 291: 1701–1712.
  6. Million Women Study Collaborators. Breast cancer and hormone-replacement therapy in the Million Women Study. *Lancet* 2003; 362: 419–427.
  7. The 2017 hormone therapy position statement of the North American Menopause Society. *Menopause* 2017; 24: 728–753.
  8. Gigerenzer G. How innumeracy can be exploited. In: *Reckoning with risk* 2003; Part III, 201–210. Penguin Group.
  9. Marsden J. NICE guideline – menopause: diagnosis and management. Long-term benefits and risks of HRT (Section 11): breast cancer. *J Post Reprod Health* 2016; 22: 85–91.
  10. The British Menopause Society consensus statement on the management of women with premature ovarian insufficiency, 2017, [www.thebms.org.uk](http://www.thebms.org.uk) (accessed 18 January 2019).
  11. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Menopause; Clinical Guideline – methods, evidence and recommendations (NG23), 2015, [www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng23](http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng23) (accessed 18 January 2019).
  12. Manson JE, Aragaki AK, Rossouw JE, et al; WHI Investigators. Menopausal hormone therapy and long-term all-cause and cause-specific mortality: the women's health initiative randomized trials. *JAMA* 2017; 318: 927–938.
  13. Yu X, Zhou S, Wang J, et al. Hormone replacement therapy and breast cancer survival: a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Breast Cancer* 2017; 24: 643–657.
  14. Parkin DM, Boyd L and Walker LC. The fraction of cancer attributable to lifestyle and environmental factors in the UK in 2010. *Br J Cancer* 2011; 105: S77–S81.
  15. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Familial breast cancer: classification, care and managing breast cancer and related risks in people with a family history of breast cancer (CG164), 2013, [www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg164](http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg164) (accessed 18 January 2019).
  16. Swain SM, Wilson JW, Mamounas EP, et al. Estrogen receptor status of primary breast cancer is predictive of estrogen receptor status of contralateral breast cancer. *JNCI* 96; 7: 516–523.
  17. Karlsson E, Lindström LS, Wilking U, et al. Discordance in hormone receptor status in breast cancer during tumor progression. *J Clin Oncol* 2010; 28: 1009–1009.
  18. Marsden J, Morden J, A'Hern R, et al.; on behalf of the UK HRT Trial Management Group. Hormone replacement therapy (HRT) is effective in relieving oestrogen deficiency symptoms (ODS) and improves quality of life in breast cancer patients: the UK randomised HRT trial experience. *Maturitas* 2017; 100:132.
  19. Kenemans P, Bundred NJ, Foidart JM et al.; LIBERATE Study Group. Safety and efficacy of tibolone in breast-cancer patients with vasomotor symptoms: a double-blind, randomised, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2009; 10: 135–146.
  20. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Early and locally advanced breast cancer: diagnosis and treatment. NICE guidelines [NG101], 2018, [www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng101/resources](http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng101/resources) (accessed 18 January 2019).